

GEDLING LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

Appendix D: Appraisal of Objectives and Policies

May 2026

Serving people, Improving lives

Contents

INTRODUCTION	5
APPRAISAL OF OBJECTIVES	5
APPRAISAL OF POLICIES.....	19
Topic Area 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Development and Flood Risk.....	21
1.1: Climate Change and Energy	21
1.2 Renewable Energy Schemes	29
1.3. Managing Flood Risk and Watercourses.....	33
1.4 Surface Water Management	36
1.5 Managing Water Quality.....	39
1.6 Aquifer Protection	42
Topic Area 2: Environmental Protection	45
2.1 Contaminated Land.....	46
2.2 Unstable Land.....	49
2.3 Hazardous Substances	52
2.4 Pollution	55
2.5 Air Quality	58
Topic Area 3 Spatial Strategy and Housing Target.....	61
3.1 Spatial Strategy.....	61
3.2 Delivering the Identified Housing Target.....	74
3.3 Housing Need and Target	83
Topic Area 4: Green Belt.....	95
4.1 The Green Belt.....	95
4.2 Reuse of Buildings within the Green Belt	102
4.3 Extensions to Buildings within the Green Belt	106
4.4 Replacement of Buildings within the Green Belt.....	110
4.5 Infill Development within the Green Belt.....	114
4.6 Homes for Rural Workers.....	118
Topic Area 5: Natural Environment	121
5.1 Blue-Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character	121
5.2 Biodiversity	132
Topic Area 6: Open Space and Recreational Facilities.....	144
6.1 Culture, Tourism and Sport	144
6.2 Protection of Open Space	151
6.3 Provision of New Open Space.....	154

6.4 Local Green Space	159
6.5 Greenwood Community Forest.....	162
6.6 Tourist Accommodation	165
6.7 Equestrian Development.....	168
Topic Area 7: Heritage	171
7.1: The Historic Environment.....	171
7.2 Designated Heritage Assets.....	177
7.3 Listed Buildings.....	180
7.4: Conservation Areas.....	182
7.5: Historic Landscapes, Parks and Gardens	185
7.6: Archaeology	188
7.7: Non-Designated Heritage Assets	191
Topic Area 8: Design	194
8.1 Design and Enhancing Local Identity	194
8.1 Design and Enhancing Local Identity	195
8.2 Amenity.....	203
8.3 Residential Density	207
8.4 Residential Gardens.....	212
Topic Area 9: Housing Mix	217
9.1 Housing Size, Mix and Choice	217
9.2 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.....	232
9.3 Specialist Accommodation	241
9.4 Housing Development on Unallocated Sites.....	244
9.5 Live Work Units.....	247
9.6 Self Build and Custom Homes	250
9.7 Extensions to Dwellings Not in the Green Belt	253
Topic Area 10: Employment.....	256
10.1 Employment Provision and Economic Development	256
10.2 Retention of Employment and Employment Uses.....	282
10.3 Employment Development on Unallocated Sites.....	285
10.4 Expansion of Existing Employment Uses Not in the Green Belt	288
10.5 Agricultural and Rural Diversification.....	293
10.6 Local Labour Agreements	296
Topic Area 11: Retail and Community Facilities	299
11.1 Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Boundaries.....	299
11.2 Development within Town and Local Centres.....	304
11.3 Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	307

11.4 Upper Floors	315
11.5 Impact Assessment Threshold	318
11.6 Development within Small Parades	321
11.7 Shopfront Development.....	324
Topic Area 12: Transport	327
12.1 Managing Travel Demand	327
12.2 Transport Infrastructure Priorities	333
12.3 Parking Standards.....	338
12.4 Cycle Routes, Recreational Routes and Public Rights of Way	344
12.5 Park and Ride	347
12.6 Highway Safety	350
Topic Area 13: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	353
13.1 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	353

INTRODUCTION

This appendix contains the assessment of:

- Plan Objectives;
- Policy Options and Reasonable Alternatives;
- Final Strategic Plan Policies (for Regulation 19 Publication Draft).

APPRAISAL OF OBJECTIVES

The objectives contained within the Gedling Local Development Plan are listed below.

Spatial Objectives

The Gedling Local Development Plan contains the following strategic objectives:

- 1. Environmentally responsible development addressing climate change:** to reduce the causes of climate change and to minimise its impacts, by locating development where it can be accessed by sustainable transport; requiring environmentally sensitive design and construction; reducing the risk of flooding; conserving and improving water quality; contributing to carbon neutrality; and addressing air, noise and other types of pollution.
- 2. High quality new housing:** to manage an increase in the supply of housing and ensure the targets of the Plan are met and delivered in sustainable locations that maximise brownfield opportunities, deliver regeneration aims, and create and support mixed and balanced communities. In doing so, there will be a rebalancing of the housing mix to maximise choice and support people into home ownership, providing affordable, family, and self and custom build housing, and housing opportunities for older people, people with disabilities and Gypsies and Travellers.
- 3. Economic prosperity for all:** to ensure economic growth is equitable and includes the knowledge-based economy. Arnold and Carlton will be enhanced by supporting opportunities for new office development especially where it aligns with growth in office and commercial development in the City Centre. Mixed use residential and employment sites at Lime Lane supported by a new Park and Ride, Teal Close and Top Wighay Farm will create the conditions for all people to participate in the economy, by providing local employment opportunities, encouraging rural enterprise, improving access to training opportunities, and supporting educational developments. Where appropriate, further development of tourism facilities will be supported.
- 4. Flourishing and vibrant centres:** to create the conditions for the protection and enhancement of a balanced hierarchy and network with Arnold town and other local centres. Responding to the changes in retail, office and leisure industries, including the growth of internet shopping by increasing leisure, residential, tourism, cultural and local services at a scale appropriate to the

centre's position in the hierarchy in addition to accessibility improvements, environmental improvements, and town centre regeneration measures.

5. **Regeneration:** to maximise brownfield regeneration opportunities, to encourage the recycling of derelict land and ensure that regeneration supports and enhances opportunities for local communities and residents, leading to all neighbourhoods being neighbourhoods of choice, where people want to live.

6. **Protecting and enhancing the area's individual and historic character and local distinctiveness:** to achieve sustainable well-designed development by promoting high quality locally distinct buildings and places that respect local character. To preserve and enhance the distinctive natural and built heritage, by protecting and enhancing the historic environment, including nationally recognised heritage assets, and by valuing the countryside for its productive qualities and ensuring its landscape character is maintained and enhanced.

7. **Achieving well-designed places in Gedling Borough:** to create a strong sense of place with its own identity. Protecting and enhancing townscape and landscape character by responding to and reinforcing locally distinctive patterns of development and design. Ensure places are sustainable, functional, inclusive and are easy to get to, to navigate around and well-integrated with the existing community. Engage with the community, using appropriate planning tools such as design codes.

8. **Strong, safe, healthy and cohesive communities:** to plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and to design out crime, promote social interaction and create the conditions for communities to become strong, safe, healthy and cohesive. To address environmental factors underpinning health and wellbeing and promote social interaction and inclusivity by design. Work with healthcare partners to deliver new and improved health and social care facilities. Integrating health and service provision, and improving access to cultural, sport and leisure and lifelong learning activities.

9. **Opportunities for all:** to give all children and young people the best possible start in life by providing the highest quality educational, community, cultural, leisure and sport facilities, for instance through improving existing or providing new schools, further education establishments and access to Universities. Meet the needs of older and disabled people, especially through providing appropriate housing and employment opportunities and prevent the unnecessary loss of valued services and facilities.

10. **Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel:** to ensure access to jobs, leisure and services is improved in a sustainable and equitable way, addressing air and noise pollution, reducing the need to travel by private car, by encouraging convenient and reliable transport systems, particularly those focused on walking, cycling and public transport, by maximising opportunities for mixed use development. To support growth by expanded use of transport data systems aimed at reducing congestion and encouraging the electrification of vehicles and improving air quality.

11. Protecting and improving natural assets: to improve and provide new Blue and Green Infrastructure, including open spaces, by enhancing and developing the network of multi-functional green spaces for the benefit of people and wildlife. To improve their connectivity, accessibility and environmental quality, increasing ecosystem services, biodiversity and contributions to the Nature Recovery Network. Protecting and enhancing nature conservation sites and priority habitats, and their connectivity within the ecological network.

12. Timely and viable infrastructure: to make the best use of existing infrastructure and provide new and improved infrastructure which supports sustainable housing and economic growth. This will be achieved through ongoing engagement with infrastructure providers. The expansion of the tram network will be explored, including potential new routes. Opportunities provided by existing transport infrastructure will be maximised and additional strategic transport improvements including capacity improvements to strategic highway junctions and a Park and Ride facility at Leapool roundabout.

Outcome of the SA assessment

The SA assessment of the GLDP objectives have been reviewed as they have been developed. These reviews have led to amendments to the plan's objectives to ensure they are compatible with the SA objectives. The outcome of the SA assessment of the GLDP objectives compatibility with the SA objectives are shown below.

Compatible key

++	Strongly compatible This means that the SA objective and the Gedling Local Development Plan objective are strongly compatible.
+	Compatible This means that the SA objective and the Gedling Local Development Plan objective are compatible.
?	Uncertain This means that it is not known (or uncertain) on the relationship between the SA objective and Gedling Local Development Plan objective.
0	No relationship This means that there is no relationship (or no impact) between the SA objective and Gedling Local Development Plan objective.
-	Incompatible This means that the SA objective and the Gedling Local Development Plan objective are not compatible.
--	Strongly incompatible This means that the SA objective and the Gedling Local Development Plan objective are strongly incompatible.

Compatibility table

SA objectives	Gedling Local Development Plan objectives											
	1. Climate change	2. High quality new housing	3. Economic prosperity for all	4. Town centres	5. Regeneration	6. Local distinctiveness	7. Well-designed places	8. Communities	9. Opportunities for all	10. Sustainable transport systems	11. Natural assets	12. Infrastructure
1. Housing	+	++	+	+	+	+	++	++	+	++	+	++
2. Employment and Jobs	+	++	++	++	+	0	0	+	++	++	0	++
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	+	++	+	+	+	?	+	+	++	+	++
4. Shopping Centres	+	+	+	++	+	+	++	++	++	++	+	+
5. Health and Well Being	+	++	++	++	+	+	++	++	++	++	++	+
6. Community Safety	0	+	0	++	++	0	++	++	+	++	+	+
7. Social Inclusion	+	++	++	++	+	+	++	++	++	++	+	+
8. Transport	++	++	+	+	+	+	++	++	+	++	+	++
9. Brownfield Land	+	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	+	++	+	++
10. Energy and Climate Change	++	+	+	+	+	+	++	+	0	++	++	?
11. Pollution and Air Quality	++	?	?	+	?	0	+	+	+	++	++	?
12. Flooding and Water Quality	++	?	?	0	?	+	+	0	0	0	++	++
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	++	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	0
14. Landscape	+	?	?	+	+	++	++	+	0	+	++	?
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	+	+	+	+	+
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	++	+	+	+	++	0	+	0	0	++	++	0

Compatibility commentary table

SA objective	Assessment findings
1. Housing To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA's objectives: - ii. High quality new housing; - vii. Achieving well-designed places; - viii. Strong, safe healthy and cohesive communities; - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel; and - xii. Timely and viable infrastructure. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans for housing growth to ensure that housing needs are met, including provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. The Plan aims to achieve well-designed places which include consideration on how new housing is planned. There is a connection between well-designed places and strong, safe, healthy and cohesive communities. The Plan promotes sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel which means that housing growth will be in sustainable and accessible locations. The Plan seeks to make best use of existing and provide new infrastructure to support housing growth.
2. Employment and Jobs To create employment opportunities.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA's objective: - ii. High quality new housing; - iii. Economic prosperity for all; - iv. Flourishing and vibrant town centres; - ix. Opportunities for all; - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel; and - xii. Timely and viable infrastructure. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans for economic growth and job opportunities in construction sector including house building industry as well as business parks, employment areas and Arnold and local centres. The Plan promotes sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel which means that most job opportunities will be in sustainable and accessible locations such as town centres and transport hubs. However, it is noted some employment uses such as warehouse type uses tend to be in less sustainable locations and some employment uses will be incompatible with existing uses at sustainable locations. The Plan seeks to make best use of existing

SA objective	Assessment findings
	and provide new infrastructure to support economic growth. The following objectives have been assessed to have no relationship with this SA objective: - vi. Protecting and enhancing the area's individual and historic character and local distinctiveness; - vii. Achieving well-designed places; and - xi. Protecting and improving natural assets.
3. Economic Structure and Innovation To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - iii. Economic prosperity for all; - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel; and - xii. Timely and viable infrastructure. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans for economic growth including high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies. The Plan promotes sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel which means that economic growth will be in sustainable locations. The Plan seeks to make best use of existing and provide new infrastructure to support economic growth. There is one objective where the impact is not known: - vii. Achieving well-designed places.
4. Shopping Centres Increase the vitality and viability of existing shopping centres.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - iv. Flourishing and vibrant town centres; - vii. Achieving well-designed places; - viii. Strong, safe healthy and cohesive communities; - ix. Opportunities for all; and - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans for protection and enhancement of shopping centres supported by sustainable transport systems. The vitality and viability of shopping centres can survive if centres are well-designed. There is a connection between well-designed places and strong, safe, healthy and cohesive communities. The design of public realm including the safety of shopping centres attract shoppers and businesses. The Plan also plans for opportunities for all to provide the highest quality

SA objective	Assessment findings
	inclusive educational, community, cultural, leisure and sport facilities and to prevent the unnecessary loss of valued services and facilities. The shopping centres are where those services and facilities tend to be.
5. Health and Well-Being To improve health and well-being and reduce health inequalities.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan strongly support this SA objective:- - ii. High quality new housing; - iii. Economic prosperity for all; - iv. Flourishing and vibrant town centres; - vii. Achieving well-designed places; - viii. Strong, safe healthy and cohesive communities; - ix. Opportunities for all; - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel; and - xi. Protecting and improving natural assets. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to improve health and well-being. The provision of good quality housing is of critical importance for people's health and well-being. The Plan also plans for opportunities for all to provide the highest quality inclusive educational, community, cultural, leisure and sport facilities and to prevent the unnecessary loss of valued services and facilities. The shopping centres are where those health services and facilities tend to be. The Plan seeks well-designed places to be sustainable, functional, inclusive and are easy to get to, to navigate around and well-integrated with the existing community. The Plan seeks to plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and promote social interaction and inclusivity by design. The Plan seeks to ensure access to jobs, leisure and services is improved in a sustainable way by encouraging sustainable transport systems, particularly walking, cycling and public transport. The Plan also plans to improve and provide new network of multi-functional green spaces, woodlands, rivers and water bodies for the benefit of people.
6. Community Safety To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - iv. Flourishing and vibrant town centres; - v. Regeneration; - vii. Well-designed places; - viii. Strong, safe healthy and cohesive communities; and - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel.

SA objective	Assessment findings
	The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to improve community safety. The Plan encourages the re-use of brownfield land by bringing back derelict land back into use and town centre regeneration measures. The Plan seeks well-designed places to be sustainable, functional, inclusive and are easy to get to, to navigate around and well-integrated with the existing community. The Plan promotes social interaction and inclusivity using share spaces and good design including designing out crime. Natural surveillance is key to community safety. The Plan encourages sustainable transport systems, particularly walking, cycling and public transport through implementing behavioural change measures. The following objectives have been assessed to have no relationship with this SA objective: - i. Environmentally responsible development addressing climate change; - iii. Economic prosperity for all; and - vi. Protecting and enhancing the area's individual and historic character and local distinctiveness.
7. Social Inclusion To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - ii. High quality new housing; - iii. Economic prosperity for all; - iv. Flourishing and vibrant town centres; - vii. Achieving well-designed places; - viii. Strong, safe healthy and cohesive communities; - ix. Opportunities for all; and - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion. The Plan plans for housing growth to ensure that needs are met and to support mixed and balanced communities. The Plan also seeks people to participate in the economy by providing new and protecting existing local employment opportunities, encouraging rural enterprise, improving access to training opportunities and supporting educational developments at all levels. The Plan also plans to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area. The Plan seeks well-designed places to be sustainable, functional, inclusive and are easy to get to, to navigate around and well-integrated with the existing community. The Plan seeks to plan positively for the

SA objective	Assessment findings
	provision and use of shared spaces and promote social interaction and inclusivity by design. The Plan also plans for opportunities for all to provide the highest quality inclusive educational, community, cultural, leisure and sport facilities and to prevent the unnecessary loss of valued services and facilities. The Plan seeks to ensure access to jobs, leisure and services is improved in a sustainable way by encouraging sustainable transport systems, particularly walking, cycling and public transport.
8. Transport 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 improve travel choice and accessibility.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - i. Environmentally responsible development addressing climate change; - ii. High quality new housing; - vii. Achieving well-designed places; - viii. Strong, safe healthy and cohesive communities; - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel; and - xii. Timely and viable infrastructure. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure and to improve travel choice and accessibility to jobs and services as well as cultural, sport and leisure and lifelong learning activities. The Plan aims to reduce the causes of climate change and to minimise its impacts through locating development where it can be highly accessible by sustainable transport. The Plan seeks high quality new homes located in sustainable locations. The Plan seeks well-designed places to be sustainable, functional, inclusive and are easy to get to, to navigate around and well-integrated with the existing community. The Plan seeks to improve access to cultural, sport and leisure and lifelong learning activities. The Plan also plans to make the best use of existing and provide new infrastructure, where required to support housing and economic growth, and make sure it is sustainable.
9. Brownfield Land To make efficient use of brownfield land and recognise biodiversity value where appropriate.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - ii. High quality new housing; - iii. Economic prosperity for all; - iv. Flourishing and vibrant town centres; - v. Regeneration; - vii. Achieving well-designed places; - viii. Strong, safe healthy and cohesive communities;

SA objective	Assessment findings
	- x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel; and - xii. Timely and viable infrastructure. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to make efficient use of brownfield land by ensuring brownfield regeneration opportunities are maximised and to encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Plan seeks that brownfield opportunities are maximised when planning for new housing and employment development and promotes town centre regeneration measures. Well-designed places on brownfield land create strong sense of place with its own identity. The Plan seeks to plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and promote social interaction and inclusivity by design. The Plan also plans to make the best use of existing and provide new infrastructure, where required to support housing and economic growth, and make sure it is sustainable.
10. Energy and Climate Change To minimise energy usage and to develop low carbon energy resource and encourage nature-based solutions to climate change.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - i. Environmentally responsible development addressing climate change; - vii. Achieving well-designed places; - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel; and - xi. Protecting and improving natural assets. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to reduce the causes of climate change and to minimise its impacts, through well-designed places including environmentally sensitive design and construction. The Plan encourages the use of sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel will benefit climate change. The Plan plans to increase the resilience of biodiversity to climate change by enhancing and developing the network of multi-functional green spaces. There is only one objective where the compatibility is not known: – xii. Timely and viable infrastructure. There is only one objective which has been assessed to have no relationship with this SA objective: – viii. Strong, safe healthy and cohesive communities.

SA objective	Assessment findings
11. Pollution and Air Quality To manage air quality and minimise the risk posed by air, noise and other types of pollution.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - i. Environmentally responsible development addressing climate change; - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel; and - xi. Protecting and improving natural assets. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to reduce the causes of climate change and to minimise its impacts, through well-designed places including environmentally sensitive design and construction and addressing air, noise and other types of pollution. The Plan plans to manage air quality and minimise the risk posed by air, noise and other types of pollution by promoting sustainable transport systems which will reduce air and noise pollution. The Plan also plans to improve and provide new blue-green infrastructure, including open spaces, by enhancing and developing the network of multi-functional green spaces which will reduce pollution. The following objectives where the compatibility is not known are: – ii. High quality new housing; – iii. Economic prosperity for all; – v. Regeneration; and – xii. Timely and viable infrastructure. There is only one objective which has been assessed to have no relationship with this SA objective: – vi. Protecting and enhancing the area’s individual and historic character and local distinctiveness.
12. Flooding and Water Quality To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - i. Environmentally responsible development addressing climate change; - xi. Protecting and improving natural assets; and - xii. Timely and viable infrastructure. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to reduce the risk of flooding, conserve and improve water quality. The Plan plans to improve and provide new blue infrastructure and to protect and enhance the ecological network of nature conservation sites and priority habitats including rivers, canals and water bodies, woodlands and areas of natural and semi natural

SA objective	Assessment findings
	grassland. The Plan also plans to make the best use of existing and provide new and improved blue-green infrastructure, where required to support housing and economic growth, and make sure it is sustainable. The following objectives where the compatibility is not known are: – ii. High quality new housing; – iii. Economic prosperity for all; and – v. Regeneration. The following objectives have been assessed to have no relationship with this SA objective: - iv. Flourishing and vibrant town centres; - viii. Strong, safe healthy and cohesive communities; - ix. Opportunities for all; and - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel.
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance blue-green infrastructure and the natural environment.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - i. Environmentally responsible development addressing climate change; and - xi. Protecting and improving natural assets. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to improve and provide new blue-green infrastructure, to protect and enhance the ecological network of nature conservation sites and priority habitats including rivers, canals and water bodies, woodlands and areas of natural and semi natural grassland. The Plan also plans to increase the resilience of biodiversity to climate change by enhancing and developing the network of multi-functional green spaces. The following objectives have been assessed to have no relationship with these SA objectives: - iii. Economic prosperity for all; and - xii. Timely and viable infrastructure.
14. Landscape To protect and enhance the landscape character.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: – vi. Protecting and enhancing the area’s individual and historic character and local distinctiveness; – vii. Achieving well-designed places; and – xi. Protecting and improving natural assets. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to enhance and maintain the landscape character and to promote

SA objective	Assessment findings
	character in townscape and landscape by responding to and reinforcing locally distinctive patterns of development, character, landscape and culture. The Plan also plans to improve and provide new network of multi-functional green spaces, woodlands, rivers, canals and water bodies. The following objectives where the impact is not known are: – ii. High quality new housing; – iii. Economic prosperity for all; and – xii. Timely and viable infrastructure. There is only one objective which has been assessed to have no relationship with this SA objective: – ix. Opportunities for all.
15. Built and Historic Environment To protect and enhance the townscape character and enhancing the place through good design. To conserve designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - vi. Protecting and enhancing the area's individual and historic character and local distinctiveness; and - vii. Achieving well-designed places. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to protect and enhance the townscape character and historic character. The Plans requires new development to be well-designed which should respect local character and to preserve and enhance the distinctive built heritage.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	The following objectives in the Gedling Local Development Plan are strongly compatible with these SA objectives: - i. Environmentally responsible development addressing climate change; - v. Regeneration; - x. Promoting sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel; and - xi. Protecting and improving natural assets. The Gedling Local Development Plan plans to reduce the causes of climate change and to minimise its impacts, through locating development where it can be highly accessible by sustainable transport, requiring environmentally sensitive design and construction, reducing the risk of flooding, and contributing to carbon neutrality in line with local targets which would have positive use of natural resources. The Plan also seeks to ensure that brownfield regeneration opportunities are

SA objective	Assessment findings
	maximised which again represent a positive use of natural resources and prioritisation of this would protect greenfield land. The Plan promotes sustainable transport systems and reducing the need to travel will reduce the levels of fossil fuels consumed through car use. The Plan also plans to improve and provide new network of multi-functional green spaces, woodlands, rivers, canals and water bodies. The following objectives have been assessed to have no relationship with this SA objective: - vi. Protecting and enhancing the area's individual and historic character and local distinctiveness; - viii. Strong, safe healthy and cohesive communities; - ix. Opportunities for all; and - xii. Timely and viable infrastructure.

APPRAISAL OF POLICIES

The appraisal of policy options has been undertaken in stages, mirroring and appraising the Local Plan as it progresses. **The first stage** involved the identification of policy topics, the identification of broad policy options, and their initial appraisal. These options were subject to early consultation with key stakeholders. A draft Scoping Report was issued to the statutory consultation bodies (the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England) for informal comments. Amendments were made where appropriate to reflect the feedback received.

A summary of this stage is included in the Gedling Local Development Plan Sustainability Appraisal Report Publication Draft with the appraisals themselves included in this document. Stage one was completed prior to consultation on the Issues and Options consultation.

Stage 2 supported the Issues and Options Consultation (July 2025) and the Council sought comments on the Scoping Report. This stage focused on the vision and spatial objectives, spatial strategy, housing distribution and employment provision and economic development. These appraisals can be found within the Issues and Options: Sustainability Appraisal Report. Overall, responses from the statutory consultation bodies were broadly supportive and confirmed that the approach met the relevant requirements.

Stage 3 built upon the earlier work. A further set of appraisals refined the previous assessments by appraising alternative policy approaches. A draft Reasonable Alternatives for Policy Options report was issued to the statutory consultation bodies, including the Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England and Nottinghamshire County Council. Key internal consultees were also consulted including Development Management, Borough Ecologist and Heritage Officer, Parks and Street Care, Food, Health and Housing, Community, Leisure and Wellbeing, Housing and Resettlement, and Economic Growth and Regeneration.

Stage 4 built upon the informal consultation undertaken with key stakeholders identified in Stage 3. At this stage, all available policy options were assessed against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. The performance of each alternative against the plan objectives was compared, and conclusions were drawn in relation to the potential outcomes of each policy alternative. An updated draft reasonable alternatives for policy options report (Appraisal of Objectives and Policies) was issued to the statutory consultation bodies liaised in Stage 3.

Stage 5 appraises the policies contained within the Local Plan, ensuring that the preferred policy framework has been assessed against reasonable alternatives and the sustainability objectives. The full set of policy alternatives, including the preferred alternative, and a summary of each option's performance and potential impacts are presented in this appendix.

Stage 6 will support the examination stage of the local plan. This stage will incorporate and appraise any comments arising from the Regulation 19 Publication Draft consultation, and will update the Sustainability Appraisal where necessary to reflect any changes to the proposed policies and site allocations.

Sustainability Appraisal Scoring Table

The table below provides guidance on how to score each SA objective.

Major positive ++	Minor positive +	Uncertain (?) or No impact (0)	Minor negative -	Major negative --
The policy would have a significant positive impact on one or more of the policy criteria questions or a minor positive impact on a significant number of the questions	The policy would have a minor positive impact on at least one of the policy criteria questions	Unknown effect or the policy has no implications for the objective	The policy would have a minor negative impact on at least one of the policy criteria questions	The policy would have a significant negative impact on one or more of the policy criteria questions or a minor negative impact on a significant number of the questions

Topic Area 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Development and Flood Risk

1.1 Climate Change and Energy

1.2 Renewable Energy Schemes

1.3 Managing Flood Risk and Watercourses

1.4 Surface Water Management

1.5 Managing Water Quality

1.6 Aquifer Protection

1.1: Climate Change and Energy

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

Options	Is it a reasonable alternative?
Retain the scope of the policy established under existing Policy 1 of the Aligned Core Strategy	Yes
Publication Draft policy approach of retaining the existing Core Strategy policy approach but also recognising the role of BGI in addressing climate change and requiring new buildings to achieve net zero regulated operational emissions.	Yes
As above but requiring new buildings to meet standards that sets higher energy use intensity and space heating demand limits and limits on embodied carbon.	Yes
Do not have a policy	No, because it is a requirement of the NPPF. Paragraph 20 of the NPPF requires strategic policies to make sufficient provision for flood risk and coastal change management and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.

1.1: Climate Change and Energy

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

A - Retain existing policy approach as set out in the Core Strategy.

B - Publication Draft policy approach of retaining the existing Core Strategy policy approach but also recognising the role of BGI in addressing climate change and requiring new buildings to achieve net zero regulated operational emissions.

C - As above but requiring new buildings to meet standards that sets higher energy use intensity and space heating demand limits and limits on embodied carbon.

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	+	+	?	All options will have a positive impact on the quality of housing stock. The impact of option C, whilst achieving higher standards, may be to decrease the affordability of new housing due to significantly higher build costs. As such the impact of option C is uncertain.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	0	0	All options are likely to have a neutral impact on jobs and productivity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	?	?	Option A is likely to have a neutral impact. However, uncertain for options B and C as it may result in more attractive units with lower running costs but option C may significantly increase the build costs thereby making new development less attractive.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	?	?	Option A is likely to have a neutral impact. However, uncertain for options B and C as it may be that higher standards in relation to emissions either increase the build costs thereby making redevelopment less attractive, or result in more attractive units with lower running costs.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	++	++	All options promote health and wellbeing by mitigating the impacts of climate changes. Options B and C provide opportunities to improve access generally, through promoting active travel, and improving access to BGI. These options also seek to minimise energy demand for heating, lighting and cooling.	

6. Community Safety	0	0	0	All options will have a neutral effect on this objective. Policies that manage the design and specific location of development would have a greater impact on achieving this objective.	Other strategies policies should include criteria that address design and layout, providing safe communities.
7. Social Inclusion	0	?	?	As for objective 4, in relation to the number of facilities, option A is likely to have a neutral impact. However, uncertain for options B and C as it may be that higher standards in relation to emissions either increase the build costs thereby making redevelopment less attractive, or result in more attractive units with lower running costs.	
8. Transport	0	+	+	Options B and C make specific reference to measures that enable sustainable lifestyles such as promoting active travel through design and layout to ensure accessibility to everyday services and facilities on foot, by bicycle or public transport.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	+	+	Options 2 and 3 require development to integrate with existing BGI, recognising the role of BGI in addressing climate change.	Other policies within the Strategic Plan should seek to minimise impact on biodiversity.
10. Energy and Climate Change	++	++	++	All three options will have a major positive impact on this objective. Options B and C will have a greater impact than option A as all policy criteria are likely to be met. Option C sets limits on energy use, space heating demand and embodied carbon and the impact will be greater than for option B which requires new buildings to achieve net zero (regulated operational emissions).	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	++	++	All three options will have a positive impact on this objective. Options B and C will have a greater impact than option A, resulting from a reduction in the use of fossil fuels, promotion of active travel and enhanced linkages to BGI.	Strategic policies should ensure sites incorporate principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods, including the provision of local services and facilities, and the provision of non-car based transport infrastructure to these facilities and those outside the site.
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	+	+	All three options support the precautionary principle and sequential test. Options 2 and 3 also address surface water runoff in accordance with the NPPF.	Need a policy relating to flooding and water quality for new development, in particular to ensure new development is suitably located outside of flood risk areas, conserve water and avoid impact of new

					development upon water quality.
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	+	+	Option A will have a neutral impact on this objective, albeit that an indirect impact of this policy will be to reduce the impact of climate change and improve the natural environment. Options B and C will have a positive impact as reference is made to integration with existing BGI and contribution to offsite networks.	
14. Landscape	0	+	+	Option A will have a neutral impact on this objective, albeit that an indirect impact of this policy will be to reduce the impact of climate change and improve the natural environment. Options B and C will have a positive impact as reference is made to integration with existing BGI and contribution to offsite networks, thereby improving visual amenity.	Landscape protection and enhancement policy criteria should be included in the Strategic Plan.
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	+	+	Options 2 and 3 include specific reference to the need for the potential impacts of SuDS on the setting of heritage assets.	All options would benefit from strategic policies which address the protection and enhancement of local character, distinctiveness and heritage assets.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	++	++	Options 2 and 3 require development to integrate with existing BGI, recognising the role of BGI in addressing climate change. In addition, these options require waste minimisation through using recycled/secondary aggregates and reusing material from excavation.	All options would benefit from strategic policies which address the use of raw

					materials, promote sustainable design and construction and the protection of best and most versatile land.
--	--	--	--	--	--

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF APPRAISALS

Topic Area 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Development and Flood Risk 1.1 Climate Change and Energy	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
A - Retain existing policy approach as set out in the Core Strategy	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	0
B - Publication Draft policy approach of retaining the existing Core Strategy policy approach but also recognising the role of BGI in addressing climate change and requiring new buildings to achieve net zero regulated operational emissions	+	0	?	?	++	0	?	+	+	++	++	+	+	+	+	++
C - As above but requiring new buildings to meet standards that sets higher energy use intensity and space heating demand limits, sets net zero regulated and unregulated emissions targets and limits on embodied carbon.	?	0	?	?	++	0	?	+	+	++	++	+	+	+	+	++

Conclusions

All options score positives against a number of objectives, with all scoring major positives in relation to energy and climate change.

However, Options B and C score positives against a number of additional objectives as they would set higher standards than the existing ACS policy. This includes higher scoring against objectives 8,9, 13, 14 , 15 and 16. It is noted in the commentary text that there are relative differences between the options, for example option C has greater benefits in relation to objective 10, however they score the same due to the SA framework questions and criteria.

Options B and C score similar across all objectives However, option C would have an uncertain impact on housing as there may be a decrease in the affordability of new housing due to significantly higher build costs.

1.2 Renewable Energy Schemes

How to determine applications for renewable energy schemes.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 168–169, which state that when determining planning applications for renewable and low carbon energy, local planning authorities should “give significant weight to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation” and that “applications outside these (designated) areas should demonstrate that the proposed location meets the criteria used in identifying suitable areas.”

Option A – allocate areas

Include a policy to identify and designate areas as suitable for renewable energy; different areas for different technologies.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply – area is not allocated for housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	Unknown impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Providing land for renewable energy infrastructure and supporting energy supply.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	++	Supports the generation and use of renewable energy.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Potential impacts during development, though reduced air pollution in the longer term.	Reduce air pollution and reduced consumption of raw materials.
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	Would be addressed through flooding policy.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-	-	Potential impacts on biodiversity and green infrastructure, though mitigation is possible.	Scope to identify areas away from sensitive areas.

Green Infrastructure			
14. Landscape	-	Possible impact on landscape character, with scope for mitigation.	Scope to identify areas away from sensitive areas.
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Possible impacts on historic landscapes and settlements, though mitigation is possible.	Identify areas away from heritage assets.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Potential impacts on water resources and greenfield/agricultural land. Reduce air pollution and reduced consumption of raw materials. Waste benefits from AD (Anaerobic Digestion) plants.	Could steer away from greenfield sites and agricultural land.

Option B – include a criteria based policy

Include a criteria based policy setting out the factors against which schemes will be assessed; what are the impacts and how it will be assessed if they are acceptable or not.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	Unknown impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Allows for required infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific reference to brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	++	Will improve energy efficiency of new buildings, use of renewable energy and support development of community energy systems. Also ensures	

		buildings address future climate change.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Scope to promote use of sustainable techniques.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Possible impact but can mitigate.	Criteria to protect environment, biodiversity and Green Infrastructure.
14. Landscape	-	Possible impact but can mitigate.	Criteria to protect landscape.
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Possible impact but can mitigate.	Criteria to balance heritage concerns with benefits of renewable energy.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	Criteria to protect greenfield and agricultural land.

Option C – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	Unknown impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Allows for required infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific reference to brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	-	Reliant on the National Planning Policy Framework, with no local policy guidance.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	Unknown impact. Depends on application.	

12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	--	Impact on the environment.	
14. Landscape	--	Impact on landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	--	Impact on heritage.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 10 as it would actively support renewable energy generation and contribute to climate change mitigation. Option A also scored a minor positive for Objective 3. However, Option A scored minor negatives for Objectives 11, 13, 14 and 15, reflecting potential adverse impacts on air quality, the natural environment, landscape and the built and historic environment. Option A also scored a minor negative for Objective 16.

Option B scored a major positive for Objective 10, reflecting strong benefits for energy and climate change through support for renewable and low carbon energy generation. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 3 and 11, indicating benefits for economic structure and innovation and for pollution and air quality. However, Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 13, 14 and 15, reflecting potential adverse impacts on biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, landscape character, and the built and historic environment associated with renewable energy development.

Option C scored a minor positive for Objective 3, suggesting some potential support for economic structure and innovation through renewable energy development. However, it recorded a minor negative for Objective 10 and major negatives for Objectives 13, 14 and 15, indicating significant potential adverse effects on biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, landscape, and the built and historic environment where reliance is placed on national policy alone without a local policy framework to guide development.

Overall, Option A provides stronger benefits for Objective 10. Option B provides clear benefits for climate change mitigation while enabling potential environmental impacts to be assessed through local criteria and provides a clearer local policy framework. In contrast, Option C performs negatively across several key environmental objectives, highlighting the importance of a local policy framework to manage renewable energy development effectively.

1.3. Managing Flood Risk and Watercourses

Whether to include a policy to protect water quality on the Trent, Leen, Ouse Beck and Lambley Dumble and Day Brook.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 171, which states that local plan policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment and should “manage flood risk from all sources” and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities such as lead local flood authorities.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy similar to the existing Local Planning Document Policy LPD 3 (Managing Flood Risk) and update to cover further water management issues such as the de-culverting of watercourses.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	This relates to water quality and would not result in an increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	++	Protects water quality and prevents contamination of watercourses.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	++	Would help to improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species.	

14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	++	Protects water quality in the Trent, Leen, Dover Beck, Ouse Beck, Lambley Dumble and Day Brook.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	This relates to water quality and would not result in an increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Reliant on national policy only to protect water quality and prevent contamination.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Reliant on national policy only to protect biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Reliant on national policy only to protect water resources and prevent contamination.	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 11, 13 and 16, reflecting strong benefits for pollution and air quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and natural resources and waste management through improved water quality protection and watercourse management. These benefits arise from the inclusion of a local policy framework that supports measures such as the protection and enhancement of watercourses and the de-culverting of rivers and streams.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 11, 13 and 16, indicating potential adverse effects on pollution and air quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and natural resource management where reliance is placed on national policy alone without a locally specific framework to guide development and watercourse management.

Overall, Option A provides clear environmental benefits through stronger protection and management of watercourses. In contrast, Option B performs negatively across several environmental objectives, highlighting the importance of a local policy to support water quality and watercourse management.

1.4 Surface Water Management

Whether to include a policy to manage surface water and protect development from surface water flooding.

Reason - Paragraph 171 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Plans should be supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and develop policies to “manage flood risk from all sources,” taking account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, including lead local flood authorities, and provide policies to manage surface water flood risk where appropriate.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy similar to the existing Local Plan Policy LPD 4 - Surface Water Management).

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	This relates to water quality and would not result in increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on the reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	++	Protects waater quality and prevents contamination of watercourses.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-	++	Would help to improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species.	

Green Infrastructure			
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	This relates to water quality and would not result in increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on brownfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Reliant on national policy only to protect water quality and prevent contamination.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Reliant on national policy only to protect biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species.	

14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Reliant on national policy only to protect water resources and prevent contamination.	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 11 and 13 due to improved control of surface water and protection of environmental assets. Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 9, 11, 13 and 16, reflecting weaker protection for surface water management and environmental quality.

Overall, Option A demonstrates stronger environmental benefits, while Option B presents risks across several key objectives.

1.5 Managing Water Quality

Consider a policy to manage water quality in Gedling Borough.

Reason - to provide guidance on protecting surface and groundwater in line with the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD), the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017, and the National Planning Policy Framework, which expects planning to support the delivery of environmental objectives to “prevent deterioration of water bodies, reduce pollution and support sustainable water use.”

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy similar to the existing Local Planning Document Policy LPD 5.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No direct impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land availability for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Reduces risk of water pollution, benefiting public health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Supports healthy communities and recreational water use.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	++	Protects water quality and prevents contamination.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	Supports mitigation of flood impacts through sustainable water management.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	++	Protects aquatic ecosystems, biodiversity, and green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	++	Maintains water quality and prevents contamination of water resources.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land availability for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Reduced local control could increase risk of water pollution affecting health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Fewer protections for recreational water use and community health.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on brownfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Limited local control could reduce protection of water quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No direct impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Limited local control could lead to adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems and biodiversity.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Higher risk of water contamination and deterioration of water resources.	
--	---	--	--

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 11, 13, and 16, reflecting strong benefits for pollution and air quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and natural resources and waste management. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 5, 7, and 12, indicating benefits for health and wellbeing, social inclusion, and flood risk management.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 5, 7, 11, 13, and 16, suggesting potential deterioration in environmental and social outcomes without a local policy in place.

Overall, Option A delivers clear environmental and social benefits across multiple objectives, while Option B performs negatively across the same key objectives, highlighting the value of a local water quality policy.

1.6 Aquifer Protection

Whether to include a policy to protect groundwater in aquifers.

Reason – advice from the Environment Agency.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy similar to the existing Local Planning Document Policy LPD 6 (Aquifer Protection).

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	This relates to water quality and would not result in increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land availability for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No impact on pollution or air quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	++	Improves quality of groundwater in aquifers and prevents contamination of water.	
--	----	--	--

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework or other pollution control regimes.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	This relates to water quality and would not result in increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land availability for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct local control on health impacts.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No local guidance on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Limited local protection; reliant on national policy only	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Limited local protection; reliant on national policy only to protect biodiversity.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Limited local control; reliant on national policy only to protect groundwater and prevent contamination.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 16, reflecting clear benefits for natural resources and waste management through the protection of groundwater resources within aquifers. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting the narrow scope of the policy and its focus on safeguarding groundwater quality rather than delivering wider social, economic or environmental outcomes.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 11, 13 and 16, indicating potential adverse effects on pollution and air quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and natural resources and waste management where reliance is placed on national policy and other pollution control regimes without a locally specific policy framework.

Overall, Option A provides clear benefits for the protection and management of groundwater resources, while Option B performs negatively across several environmental objectives due to the absence of a local policy framework.

Topic Area 2: Environmental Protection

2.1 Contaminated Land

2.2 Unstable Land

2.3 Hazardous Substances

2.4 Pollution

2.5 Air Quality

2.1 Contaminated Land

Consider a specific policy on contamination.

Reason - to provide guidance from the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 196-198, which state that planning policies and decisions should ensure that a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination, and should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment.

Option A - include a policy

Retain Policy LPD 7 (Contaminated Land) of the Local Planning Document.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	-	Could restrict supply of land for housing depending on location.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Could restrict supply of land for new businesses; may impact range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Could restrict supply of land for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Could protect against contamination and pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	Could protect against contamination of surface and groundwaters.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Could protect biodiversity and natural environment depending on location.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	++	Would address contamination issues.	
--	----	-------------------------------------	--

Option B - do nothing

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	-	Could restrict supply of land for housing depending on location.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Could restrict supply of land for new businesses; may impact range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Could restrict supply of land for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No local guidance on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Reliant on national policy only to prevent contamination and manage pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	Reliant on national policy only to prevent contamination and manage pollution.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Limited local protection; reliant on national policy only to protect biodiversity.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Limited local control; reliant on national policy only to manage contaminated land and resources.	
--	---	---	--

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objective 16, reflecting strong benefits for natural resources and waste management. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 11, 12 and 13, indicating benefits for pollution and air quality and for biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure.

However, Option A scored minor negatives for Objectives 1, 2, and 3, suggesting potential constraints on housing delivery, employment, and economic development outcomes.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 13, and 16, highlighting potential adverse effects on key environmental and economic objectives where a local policy is not in place.

Overall, Option A provides clear environmental benefits and targeted protections for contaminated land, while Option B performs negatively across the same key objectives, demonstrating the added value of retaining a local policy.

2.2 Unstable Land

Consider a specific policy on land stability.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 196, which states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that “a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination.”

Option A - include a policy

Retain Policy LPD 8 (Unstable Land) of the Local Planning Document.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	-	Could restrict supply of land for housing depending on location.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Could restrict supply of land for new businesses; may impact range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Could restrict supply of land for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	Relates to land stability; no direct effect on pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	Relates to land instability; no loss of biodiversity or change to green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	Relates to land instability; no impact on character or visual amenity.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	Relates to land stability; no impact on natural resources or waste.	

Option B - do nothing

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	-	Could restrict supply of land for housing depending on location.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Could restrict supply of land for new businesses; may impact range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Could restrict supply of land for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No local guidance on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	Relates to land stability; no direct effect on pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or change to green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on natural resources or waste.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor negatives for Objectives 1, 2 and 3, reflecting potential constraints on housing delivery, employment opportunities and economic structure and innovation. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting the focused scope of the policy and its primary role in ensuring site suitability and safe development rather than delivering wider sustainability benefits.

Option B also scored minor negatives for Objectives 1, 2 and 3, indicating similar potential constraints on housing, employment and economic development. All other objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting the limited influence of the policy approach on wider environmental and social outcomes.

Overall, both options perform similarly. However, Option A provides a clearer local policy framework for managing development on unstable land, while Option B relies on national policy to address land stability considerations.

2.3 Hazardous Substances

Consider a policy on hazardous substances.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 198, which states that new development is “appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development”.

Option A - include a policy

Include a policy on hazardous substances.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land availability for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	++	Reduces risk to public health from hazardous substances.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Helps protect communities from hazards.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Reduces risk of soil and water contamination.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Reduces risk to ecosystems and biodiversity.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	Protects soil and water resources from contamination.	
--	---	---	--

Option B - do nothing

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land availability for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Reduced local control could increase risk to public health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced opportunities to protect communities from hazards.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No local guidance on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Limited local control could result in contamination of soil or water.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Limited local control could result in adverse effects on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Potential contamination of soil or water if not locally managed.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 5, reflecting strong benefits for health and wellbeing through the management and control of hazardous substances. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 7, 11, 13, and 16, indicating benefits for social inclusion, pollution and air quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and natural resources and waste management.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 5, 7, 11, 13, and 16, suggesting potential adverse effects on health, environmental quality, and natural resource management where no local policy is in place.

Overall, Option A delivers clear health and environmental benefits across several objectives, while Option B performs negatively across the same key objectives, highlighting the importance of a local policy to manage hazardous substances.

2.4 Pollution

Consider a policy on pollution.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 198, which states that new development is “appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development”.

Option A - include a policy

Retain Policy LPD 10 (Pollution) of the Local Planning Document.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land availability for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Opportunity to make a positive impact on public health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Positive impact on community activities.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Co-benefits of air quality mitigation on climate change	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	++	Reduces pollution levels in soil, air, water, and noise.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	could protect against pollution of surface and groundwaters	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Reduces pollution levels in soil, air, water which may impact on the natural environment and local ecosystems.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	Positive impact on the natural environment	
--	---	--	--

Option B - do nothing

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land availability for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Reduced local control could negatively affect public health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced opportunities for community activities.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No local guidance on reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	-	Reduced local control could negatively affect this objective.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Potential for soil, water, or air pollution if not actively managed locally.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	Reduced local control could negatively affect this objective.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Reduced local control could negatively affect this objective.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Potential for contamination of water, soil, or air if not managed locally.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 11, reflecting strong benefits for pollution and air quality through the inclusion of a specific local policy. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 5, 7, 10, 12, 13 and 16, indicating benefits for health, climate change, water quality, biodiversity, wellbeing and social inclusion.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 16, suggesting potential adverse effects on health, environmental quality, climate change, water quality, biodiversity, natural resources and waste management where no local policy is in place.

Overall, Option A provides clear benefits for managing pollution and protecting health and environmental quality, while Option B performs negatively across the same key objectives, demonstrating the value of retaining a local pollution policy.

2.5 Air Quality

Consider a specific policy on air quality.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 192, which states that planning policies and decisions should “sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants,” taking into account cumulative impacts and opportunities to improve air quality.

Option A - include a specify policy

Include a policy on air quality.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	-	Could restrict housing supply in areas of poor air quality.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Could restrict types of businesses due to air quality constraints.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Could limit land availability for development.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct effect on health (local air quality managed elsewhere).	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct effect on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	+	Could help to reduce journeys undertaken by car.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land reuse.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	co-benefits of air quality mitigation on climate change.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	++	Addresses air pollution issues and reduces emissions.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Reduces air pollution levels which may impact on the natural environment and local ecosystems.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No direct impact on natural resources or waste recovery.	

Option B - do nothing

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	-	Could restrict housing supply in areas of poor air quality or due to vehicle emissions from new housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Could restrict types of businesses in areas of poor air quality, affecting job opportunities.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Could limit land availability for development.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health at local level.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct effect on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	+	Could help to reduce journeys undertaken by car.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land reuse.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	-	Reduced local control could negatively affect this objective.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Addresses air pollution issues through national policy only.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Reduced local control could negatively affect this objective.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage assets or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No direct impact on natural resources or waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 11, reflecting strong benefits for pollution and air quality through the introduction of a specific local policy. Minor positives were recorded for Objectives 8, 10 and 13, indicating climate change, biodiversity and potential transport-related benefits where measures support improved air quality outcomes.

However, Option A scored minor negatives for Objectives 1, 2, and 3, suggesting potential constraints on housing delivery, employment, and economic development where stricter air quality controls may limit development opportunities.

Option B scored minor positives for Objectives 8 and 11, indicating some benefits for transport and air quality through reliance on national guidance. However, Option B also scored minor negatives for Objectives 1, 2, 3, 10 and 13 reflecting similar potential constraints on housing and economic growth.

Overall, both options deliver positive outcomes for air quality and transport objectives, with Option A providing stronger benefits for Objective 11. Option B performs similarly but with fewer positive effects overall due to the absence of a dedicated local policy.

Topic Area 3 Spatial Strategy and Housing Target

3.1 Spatial Strategy

3.2 Delivering the Identified Housing Target

3.3 Housing Need and Target

3.1 Spatial Strategy

Identification of reasonable alternatives

Options	Is it a reasonable alternative?
Retain existing policy approach as set out in the Core Strategy of urban concentration. Most development to be located within or adjoining the main built-up area (including adjacent to Hucknall) and Key Settlements identified for growth.	Yes
Do not have a spatial strategy policy.	No. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that development plans must include strategic policies to address each local planning authority's priorities for the development and use of land in its area.
Disperse development broadly beyond the main built-up area, within existing and new settlements that are within the Green Belt.	Yes
Retain existing policy approach and prioritise new development that can protect and enhance the strategic river corridors, canal corridors, the Greenwood Community Forest and urban fringe areas, and/or prioritise other blue-green Infrastructure assets.	Yes
Focus on location of new development with regard to existing and proposed transport infrastructure.	Yes
Alongside the strategic location of development, include policy criteria that should be applied to proposals to ensure sustainable development, such as maximising blue and green infrastructure, meeting identified housing needs, promoting public transport and active travel, delivering 20-minute neighbourhoods, creating attractive places, and delivering economic growth.	Yes

3.1 Spatial Strategy

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

- A - Retain existing policy approach as set out in the Core Strategy of urban concentration. Most development located within or adjoining the main built-up area where feasible (including adjacent to Hucknall) and Key Settlements identified for growth.
- B - Disperse development broadly beyond the main built-up area, within existing or new settlements that are within or beyond the Green Belt.
- C - Retain existing policy approach and prioritise new development that can protect and enhance the strategic river corridors, canal corridors, the Greenwood Community Forest and urban fringe areas, and/or prioritise other blue-green Infrastructure assets.
- D - Focus on location of new development with regard to existing and proposed transport infrastructure.
- E - Alongside the strategic location of development, include policy criteria that should be applied to proposals to ensure sustainable development, such as maximising blue and green infrastructure, meeting identified housing needs, promoting public transport and active travel, delivering compact and connected neighbourhoods, creating attractive places, and delivering economic growth.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	+	+	+	+	+	These options address the strategic distribution of development across the plan area, including housing. All options will deliver the required housing stock. Major positive for options A, C, D and E because the location of new housing growth would be within and adjoining the main built up area and would have regard to existing and proposed transport infrastructure. Minor positive for option B because this option would provide policy approach for new housing growth to meet housing requirement, which would involve the range and affordability of new housing for all social groups. Option E includes the strategic priority that, where pertinent, developments meet identified housing needs.	In respect of option C, the policy would need to ensure that development is located outside of flood zones to allow an enhanced green space or buffer zone next to the river to ensure suitable biodiversity and environmental enhancements.
2. Employment and Jobs	+	+	+	+	+	These options address the strategic distribution of development across the plan area, including employment. Minor positive for all options because each option would provide policy approach for new economic development growth which should provide new jobs. Option E includes the consideration of economic growth as a strategic priority.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	+	+	+	+	All options perform positively against this objective. However, options A, C, D and E are identified as major positive because the location of new employment, retail and other types of development growth would be within and adjoining the main built up area and would have regard to existing and proposed transport infrastructure. Minor positive for option B because this option would provide policy approach for new economic development growth. Option E includes specific consideration of blue and green infrastructure, public transport, active travel, 20-minute neighbourhoods, and economic growth.	In respect of option C, the policy would need to ensure that development is located outside of flood zones to allow an enhanced green space or buffer zone next to the river to ensure suitable biodiversity and environmental enhancements.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
4. Shopping Centres	++	+	?	?	+	Option A will deliver development within the main built-up area and key settlements, of which contain town and local centres. Option B is similar however it would benefit centres within key settlements more, to the detriment of centres within the main built-up area, as more development would be dispersed to these locations. Uncertain for options C and D as it depends on the locations and proposals of new development, it is considered that the impact of the options on shopping centres is uncertain.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	?	++	?	+	Prioritising new development that protects and enhances blue and green infrastructure (Option C) will have health and wellbeing benefits as this will provide accessible open space, including natural greenspace, recreational areas, sports pitches, and active travel routes. Uncertain for options A, B and D as it depends on the locations and proposals of new development. It is expected that large housing allocations would provide new open space or enhance the quality of existing open space or blue-green infrastructure which could provide opportunities for recreational physical activity.	Ensure that new development does not affect access to health services and provide new open space or enhance the quality of existing open space or blue-green infrastructure. Opportunities to promote the enhancement of blue green infrastructure should be encouraged.
6. Community Safety	0	0	0	0	0	All options will have a neutral effect on this objective. Policies that manage the design and specific location of development would have a greater impact on achieving this objective.	Strategic policy criteria (Option E) should include criteria that address design and layout, providing safe communities.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
7. Social Inclusion	+	0	+	0	+	Option A and E will direct development towards the main urban area where most deprived areas are located. Whilst Option B may direct development away from most deprived areas within the main urban area, overall it is considered neutral. Options C would, by preserving and enhancing BGI protect existing cultural assets, encourage community activities related to local BGI and provide educational environments. Option D is neutral as transport infrastructure will not influence this objective.	Strategic policy criteria (included in Option E) should include requirements that developments deliver sustainable and prosperous communities.
8. Transport	++	-	+	++	++	Options A, D and E score major positive against this objective as they would utilise existing transport infrastructure within urban areas, minimise impacts on the environment and reduce journeys undertaken by private cars. Option D will help develop transport networks. Option B would, due to the reduced transport infrastructure beyond the main built up area and key settlements, not use existing infrastructure, minimise impacts on the environment, reduce journeys by private car or increase accessibility to services. Option C would help develop active travel infrastructure (walking and cycling).	Option B would be mitigated by policies in the plan that require significant improvements to public transport and active travel infrastructure. This should be identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and be tested within the viability appraisal.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
9. Brownfield Land	+	--	?	?	+	Whilst Option A would still result in the use of greenfield land to deliver its housing and employment targets, it would make the most efficient use of brownfield land within the urban area Option B would require the use of significant areas of greenfield land as there is unlikely to be sufficient brownfield opportunities adjacent to existing settlements or within locations identified to deliver new settlements. Option C and D are unknown as it depends on the locations selected for development. Option D is likely to locate development within urban areas where transport infrastructure is located, however it may direct development to transport nodes within or closer to locations beyond the built-up area. Option C could direct development towards existing BGI where brownfield opportunities may or may not exist. Option E would include criteria that promotes sustainable development. This would comprise the use of brownfield land.	If available, the selection of locations with brownfield land available would improve Option B's performance against this objective.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	?	+	+	+	Option C scores major positive against this objective as the prioritisation of BGI will reduce urban heat island effects, sequester carbon, reduce carbon (by increasing active travel opportunities), increase resilience of biodiversity to climate change, help people adapt to climate change and increase ecosystem services. Option B may result in a less sustainable distribution of development and may increase private car use and carbon emissions. However, this will depend on the locations selected for growth. Option A and E would have a minor positive effect on this objective. It is likely to deliver a more sustainable distribution of development. Option D would have a positive impact as this option would have regard to existing and proposed public transport infrastructure, particularly public transport .	Policies within the plan should encourage BGI, improve the energy efficiency of new buildings, and renewable energy generation.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	--	+ +	+	+	Option A would increase development within the Nottingham Urban Area Agglomeration zone. Option B is likely to increase the use of private car as development is distributed across a wider area, including outlying settlements where there is less public transport provision and private car journeys would be longer. The promotion of BGI within Option C will help mitigate air, noise and water pollution. Option D's impact on pollution will be minor positive as locating new development alongside new or existing public transport infrastructure will help manage air pollution. Option E includes specific consideration of blue and green infrastructure, public transport and active travel.	Policies should ensure sites incorporate principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods, including the provision of local services and facilities, and the provision of non-car based transport infrastructure to these facilities and those outside the site. Need a policy relating to pollution and air quality for new development.
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	?	+ +	?	+	Whilst option A and E would direct development to locations within or adjacent to the main urban area where there are significant areas of within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (primarily within the Trent Valley), the effects of this option remain uncertain as elevated areas outside these flood zones could provide locations for development. Option E includes specific consideration of blue and green infrastructure. Option C would, through the provision of BGI, provide land for flood water storage and improvements in water quality. Options B and D's effects on this objective will also depend on the locations of development.	Need a policy relating to flooding and water quality for new development, in particular to ensure new development is suitably located outside of flood risk areas, conserve water and avoid impact of new development upon water quality.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	?	+	?	+	For options A, B and D, it depends on the locations and proposals of new development. Option C would have a major positive effect on this objective as protection and enhancement of BGI would have clear benefits to the natural environment. Option E includes specific consideration of blue and green infrastructure.	Strategic policies should embed BGI within development requirements. This should optimise opportunities to deliver environmental net-gain, active travel, recreational open space and the other benefits that BGI brings. Priority habitats should be created, connected protected and enhanced to improve the ecological network.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
14. Landscape	+	-	?	?	+	Option B is likely to have an adverse effect on landscape as the dispersal of development across the plan area is likely to create more urban townscapes in areas of more rural character. Whilst this could be mitigated to a degree through site selection, the overall effect will be an urbanisation of landscapes locally. Conversely, Option A and E would focus development within urban townscapes where it would be easier to accommodate visually. The effects of Options C and D upon this objective would depend on the location, some of which may be in less urbanised environments.	Informed by site appraisals, site policies in the Plan should promote landscape protection and enhancement. Landscape protection and enhancement policy criteria should be included in the Plan. Landscape and visual impacts of development in urban fringe locations could be reduced by integrating it with the existing urban area and by avoiding fringe locations that have sensitive landscape features and/or are valued for their visual amenity.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	?	+	?	+	It depends on the locations and proposals of new development in relation to existing designated and non-designated heritage assets (including Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, locally interest buildings and archaeology) and whether the proposals would respect, maintain and strengthen the local character and distinctiveness of the townscape or settlement character. There may be opportunities for heritage led regeneration projects to include housing. Promoting growth alongside BGI (Option C and E) would however, where appropriate to do so, enable the preservation of existing heritage assets and their setting.	All options would benefit from policies which address the protection and enhancement of local character, distinctiveness and heritage assets
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	--	?	?	+	Option B would result in the loss of significantly more greenfield land if development is redirected away from the main urban area towards outlying settlements where there is less brownfield land available. Conversely, Option A and E would be minor positive. Option C is uncertain as it depends on the location development that is being delivered alongside existing and new BGI. This may or may not be brownfield. The effect of Option D is also unknown, as this will depend on the locations of development selected. Some may be located in more urban areas (for example close to railway stations in rural areas).	All options would benefit from policies which address the use of raw materials, promote sustainable design and construction and the protection of best and most versatile land.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF APPRAISALS

Topic Area 3 Spatial Strategy and Housing Target 3.1 Spatial Strategy	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
A - Retain existing policy approach as set out in the Core Strategy of urban concentration. Most development located within or adjoining the main built-up area where feasible (including adjacent to Hucknall) and Key Settlements identified for growth.	++	+	++	++	?	0	+	++	++	+	-	-	?	+	?	+
B - Disperse development broadly beyond the main built-up area, within existing or new settlements that are within or beyond the Green Belt.	+	+	+	+	?	0	0	-	--	?	--	?	?	-	?	--
C - Retain existing policy approach and prioritise new development that can protect and enhance the strategic river corridors, canal corridors, the Greenwood Community Forest and urban fringe areas, and/or prioritise other blue-green Infrastructure assets.	++	+	++	?	++	0	+	+	?	++	++	++	++	?	+	?
D - Focus on location of new development with regard to existing and proposed transport infrastructure.	++	+	++	?	?	0	0	++	?	+	+	?	?	?	?	?
E - Alongside the strategic location of development, include policy criteria that should be applied to proposals to ensure sustainable development, such as maximising blue and green infrastructure, meeting identified housing needs, promoting public transport and active travel, delivering 20-minute neighbourhoods, creating attractive places, and delivering economic growth.	++	++	++	+	+	0	+	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

CONCLUSIONS

The appraisal of alternative approaches to Topic Area 3.1 and the spatial distribution of development across the plan area has highlighted the benefits of all options against those objectives that address housing and economic development. Regarding the distribution of development, Option B (a dispersed strategy), this scored minor or major negative against those objectives that seek to protect the environment, including the loss of greenfield land, increased pollution, harm to landscape and loss of natural resources. Retaining the current approach (urban concentration) performed better against these objectives, except for effects on pollution. This is understandable given the likelihood that Option A would focus development in less environmentally sensitive urban or urban edge locations.

The prioritisation of locating development where it can complement Green and Blue Infrastructure performed well against the environmental objectives. Whereas there was more uncertainty regarding the effects of Option D, focusing development in the vicinity of transport infrastructure. This uncertainty reflects the broad choice of locations that development could be directed too.

Option E did not address the distribution of development. This focused on whether the policy would benefit from strategic criteria that addressed the broad range of issues that combined to ensure sustainable development. Unsurprisingly, given the criteria suggested, it scored well against all the SA objectives.

On balance, Option C is preferred as it retains the current approach of an urban concentration whilst seeking to integrate new developments with green infrastructure and existing transport infrastructure would comprise a sustainable strategy for the distribution of development.

3.2 Delivering the Identified Housing Target

Identification of reasonable alternatives

Options	Is it a realistic option
Deliver the identified housing target by allocating additional strategic sites.	Yes
Deliver the identified housing target within a mix of strategic sites and non-strategic sites	Yes

3.2 Delivering the Identified Housing Target

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

A - Deliver the identified housing targets by allocating additional strategic sites.

B - Deliver the identified housing targets within a mix of strategic and non-strategic sites

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	+	+	Both options will ensure that the housing stock meets housing needs.	Where required, Local Plans should identify sufficient plots and pitches to meet travellers and showpeople's needs.
	+	+	Delivery within strategic sites either in part or in full (Options A and B) are likely to provide greater opportunities to deliver pitches and plots for travellers and showpeople. The greater economies of scale will also provide the required infrastructure.	Infrastructure Delivery Plans will identify required infrastructure.
2. Employment and Jobs	+	+	Both options are likely to have a minor positive effect on employment and jobs.	Employment policies should deliver sufficient employment land to meet identified needs.
		+	Options A will provide opportunities for mixed use (employment and housing) strategic sites.	
			Option B will provide employment opportunities within both strategic sites and non-strategic rural sites.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	+	Options A and B would deliver strategic scale development that would, to deliver sustainable communities, include a mix of uses and local employment.	Employment policies should deliver sufficient employment land to meet identified needs.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
4. Shopping Centres	+	+	Both options are positive. However, option A will direct strategic sites away from some key settlements and their local centres. Option B will facilitate the distribution of sites across the plan area where it will benefit all centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	+	Options A and B will deliver strategic scale development that could deliver health facilities and provide comprehensive green infrastructure.	Informed by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, policies in the plan should deliver sufficient health facilities and green infrastructure to meet needs.
6. Community Safety	?	?	The effects of the options will depend on the location, design, and layout of developments. Consequently, their effects are unknown and uncertain.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	+	The delivery of strategic sites within Options A and B could include community facilities and neighbourhood centres.	Informed by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, policies in the plan should deliver sufficient community facilities.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
8. Transport	?	?	Option B would result in an increased number of non-strategic sites. Distributed over a wider area this would have the potential to increase the journey distances of private car. Conversely, the delivery of larger strategic sites would enable the delivery of accessible and connected public transport and active travel infrastructure on-site. However, this is still uncertain, as it will depend on the selected sites (and their potential for connectivity) and the specific policy requirements.	Informed by Transport Modelling and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, site specific development requirements should ensure appropriate transport infrastructure is delivered. Policies should ensure contributions for transport infrastructure are provided.
9. Brownfield Land	-	?	Option A would focus development within larger strategic sites. This would provide less flexibility during site selection and would require predominantly greenfield land. Options B is uncertain.	

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	?	The effects of both options upon this objective will depend on other factors, notably policies which seek to manage the energy use of new development. Option B may result in a more dispersed pattern of non-strategic sites. Without sufficient transport infrastructure or continued transition to electric vehicles this could increase rather than reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Effects of these options on biodiversity's resilience to climate change and ecosystem services will depend on the sites selected.	Policies should set out how developments will contribute to the achievement of net-zero. Including reductions in emissions and the mitigation of causes and effects of climate change. Biodiversity and blue green infrastructure policies should deliver net-gains in biodiversity and enhance the biodiversity network. This will enhance resilience to climate change.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	?	The effects of both options upon this objective will depend on other factors, notably policies which seek to manage air, noise and other types of pollution.	Policies should direct development to locations with access to public transport services and active travel infrastructure. Concepts of 20-minute neighbourhoods, where services and facilities are within easily accessible locations would mitigate the effect of new development on pollution levels.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	?	The effects of both options on this objective will depend on the specific locations of development.	Policies should direct development within flood zone 1 unless justified through the sequential and exception tests. Policies should also require SuDS and water efficiency measures (Nottinghamshire is water stressed area and currently reliant on the Sherwood aquifer for supply)
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	?	Effects of these options on biodiversity and blue and green infrastructure will depend on the sites selected.	Strategic policies should embed BGI within development requirements. This should optimise opportunities to deliver environmental net-gain, active travel, recreational open space and the other benefits that BGI brings. Priority habitats should be created, connected protected and enhanced to improve the ecological network.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
14. Landscape	-	0	Effects of these options on landscape will depend primarily on the sites selected. However, Option A is, due to the scale and number of strategic sites, likely to have greater landscape impacts. Dispersing non-strategic sites would provide more opportunities to integrate development within the landscape, unlike large strategic sites.	Landscape considerations should inform strategic site selections. Informed by site appraisals, strategic site policies in the Plan should promote landscape protection and enhancement. Landscape protection and enhancement policy criteria should be included in the Plan.
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	?	Effects of these options on the built and historic environment will depend primarily on the sites selected. Larger strategic sites would enable layouts and master planning that avoids or integrates heritage and built assets. Dispersing non-strategic sites would provide more opportunities to avoid built and historic environment constraints.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	?	Effects of these options on natural resources, specifically the loss of greenfield best and most versatile land, will depend primarily on the sites selected. However, Option B may allow, due to the greater flexibility of smaller non-strategic sites opportunities to avoid best and most versatile land.	

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Topic Area 3 Spatial Strategy and Housing Target 3.2 Delivering the Identified Housing Targets	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
A - Deliver the identified housing targets by allocating additional strategic sites.	++	+	+	+	+	?	+	?	-	?	?	?	?	-	?	?
B - Deliver the identified housing targets within a mix of strategic and non-strategic sites	++	++	+	++	+	?	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	?

CONCLUSIONS

Options A (delivery by allocating additional strategic sites) and B (combination of delivery within a mix of strategic and non-strategic sites) scored positively against the housing, economic, health and social inclusion objectives. Option B was uncertain or unknown against the objectives in relation to services, facilities and infrastructure on site, as non-strategic sites will limit the viability of the delivery of services, facilities and infrastructure on site. Both options have uncertain effects on transport, with negative effects on brownfield land and landscape objectives (Option A). Specifically, Option A would, by virtue of the size of strategic sites be less likely to avoid greenfield sites or mitigate their landscape impacts.

In conclusion, notwithstanding the inherent uncertainty of all options, Option B the delivery of a mix of strategic sites and non-strategic sites avoided any negative effects and had more major positive effects.

3.3 Housing Need and Target

Identification of reasonable alternatives

Options	Is it a realistic option
Retain existing housing target within the Core Strategy.	No. Paragraph 61 of the NPPF requires housing targets are informed by the standard method in national guidance unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach. Both options would likely result in an alternative housing target.
Do not have a policy	No. Paragraph 66 of the NPPF requires Strategic policy-making authorities establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area.
Use standard method as a minimum for housing targets. This is medium growth option and requires land release from the Green Belt.	Yes. Paragraph 62 of the NPPF requires housing targets are informed by the standard method in national guidance unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach.
Reduce the amount of housing required in order to avoid the loss of Green Belt, reduce harm to environmental assets and deliver a sustainable distribution of development. This is a low growth option and would limit development to non Green Belt areas.	Yes. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, unless the application of policies in the NPPF, including Green Belt and environmental policies would restrict the scale of development.
Increase the minimum amount of housing required, based on the standard method for calculating housing need. This alternative method would consider demographic trends, market signals and economic forecasts. This is a high growth option and would include all Reasonable Alternative housing sites.	Yes. Paragraph 69 of the NPPF states that the housing requirement figure may be higher than the identified housing need if, for example, it includes provision for neighbouring areas, or reflects growth ambitions linked to economic development or infrastructure investment.

3.3 Housing Need and Target

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

- A - Use standard method as a minimum for housing targets (This would equate to 11,484 dwellings including existing supply of 5544 and is a medium growth option and requires land release from the Green Belt).
- B - Lower the amount of housing required in order to avoid the loss of Green Belt and harm to environmental assets and deliver a sustainable distribution of development (This would equate to 7,904 dwellings including existing supply of 5544 and is a low growth option).
- C - Increase the minimum amount of housing required, based on the standard method for calculating housing need. This alternative method would consider demographic trends, market signals and economic forecasts. (This would equate to 22,409 dwellings including existing supply of 5544 and is a high growth option and requires the highest land release from the Green Belt).

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	+	+	+	Major positive for options A and C because they would meet the housing needs, involving the range and affordability of new housing for all social groups. Option B relates to reduced number of homes, however it is considered that it is minor positive because new housing would still be provided.	

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
2. Employment and Jobs	?	?	?	Option B relates to reduced housing required to take account of the existing Green Belt and other factors such as demographic trends and market signals and option C relates to increased housing required to include additional buffer and take account of the same factors as Option B. Both could result in change in employment opportunities. Option A relates to minimum housing requirement, which is a medium growth option compared to the two other options, and could result in change in employment opportunities.	Policies should encourage strategic scale developments to include construction training programs for residents. Ensure there are employment opportunities in or near area of new housing growth and accessible locations.
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	?	?	The effects of these options will depend on the sites selected. Option A could result in existing poor quality employment land being released for housing to meet the minimum housing requirement. Option B relates to reduced housing required to take account of the existing Green Belt and other factors such as demographic trends and market signals, this could still result in existing employment land being released for housing. Option C relates to increased housing required to include additional buffer and take account of other factors such as future demographic trends and market signals so there could be demand for new employment land.	Ensure demand for employment land not affected.

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
4. Shopping Centres	?	?	?	All options would have an unknown effect on this objective as the location of development and accessibility to centres would determine whether they would increase the vitality of town and local centres.	Ensure the vitality of existing centres not affected by new development. Policies should ensure appropriate levels of housing are located within or close to centres and that sufficient transport infrastructure or services are provided to link new residents to these centres.
5. Health and Well Being	?	?	?	All options would have an unknown effect on this objective as the location of development, its scale and its layout and design will determine whether health facilities are required, open space will be provided, or existing spaces improved. It is expected that large housing allocations would provide new open space or enhance the quality of existing open space or blue-green infrastructure which could provide opportunities for recreational physical activity.	Policies should require, where deficits exist, contributions to or the provision of health facilities. Blue-Green Infrastructure policies should require the creation, protection and enhancement of BGI and set the context for supplementary plans where required.
6. Community Safety	0	0	0	All options will have a neutral effect on this objective as the reduction in crime and fear of crime, and the contribution to a safe and secure environment will depend on the layout and design of new developments.	Design policies within the plan should include consideration of crime reduction and set the context for supplementary plans where required.

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
7. Social Inclusion	?	?	?	Impacts on existing cultural assets will depend on the location and scale of development.	Policies should require, where deficits exist, contributions to or the provision of community facilities, including education facilities.
8. Transport	?	?	?	The effect of these options on transport infrastructure will depend on the scale and location of development. It will also depend on policies that require transport infrastructure where this is required to deliver sites and meet the needs of occupants.	Ensure that new development is located close to existing transport infrastructure or a new transport network is established to minimise the impact on the environment. Ensure measures to encourage alternative modes of transport are in place and good accessibility to services and facilities. Transport Modelling and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan should identify required transport infrastructure that will contribute to a reduction in the use of private car.

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
9. Brownfield Land	-	+	-	Option A will require the use of greenfield land and therefore potentially impact on biodiversity value and therefore minor negative. Option B would reduce pressure to release greenfield land for development and a minor positive. Conversely Option C would require the release of more greenfield land to meet an increased housing target.	Policies should direct development to urban locations, where brownfield land is more likely to be available. Policies should also seek to reduce the loss greenfield land.
10. Energy and Climate Change	-	+	-	The effects of all three options upon this objective will depend on other factors, notably policies which seek to manage the energy use of new development and the location of development. However, Options B and C, which promote either less or more development, are likely to have different effects on ecosystem services and the resilience of biodiversity to climate change.	Policies in the plan should set out how developments will contribute to the achievement of net-zero. Including reductions in emissions and the mitigation of causes and effects of climate change.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	-	--	All options will increase development within the plan area and consequently this is likely to increase pollution. Option C would deliver more development and is likely to have a major negative effect on this objective.	Policies should direct development to locations with access to public transport services and active travel infrastructure. Concepts of 20-minute neighbourhoods, where services and facilities are within easily accessible locations would mitigate the effect of new development on pollution levels.

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	-	--	The effect of all three options on this objective on flooding are to a degree unknown as it will depend on the location of development. However, the provision of new housing would likely increase water consumption and could reduce water quality if pollution is not controlled. As Option C would deliver more housing, these effects would be greater.	To ensure housing development does not increase risks of flooding, policies should direct development away from areas of flood risk and reduce the risk of flooding elsewhere. Policies should also ensure development does not adversely affect the water quality of water courses. As the plan area is identified as being water stressed, policies should require new developments meet standards that reduce water consumption.

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	?	?	It depends on the locations and proposals of new development. It is recognised that options A and C may require land release from the Green Belt so this would have impact on natural environment, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure depending on location. Although it is expected that large housing allocations would provide new open space or green space and would be subject to biodiversity net gain. The delivery of blue and green infrastructure is unknown as this will depend on policy requirements in the plan.	A policy would be required to provide the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, protected species. Policies should ensure developments consider and incorporate appropriate blue and green infrastructure as a priority. These should integrate with and enhance the wider blue and green infrastructure network.
14. Landscape	-	+	-	Unlike effects on the natural environment and blue and green infrastructure, where site selection can avoid BGI assets, there is greater certainty that the overall number of new homes will have an effect on landscape. Especially within Gedling where an increased housing target could only be accommodated through further greenfield releases. Option C is likely to have a greater adverse effect on landscapes due to the increase in housing development and likelihood that it will require more greenfield land. A reduction in the housing target within Option B (considering Green Belt and other environmental constraints) will have a minor positive effect on this objective. Option A would result in the loss of some greenfield land and is therefore minor negative.	Policies should require consideration of landscape impacts and set out the framework for landscape protection within supplementary plans and masterplans where necessary.

15. Built and Historic Environment	-	+	-	An increased housing target may require greater densities and loss of amenity open spaces within urban areas. The townscapes have the potential to be adversely affected. In addition, the character of outlying settlements would be adversely affected by significant levels of housing that cannot be accommodated within the urban area. However, impacts on specific heritage assets will depend on the locations and proposals of new development. It is recognised that the locations or number of homes could be limited due to heritage assets nearby. There may be opportunities for heritage-led regeneration projects to include housing. Regarding the managing of assets, encouraging access, regeneration and heritage-based tourism, the effects of all three options are uncertain or neutral and achieving these will depend on the sites selected and heritage policies in the plan.	Policies should ensure developments protect and enhance the historic environment, foster heritage led regeneration and promotes sustainable tourism. Regarding the managing of assets, encouraging access, regeneration and heritage-based tourism, the effects of all three options on this objective are uncertain or neutral and achieving these aims will depend on the sites selected and heritage policies within the plan
---	---	---	---	--	--

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
					.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	-	--	Whichever option is selected, housing supply within the plan area will include significant quantities of greenfield land, some of which will be best and most versatile. Therefore, options A and B are considered minor negative. Option C will result in more greenfield land and best and most versatile land, therefore, is considered major negative. It will also result in more waste being generated from more households. Whilst Option B will result in less greenfield land and best and most versatile land being lost, losses will still occur. It will also still result in an increase in waste being generated. Option A would also result in the loss of some greenfield land and best and most versatile land.	Sites should avoid best and most versatile land and policies should discourage the use of such land. Policies should promote the use of sustainable design and construction.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Topic Area 3 Spatial Strategy and Housing Target 3.3 Housing Need and Target	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
A - Use standard method as a minimum for housing targets. (This is medium growth option and requires land release from the Green Belt).	+	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	-
B - Lower the amount of housing required in order to avoid the loss of Green Belt and harm to environmental assets and deliver a sustainable distribution of development (low growth option).	--	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	+	+	-	-	?	+	+	-
C - Increase the minimum amount of housing required, based on the standard method for calculating housing need. This alternative method would consider demographic trends, market signals and economic forecasts and Reasonable Alternative sites (high growth option).	++	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	-	-	--	--	?	-	-	--

CONCLUSIONS

Broadly, the effects of all three options upon the SA objectives 2 to 8 are similar. Notably their effects upon economy, shopping centres, health and well-being, community safety, social inclusion and transport objectives are either uncertain as effects will depend on the location of development.

There is greater certainty that meeting the housing needs, either set by the standard method (Option A) or an increased need (Option C), is likely to have an adverse effect upon environmental objectives. Notably, Option C and an increase in housing need and target would, due to increased land requirements, have an adverse effect on many of these objectives.

Conversely, and unsurprisingly, reducing the target to avoid the loss of Green Belt and reduce harm to environmental assets has less adverse effects on the environmental objectives. However, a reduction in the housing would have a major negative effect on the housing objective.

Whilst meeting need identified through the standard method Option A would have adverse effects, albeit not as great as Option C. It would allow for a sustainable distribution of development and sensitive site selection (avoiding environmental or heritage assets, or sensitive townscapes or landscapes) could mitigate these effects, and therefore this option is considered more favourable overall.

Topic Area 4: Green Belt

- 4.1 The Green Belt
- 4.2 Reuse of Buildings within the Green Belt
- 4.3 Extensions to Buildings within the Green Belt
- 4.4 Replacement of Buildings within the Green Belt
- 4.5 Infill Development within the Green Belt
- 4.6 Homes for Rural Workers

4.1 The Green Belt

Identification Of Reasonable Alternatives

Options	Is it a realistic alternative?
Not have a policy to maintain the principle of the Green Belt.	No because it is a requirement of the NPPF. Paragraphs 145 to 147 of the NPPF states the importance of maintaining Green Belts and that, once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances exist. Paragraph 156 of the NPPF states that for land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation Golden Rules apply, including new or improved green spaces.
Retain the existing approach as set out in the Core Strategies which retains the principle of the Green Belt and reviews the Green Belt boundaries to meet development requirements.	Yes
Retain the existing approach as set out in the Core Strategies which retains the principle, and reviews the Green Belt boundaries, but include compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land where Green Belt land has been lost.	Yes
Retain the existing approach as set out in the Core Strategies but include the designation of additional safeguarded land.	Yes
Retain the existing Green Belt and do not undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries.	Yes

4.1 The Green Belt

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

A - Retain the existing approach as set out in the Core Strategies which retains the principle of the Green Belt and reviews the Green Belt boundaries to meet development requirements.

B- Retain the existing approach as set out in the Core Strategies which retains the principle, and reviews the Green Belt boundaries, but include compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land where Green Belt land has been lost.

C - Retain the existing approach as set out in the Core Strategies but include the designation of additional safeguarded land.

D - Retain the existing Green Belt and do not undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	++	++	++	--	Options A to C would provide the mechanism to review Green Belt boundaries to meet development requirements which would include meeting housing need. Additional safeguarded land would provide potential flexibility but this would be beyond the plan period. Option D would reduce the ability to meet housing needs.	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	?	?	?	It is considered that all options would have an uncertain impact on this objective. It would depend on the type and location of development.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	++	++	++	--	Options A to C would provide the mechanism to review Green Belt boundaries to meet development requirements which would include providing the land required to meet economic and business need. Option D would reduce the ability to meet economic and business needs.	
4. Shopping Centres	?	?	?	?	It is considered that all options would have an uncertain impact on this objective. It would depend on the location and type of development and whether this resulted in benefits to existing shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	++	?	?	It is considered that the impact for Options A and C would be uncertain as it depends on the type and location of development. Option D is considered uncertain as it is unlikely to result in improvements to health, open space although it may retain food growing opportunities. Option B would include improvements to accessibility of Green Belt land which would increase opportunities for recreational activities and may also include provision of open space.	Ensure that compensatory improvements include enhancing accessibility and providing opportunities for recreational activities.
6. Community Safety	0	0	0	0	It is considered that all options would have no implications for the objective.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	?	0	0	It is considered that Options A, C and D would have no implications for the objective. Option B may provide access to community activities but this is considered to be uncertain.	Ensure compensatory measures include consideration for how improved access can facilitate social inclusion opportunities.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	Commentary	Mitigation
8. Transport	?	?	?	?	It is considered that all options would have an uncertain impact on this objective. It would depend on the location of development.	Ensure consideration is given to proximity to public transport and to existing facilities and services.
9. Brownfield Land	?	?	?	?	It is considered that all options would have an uncertain impact on this objective. Option D may result in a greater focus on brownfield land. However, there is also brownfield land within the Green Belt which may be released as part of a review. Therefore, the impact is considered to be uncertain for all options.	Ensure consideration is given to brownfield land within the Green Belt when reviewing Green Belt boundaries.
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	?	?	?	It is considered that all options would have an uncertain impact on this objective. It depends on the type and location of the development. Option B, which includes compensatory improvements to environmental quality, may increase resilience of biodiversity to climate change but this is considered to be uncertain.	Ensure that compensatory measures include improving resilience of biodiversity to climate change.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	?	?	?	It is considered that all options would have an uncertain impact on this objective. Development may increase air, noise and other types of pollution but this depends on the type and location of development.	Ensure consideration is given to pollution and air quality, for example through considering proximity to public transport links and accessibility to facilities and services.
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	?	?	?	It is considered that all options would have an uncertain impact on this objective. Option B may include improving to water quality through environmental quality improvements but this is considered to be uncertain. Option D may direct development towards areas of higher flood risk.	Ensure consideration is given to flood risk when considering Green Belt boundaries. Ensure compensatory improvements consider water quality.
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-	?	+	?	+	It is considered that Options A and C would have an uncertain impact on this objective. Removing land from the Green Belt for development or designating additional safeguarded land may have an impact on the natural	Ensure consideration is given to the natural environment,

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	Commentary	Mitigation
Green Infrastructure					environment, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure but this depends on the location and characteristics of the development site. Option B would include compensatory improvements which would improve environmental quality and accessibility. Option D is more likely to protect and conserve biodiversity, blue and green infrastructure and the natural environment but is unlikely to lead to any improvements.	biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure when considering Green Belt boundaries.
14. Landscape	?	?	?	+	It is considered that Options A, B and C would have an uncertain impact on this objective. Removing land from the Green Belt for development may have an impact on landscape but this depends on the location and character of the landscape. Option D is more likely to protect existing landscape character.	Ensure consideration is given to landscape character and quality when considering Green Belt boundaries.
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	?	?	?	It is considered that all options would have an uncertain impact on this objective. Preserving the setting and special character of historic towns is one of the five purposes of the Green Belt and should be taken into account as part of reviewing Green Belt boundaries or designating additional safeguarded land. However, more development in town and cities may also have an impact on the built and historic environment.	Ensure consideration is given to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	?	?	++	It is considered that Options A, B and C would have an uncertain impact on this objective as it would depend on which areas of Green Belt were removed and the type of development. Option D is likely to protect agricultural land and prevent loss of greenfield.	Consider whether the land is the best and most versatile agricultural land and consider whether the land is greenfield or brownfield when considering Green Belt boundaries and the designation of additional safeguarded land.

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 4: Green Belt 4.1 The Green Belt	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
Option A – Retain existing ACS approach	++	?	++	?	?	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Option B – Review the Green Belt boundaries, and include compensatory improvements	++	?	++	?	++	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	?	?
Option C – Designate additional safeguarded land	++	?	++	?	?	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Option D - Retain the existing Green Belt and do not undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries.	--	?	--	?	?	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	++

CONCLUSIONS

Four options were considered as part of the appraisal.

Options A, B and C scored major positives for Objectives 1 and 3 as they would provide the mechanism to review Green Belt boundaries to meet development requirements for housing and economic development. However, Option D scored major negatives for these Objectives as it would reduce the likelihood of housing and economic needs being met.

For Objectives 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15 the impact was considered uncertain for all Options as it would depend on the type and location of development. For Objective 7, Options A, C and D were considered to have no impact but Option B was an uncertain as it may provide access to community facilities which may help social inclusion.

Option B scored a major positive for Objective 5 as it would include improvements to accessibility of Green Belt land which would increase opportunities for recreational activities and have health and wellbeing benefits.

Option B scored a minor positive for Objective 13 as it would include compensatory improvements which would improve environmental quality and accessibility. Option D also scored a minor positive as it would be more likely to protect and conserve biodiversity, blue and green infrastructure and the natural environment.

Option D score a minor positive for Objective 14 as it would be likely to protect existing landscape character. Options A, B and C were uncertain as removing land from the Green Belt for development may have an impact on landscape but this depends on the location and character of the landscape.

For Objective 16, Option D scored a major positive as it is likely to protect agricultural land and prevent loss of greenfield land. It is considered that Options A, B and C would have an uncertain impact on this objective as it would depend on which areas of Green Belt were removed and the type of development.

Overall, Options A, B and C provide significant benefits for housing and economic growth, with Option B offering additional advantages for health, wellbeing and environmental quality. In contrast, Option D prioritises the protection of the natural environment, landscape and natural resources but performs poorly in meeting development needs. However, for Options A, B and C, a number of environmental effects remain uncertain as outcomes will depend on the location and type of development.

4.2 Reuse of Buildings within the Green Belt

How to approach the reuse of buildings in the Green Belt when not in the same use.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 154, which states that “the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction” is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, provided it preserves openness and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, and to avoid loopholes where appropriate development is converted to inappropriate use shortly after being built.

Option A – include a time period policy

Include a policy to require that buildings granted for appropriate uses must be used for a period of at least 10 years prior to reuse/redevelopment for inappropriate uses i.e. the period it would need to be genuinely used for.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Supports the reuse and potential expansion of existing dwellings helping to bring vacant buildings back into use.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No direct impact on employment	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	-	Buildings likely to be in inaccessible locations, could increase travel.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on brownfield land reuse; policy applies in Green Belt.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on energy efficiency or renewable energy.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	Reuse or change of use of building = no impact on flood risk.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	Relates to time period only; no effect on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No change to landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No change to reuse of existing building.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on natural resources or waste recovery.	

Option B – include a criteria based policy

Set out a series of criteria against which the reuse of buildings is to be judged. Proposals which do not comply with the majority of the criteria are considered to not preserve the openness of the countryside and are therefore inappropriate in the Green Belt but could be granted if there are 'special circumstances'.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Proposals are assessed against a range of criteria	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No direct impact on employment	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health outcomes	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime or safety	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion or community access	
8. Transport	0	More restricted on location	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy use or impact on energy efficiency	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk or water quality	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No change to reuse of existing buildings; dependent on design of proposals	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	

Option C – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework and case law.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Existing building being reused for residential.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No direct impact on employment	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	-	Building likely to be in an inaccessible location.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	Policy applies in Green Belt; no direct impact on brownfield land reuse.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on energy efficiency or renewable energy.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Policy does not restrict change of use; potential local impacts.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Policy does not restrict reuse; may have negative effects on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	

14. Landscape	-	Policy does not restrict reuse; potential negative effect on openness/landscape character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Depends on the design of replacement building.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Policy does not restrict; may increase resource use or environmental impact.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a minor positive for Objective 1, reflecting potential benefits for housing through enabling the reuse of existing buildings within the Green Belt where they have been in an appropriate use for a specified period. A minor negative was recorded for Objective 8 (Transport), reflecting the potential for additional travel demand associated with development in rural locations. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting the focused nature of the policy and its limited wider environmental, social or economic impacts.

Option B also scored a minor positive for Objective 1, reflecting the potential for the reuse of existing buildings to contribute to housing provision. All other objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting the flexible, criteria-based approach which allows proposals to be assessed on a case-by-case basis without generating clear additional effects across other sustainability objectives.

Option C scored a minor positive for Objective 1, reflecting the continued potential for building reuse under national policy. However, minor negatives were identified for Objectives 8, 11, 13, 14 and 16, indicating potential adverse effects relating to transport, pollution and air quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, landscape, and natural resources and waste management where development may occur without the additional clarity and safeguards provided by a local policy.

Overall, Option A provides benefits for housing while introducing a clearer local policy mechanism to manage the reuse of buildings in the Green Belt. Option B provides a criteria-based approach to assessing proposals providing benefits for housing with all other objectives being neutral. Option C performs negatively across several environmental objectives due to the absence of a local policy framework.

4.3 Extensions to Buildings within the Green Belt

How to define 'disproportionate additions' in relation to extensions to a building.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 154, which states that the extension or alteration of a building is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt provided that it "does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building."

Option A - include a policy

Allow for extensions up to 50% of the existing floor space. Extensions beyond this are deemed to be disproportionate and therefore inappropriate in the Green Belt.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	May increase housing range, investment, and reduce unfit homes.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Flexible approach allows adaptation of agricultural and commercial buildings.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Flexible approach helps businesses adapt buildings for their purpose.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct effect on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	Neutral effect on transport.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	Policy applies in Green Belt; no direct impact on brownfield reuse.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	Neutral; no effect on energy efficiency or renewable energy.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Site-by-site impact; likely extension into garden/greenfield rather than green infrastructure.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	Reduces soft areas for runoff; increases hard surfacing in already developed areas.	Could allow conditions on drainage to be imposed.

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Likely impacts on biodiversity/green infrastructure depending on site.	Need separate policies on natural environment.
14. Landscape	?	Site-specific impact; cannot make general assessment.	Need separate policies on landscape.
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Site-specific impact; cannot make general assessment.	Need separate policies on heritage.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Potential loss of greenfield or agricultural land.	Need separate policies.

Option B - include a criteria based policy

Set out a series of criteria against which extensions can be assessed. Decision makers will need to make a judgement about whether an extension is disproportionate taking account of the criteria.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Possibly increase range of housing. May increase investment and reduce unfit homes. Less clarity than Option A.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	Less clarity over whether extensions would be allowed.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	Less clarity.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	0	No impact.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	Impact on greenfield land and agricultural land is minimal.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No impact on waste recovery or pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	Covered in criteria - provision of sustainable drainage systems.	Need to build in criteria.

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Site by site impact – unable to make general assessment. Depends on criteria chosen.	Need to build in criteria to protect.
14. Landscape	?	Site by site impact - unable to make general assessment. Depends on criteria chosen.	Need to build in criteria to protect.
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Site by site impact - unable to make general assessment. Depends on criteria chosen.	Need to build in criteria to protect.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option C – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	Less clarity than Option A; less positive impact on housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	Does not actively support employment reuse.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No active guidance on building extensions or employment.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	Neutral effect on transport.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact; policy applies in Green Belt.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	Neutral; no effect on energy efficiency or renewable energy.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Lack of clarity; policy does not restrict extensions that could increase resource use or environmental impact.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	Potential reduction in soft areas; relies on other policies for mitigation.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Potential adverse impacts; reliant on other policies to mitigate.	
14. Landscape	-	Least clarity; reliant on other policies to protect landscape character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Least clarity; reliant on other policies to protect heritage.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Potential loss of greenfield or agricultural land; reliant on other policies.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 1, 2, and 3, reflecting benefits for housing, employment, and economic structure and innovation by allowing extensions of up to 50% of existing floor space. However, Option A scored minor negatives for Objectives 11, 12, 13, and 16, indicating potential adverse effects on pollution and air quality, flood risk and water quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and natural resources and waste management. Impacts on landscape and the built and historic environment were uncertain, reflecting variability depending on the scale and location of extensions.

Option B scored a minor positive for Objective 1 and Objective 12, suggesting limited benefits for housing and flood risk and water quality through a more flexible, criteria-based approach. The impacts on a number of environmental and heritage objectives, including Objectives 13, 14, and 15, were uncertain, reflecting the need for case-by-case judgement when assessing whether extensions are disproportionate.

Option C scored minor negatives for Objectives 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, indicating potential adverse effects on environmental quality, landscape, the built and historic environment, and natural resources where no local policy is in place and reliance is placed solely on national guidance.

Overall, Option A supports housing and economic objectives but records negative effects for several environmental objectives. Option B provides a more balanced approach with limited positive effects and greater flexibility, although outcomes remain uncertain for some environmental and heritage objectives. Option C performs negatively across key environmental and heritage objectives, highlighting the risks of not providing local policy guidance.

4.4 Replacement of Buildings within the Green Belt

How to approach the replacement of buildings in the Green Belt when not in the same use.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 154, which states that the replacement of a building is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt provided that "the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces". Also to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 154 which states "development in the Green Belt is inappropriate, unless... (d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces".

Option A – include a time period policy

Include a policy to require that buildings granted for appropriate uses must be used for a period of at least 10 years prior to reuse/redevelopment for inappropriate uses i.e. the period it would need to be genuinely used for.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Encourages replacing older housing stock to meet housing needs.	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	Depends on how restrictive the policy is.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	--	Policy restricts scope for employment uses in the Green Belt.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime or safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	-	Buildings likely to be in inaccessible locations, could increase travel.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on previously developed land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to air or water pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	Replacement or change of use of a building would have no impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	Relates to the time period of use, so no direct environmental change.	
14. Landscape	0	No change to visual amenity or landscape character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	Depends on the design of the replacement building.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on resource use or waste recovery.	

Option B – include a criteria based policy

Set out a series of criteria against which the replacement of buildings is to be judged. Proposals which do not comply with the majority of the criteria are considered to not preserve the openness of the Green Belt and are therefore inappropriate in the Green Belt but could be granted if there are 'special circumstances'.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Proposals are assessed against a range of criteria	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	Depends on how restrictive the policy is for employment use.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Less restrictive than Option A	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	More restricted on location	

9. Brownfield Land	0	Policy applies in Green Belt; no direct impact on brownfield land reuse.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	Replacement or change of use = no impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	Relates only to time period; no effect on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No change to landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	Depends on design of replacement building.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No reference to whether use is more intensive.	

Option C – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework and case law.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	Less clarity than Option A; less positive impact on housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	Does not actively support employment reuse.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact employment.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	-	Buildings likely to be in inaccessible locations, could increase travel.	
9. Brownfield Land	+	Policy does not restrict reuse; positive impact on brownfield land reuse.	

10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Policy does not restrict reuse; may have minor local impacts on resources or emissions.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Policy does not restrict reuse; may have minor negative effects on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	-	Policy does not restrict reuse; potential negative effect on openness/landscape character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	Depends on design of replacement building.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Policy does not restrict; may increase resource use or environmental impact.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a minor positive for Objective 1, reflecting potential benefits for housing through managing the replacement of buildings in the Green Belt and ensuring appropriate use over a specified period. However, a major negative was recorded for Objective 3, indicating constraints on economic structure and innovation due to the restrictive nature of the policy, and a minor negative for objective 8 due to houses in inaccessible locations. All other objectives recorded neutral or uncertain effects, reflecting the narrow focus of the policy on controlling replacement development rather than delivering wider social or environmental benefits.

Option B similarly scored a minor positive for Objective 1, reflecting the potential to support housing delivery through a criteria-based approach. A minor negative for Objective 3 was also recorded, reflecting the restrictive impact on economic development, while all other objectives were neutral or uncertain due to the focused scope of the policy.

Option C scored minor negatives for Objectives 8, 11, 13, 14 and 16, indicating potential adverse effects on transport, pollution and air quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, landscape, and natural resources and waste management where reliance is placed solely on national policy and case law. A minor positive was recorded for Objective 9, as the NPPF is less restrictive than potential local policy regarding reuse, which has a positive impact on brownfield land reuse.

Overall, Option A provides a mechanism to manage replacement development in the Green Belt while constraining economic flexibility. Option B provides a criteria-based approach with similar limitations. Option C performs negatively across several environmental objectives due to the absence of a local policy framework.

4.5 Infill Development within the Green Belt

Approach to infill boundaries.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 154, which states that exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt include “limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan,” and “limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites... which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.”

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to define limited infilling as the development of small gaps within the wider development or village of no more than one to two dwellings or 150 square metres increase in floorspace . Anything larger or not part of a gap is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	++	Limited infill increases housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	++	Supports land/buildings for business use and supports economic activity.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No change in access to health services.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	+	Likely to use existing transport infrastructure; improves access to services.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	Policy primarily addresses Green Belt infill; no direct effect on brownfield reuse.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	Neutral; no effect on renewable energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Potential minor impacts depending on site selection.	

12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	May impact flood risk depending on site and drainage.	Need separate policies on flood risk.
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Could help protect natural environment	
14. Landscape	+	Could help protect important landscape areas and maintain visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Consider linkages with Conservation Area boundaries.	Heritage policies will aid protection.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Will not prevent loss of natural resources	

Option B – include a criteria based policy

Set out a series of criteria against which planning applications for ‘infill’ type development can be assessed to establish if they are infill and are limited.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Depends on proposals, will increase the range of housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Depends on proposals, will provide land and buildings for business use.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No change in access to health services.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	+	Will use existing transport infrastructure and increase access to services (if there are any).	
9. Brownfield Land	-	Will not prevent the loss of greenfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No impact on waste recovery or pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	May impact on flood risk.	Need separate policies on flood risk.

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Could help exclude important areas and open space.	
14. Landscape	+	Could help exclude important areas and open space.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Consider linkages with Conservation Area boundaries.	Heritage policies will aid protection.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option C – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework and judgements as to whether proposals constitute 'infilling' and are 'limited'.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	May still provide housing through permitted infill development.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	Neutral; no active policy to encourage business use.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	May still provide land/buildings for business use.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No change in access to health services.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	0	Neutral effect on transport network and modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	Limited infill primarily in Green Belt; neutral effect on brownfield reuse.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No effect on energy efficiency or renewable energy.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Lack of restriction may allow development that affects local resources.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	May impact flood risk depending on site drainage and surface water management.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No direct impact; visual/landscape effects depend on site circumstances.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	Dependent on circumstances; no active protection.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Policy does not restrict loss of greenfield land.	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 1 and 3, reflecting strong benefits for housing delivery and economic structure and innovation by providing clear guidance on limited infill development within the Green Belt. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 8, 13 and 14, indicating benefits for transport, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and landscape where infill development is appropriately controlled. However, minor negatives were recorded for Objectives 11, 12, 15 and 16, reflecting potential adverse impacts on pollution and air quality, flooding and water quality, the built and historic environment, and natural resources where development occurs in sensitive locations.

Option B scored minor positives for Objectives 1, 3, 8, 13 and 14, indicating benefits for housing, economic structure and innovation, transport, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and landscape through a flexible criteria-based approach to assessing infill proposals. Minor negatives were recorded for Objectives 9, 12 and 15, reflecting potential impacts on brownfield land, flooding and water quality, and the built and historic environment where infill is permitted under criteria rather than strict limits.

Option C scored minor positives for Objectives 1 and 3, reflecting some potential support for housing and economic outcomes through the application of national policy. Minor negatives were recorded for Objectives 11, 12 and 16, indicating potential adverse effects on pollution and air quality, flooding and water quality, and natural resource management where no local guidance defines the scale or location of infill development. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects or uncertainty.

Overall, Option A provides strong benefits for housing and economic objectives while also managing environmental and landscape impacts through clear local limits on infill development but with some minor environmental impacts. Option B provides a flexible criteria-based approach with similar benefits but also has some minor environmental impacts. Option C performs negatively across several environmental objectives due to the absence of a local policy framework.

4.6 Homes for Rural Workers

Approach to rural workers dwellings.

Reason - to address the gap left by the loss of Planning Policy Statement 7 Annex A and to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 83, which states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and that local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances, such as “the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside.”

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to identify different types of rural workers (non-exclusive) and adapt Planning Policy Statement 7 Annex A criteria into Gedling specific policy.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Provides housing for rural workers; gives more certainty when granting permission.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	May reduce rural unemployment; supports rural economic activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	++	Provides buildings and land for business use; supports rural enterprises.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on local or town centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No change in access to health services.	
6. Community Safety	+	Could reduce crime on site.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct impact on social factors.	
8. Transport	-	May increase reliance on private vehicles; limited sustainable transport options.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	Policy generally applies to rural/Greenfield sites; neutral effect on brownfield reuse.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy efficiency or renewable energy.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Potential minor local impacts from development.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	Possible increased flood risk depending on site drainage.	Need separate policies on flood risk.

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct protection, minor indirect impacts possible.	
14. Landscape	0	No direct landscape protection; minor indirect impacts possible.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	Neutral impact on local character/design.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Likely loss of greenfield land.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework and case law.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	May still provide housing for rural workers through national policy.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Could reduce rural unemployment by supporting essential workers.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	May provide buildings to support rural business activity.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or village centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No change in access to health services.	
6. Community Safety	+	Could help reduce crime on site.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct impact on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	-	Likely reliance on private vehicles in rural locations.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No encouragement for brownfield land reuse.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Potential minor local impacts from dispersed rural development.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	May increase flood risk depending on site-specific circumstances.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Lack of local criteria may lead to minor negative impacts.	
14. Landscape	-	Absence of local guidance may result in incremental landscape impacts.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	Neutral impact on character; reliant on other policies.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Likely loss of greenfield land; no local safeguards.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 3 and minor positives for Objectives 1, 2 and 6, reflecting support for rural employment, housing needs and community safety. However, Option A scored minor negatives for Objectives 8, 11, 12 and 16, indicating potential transport-related impacts and environmental constraints associated with isolated rural development.

Option B scored minor positives for Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 6 but also minor negatives for Objectives 8, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 16. These negatives reflect weaker environmental protection and potential impacts on the natural environment and resources when relying solely on national policy.

Overall, both options show similar social and economic benefits, but Option A includes a major positive by providing buildings and land for business use. Both options present environmental and transport-related challenges.

Topic Area 5: Natural Environment

5.1 Blue-Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character

5.2 Biodiversity

5.3 Landscape Character

5.1 Blue-Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character

Identification of reasonable alternatives

Blue-Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character

Options	Reasonable Alternative?
Blue and Green Infrastructure	
Do not have a policy.	No. Paragraph 180 states that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategies which identifies current network of primary blue and green infrastructure corridors. Prioritises enhancement in around strategic development.	Yes.
Develop a wider network than currently identified (informed by an updated BGI Strategy).	Yes.
Set out strategic BGI priorities for development plans and separate criteria for development proposals. Include mitigation hierarchy to address harm to assets and weighting that should be applied to the benefits and harm of a proposal that affects an asset or network.	Yes.
Include a policy to encourage 'urban greening' through larger gardens, wider tree lined streets, community orchards, requirement for more green space etc.	Yes.
Include a policy to set targets for % increase in tree canopy cover for each authority.	Yes.
Landscape	
Do not have a policy.	No. Paragraph 180 requires planning policies to protect and enhance valued landscapes.
Retain current approach where landscape character is protected in line with recommendations in the Landscape Character Assessment. Corridors and assets should be multi-functional, and these functions are listed.	Yes.
Include policy on landscape character, identifying valued landscapes	Yes.

5.1 Blue-Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

Blue-Green Infrastructure

- A - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategies which identifies current network of primary blue and green infrastructure corridors. Prioritises enhancement in around strategic development.
- B - Develop a wider network than currently identified (informed by an updated BGI Strategy).
- C - Set out strategic BGI priorities for development plans and separate criteria for development proposals. Include mitigation hierarchy to address harm to assets and weighting that should be applied to the benefits and harm of a proposal that affects an asset or network.
- D - Include a policy to encourage 'urban greening' through larger gardens, wider tree lined streets, community orchards, requirement for more green space etc.
- E - Include a policy to set targets for % increase in tree canopy cover for the Borough.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	0	0	0	This policy will have no implications for housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	0	0	0	0	This policy will have no implications for employment and jobs.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	0	0	0	0	This policy will have no implications on economic structure and innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	0	0	0	0	This policy will have no implications for shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	?	+	+	+	Option A delivers enhancements to the identified blue and green infrastructure corridors. Option B will develop a wider network and deliver further enhancements. Both options will improve the quality of the existing open space. Option C will set out blue and green infrastructure priorities for development plans and applications, which will improve the existing network and will deliver enhancements. Option D delivers new open space and will improve existing open space through urban greening. Option E will increase tree canopies in the Borough, which will improve the quality of the existing open space.	Mitigation will be sought as part of the detailed design of a development.
6. Community Safety	0	0	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications on community safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	0	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	0	0	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications for transport.	
9. Brownfield Land	+	?	+	0	0	Option A delivers enhancements to the identified blue and green infrastructure corridors. Option B will develop a wider network and deliver further enhancements. Both options will	Mitigation will be sought as part of the detailed design of a development.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
						minimise the impact of the development on the biodiversity of the site. Option C includes criteria for development proposals to ensure the delivery of blue and green infrastructure strategic priorities. This will minimise the impact of the development on the biodiversity of the site. Option D and E will not have implications to brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	++	?	++	+	+	Options A, B and C will increase the resilience of biodiversity to climate change by protecting and enhancing blue and green infrastructure, increasing the habitats for nature to exist in and delivering infrastructure which can reduce greenhouse gases. Options D and E will reduce greenhouse emissions by delivering infrastructure that will contribute to a reduction in carbon such as trees.	Mitigation will be sought as part of the detailed design of a development.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	++	?	++	++	++	All options will deliver an increase in blue and green infrastructure which can improve air quality and reduce pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	++	?	++	+	+	Options A and B will deliver enhancements to green and blue infrastructure, which can support flood risk mitigation, reduce existing flood risk and improve the quality of water. Option C will set out BGI priorities which will deliver enhancements to green and blue infrastructure. This will ensure that any harm to the network will be mitigated. This will contribute to mitigating and reducing flood risk and can improve water quality and WFD status. Options D and E can contribute to mitigating flood risk by improving water storage and dispersing the water naturally.	Mitigation will be sought as part of the detailed design of a development.
13. Natural Environment,	++	?	++	++	++	All policy options will protect and enhance retained habitats or create new habitats, allowing for biodiversity net gains.	Mitigation will be sought as part of

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure						All policy options will help to protect landscapes and open space and blue and green corridors and networks. Options D and E will enhance woodland cover.	the detailed design of a development.
14. Landscape	0	0	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to the landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	0	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to the built and historic environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	0	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications on natural resources and waste management.	

5.1 Blue-Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character

Landscape Character

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

- F - Retain current approach where landscape character is protected in line with recommendations in the Landscape Character Assessment. Corridors and assets should be multi-functional, and these functions are listed.
- G - Include policy on landscape character, identifying valued landscapes.

SA objectives	F	G	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	The policy will have no implications for housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	0	The policy will have no implications on employment and jobs.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	0	The policy will have no implications on economic structure and innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	0	The policy will have no implications for shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	0	The policy will have no implications for health and well being.	
6. Community Safety	0	0	The policy will have no implications on community safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	0	The policy will have no implications on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	0	0	The policy will have no implications for transport.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	0	The policy will have no implications on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	0	The policy will have no implications on energy and climate change.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	0	The policy will have no implications on pollution and air quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	?	Option A will encourage landscapes to be multifunctional, which can include providing areas to mitigate flood risk as part of the landscape. The implications of Option B on flood and water quality are unknown.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	++	?	Option A will protect landscape character and will encourage multifunctional landscapes, which can improve the quality of existing open spaces and improve blue and green infrastructure networks. The implications of Option B on flood and water quality are unknown.	

SA objectives	F	G	Commentary	Mitigation
14. Landscape	+	?	Option A will have a positive impact on the visual amenity of the plan area through the enhancement of the blue and green infrastructure network. The implications of Option B on landscape is unknown.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	?	Option A will conserve and enhance the landscape character which could benefit the built and historic environment by protecting the landscape setting of historic assets and the heritage of settlements. The implications of Option B on the built and historic environment are unknown.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	0	The policy will have no implications on natural resources and waste management.	

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 5: Natural Environment 5.1 Blue-Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
Blue and Green Infrastructure																
A - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategies which identifies current network of primary blue and green infrastructure corridors. Prioritises enhancement in around strategic development.	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	++	++	++	++	0	0	0
B - Develop a wider network than currently identified (informed by an updated BGI Strategy).	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0
C - Set out strategic BGI priorities for development plans and separate criteria for development proposals. Include mitigation hierarchy to address harm to assets and weighting that should be applied to the benefits and harm of a proposal that affects an asset or network.	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	++	++	++	++	0	0	0
D - Include a policy to encourage 'urban greening' through larger gardens, wider tree lined streets, community orchards, requirement for more green space etc.	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	++	+	++	0	0	0

Topic Area 5: Natural Environment 5.1 Blue-Green Infrastructure and Landscape Character	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
E - Include a policy to set targets for % increase in tree canopy cover for each authority.	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	++	+	++	0	0	0
Landscape																
F - Retain current approach where landscape character is protected in line with recommendations in the Landscape Character Assessment. Corridors and assets should be multi-functional, and these functions are listed.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	+	+	0
G - Include policy on landscape character, identifying valued landscapes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	0

CONCLUSIONS

Blue-Green Infrastructure

The alternative approaches for Blue and Green Infrastructure and Landscape scored positively against the objectives they affected. Where an option did not score positively against an objective, it was either assessed to have no impact upon the objective or the impact of the option on the objective was unknown.

When considering the Blue and Green Infrastructure Options A-E, Options A and C-E scored major positive against the Pollution and Air Quality objective and the Natural Environment, Biodiversity and BGI objective. This is not surprising given the nature of the policy and its options. Options A and C scored more positives than Options D-E. However, Options A and C had a wider scope to positively benefit more objectives, whereas Options D-E provided more focused policy options, narrowing the scope to positively benefit other objectives.

The impact of Option B against some of the objectives was assessed to be unknown given that the proposed wider blue and green infrastructure network is unknown, and therefore the impact of the option on the objectives is unknown.

Overall, Options A and C perform most positively across the objectives, particularly in relation to pollution and air quality and the natural environment, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure. Option A provides the widest range of benefits across multiple objectives due to its broader scope, while Options D and E offer more focused benefits but with a narrower range of positive effects. Option B remains uncertain for a number of objectives due to the undefined nature of the network. On balance, Option A delivers the most comprehensive and consistent positive outcomes across the objectives.

Landscape Character

When considering the Landscape Options F-G, the two options had no impact upon twelve of the objectives. Option F scored positively against objectives 12-15 as the option complements the environmental objectives. However, against objectives 12-15 the impact of Option G was assessed to be unknown given that the proposed wider landscape network is unknown and therefore the impact of the option on the objectives is unknown.

5.2 Biodiversity

Identification of Reasonable Alternatives

Options	Is it a realistic alternative?
Retain policy which sets out how biodiversity will be increased over the plan period. This will be achieved by protecting and enhancing networks or habitats and species; avoiding the fragmentation of the blue and green infrastructure network; providing biodiversity features on site; supporting management of new and created habitats; apply the mitigation hierarchy. Designated sites will be protected and development on non-designated sites will only be permitted where harm outweighs the benefits.	Yes
Do not have a policy	No. Paragraph 187 requires planning policies contribute and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures
Retain the broad policy approaches within the Aligned Core Strategy but identify ecological networks within the plan and establish policy protections where development may affect these networks.	Yes. Required within paragraph 187.
Do not specify a biodiversity net gain amount.	Yes. Legislation requires (from January 2024) a minimum net-gain of 10%.
Set 10% minimum biodiversity net gain and allow development briefs and masterplans the option to set higher % biodiversity net gain amount feasible.	Yes. Neither environmental legislation nor national planning policy prevent local authorities setting a greater net gain within their local plans. Provided it is justified.
Set minimum biodiversity net-gain of between 10 -20% and allow development briefs and masterplans the option to set higher % biodiversity net gain amount where feasible.	Yes. Neither environmental legislation nor national planning policy prevent local authorities setting a greater net gain within their local plans. Provided it is justified.

5.2 Biodiversity

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

A - Retain policy which sets out how biodiversity will be increased over the plan period. This will be achieved by: protecting and enhancing networks or habitats and species; avoiding the fragmentation of the blue and green infrastructure network; providing biodiversity features on site; supporting management of new and created habitats; apply the mitigation hierarchy. Designated sites will be protected and development on non-designated sites will only be permitted where harm outweighs the benefits.

B - Retain the broad policy approaches within the Aligned Core Strategy but identify ecological networks within the plan and establish policy protections where development may affect these networks.

C - Do not specify a biodiversity net gain amount.

D - Set 10% minimum biodiversity net gain and allow development briefs and masterplans the option to set higher % biodiversity net gain amount where feasible.

E - Set minimum biodiversity net-gain of between 10 - 20% and allow development briefs and masterplans the option to set higher % biodiversity net gain amount where feasible.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	?	?	0	?	-	Options A and B set out the strategic policies that will protect and enhance biodiversity. Impacts on this objective will depend on development sites and their biodiversity value. Their effects are therefore uncertain. Option C will be neutral as biodiversity net gain of 10% is mandatory. Option D's effects are uncertain as these will depend on whether a higher % of net gain is set subsequently. Option E may affect the developable area of development sites and their viability. This may affect their deliverability and/or the ability to provide affordable housing contributions.	Sites selected should have lower biodiversity value to reduce the amount of net-gain. Plan wide viability appraisals must ensure that, if an increased biodiversity net-gain is justified, deliverability of sites and affordable housing contributions are not adversely affected.
2. Employment and Jobs	?	?	0	?	-	Like their effects on the housing objective above, the effects of Options A and B will depend on the development sites. Option C would be neutral as legislation requires a mandatory 10% net gain in biodiversity. Option D is unknown as subsequent development briefs and masterplans will determine whether an increase in biodiversity net gain is justified. Option E may affect the developable area of development sites and their viability.	Sites selected should avoid adversely affecting biodiversity assets and have lower biodiversity value to reduce the amount of net-gain. Plan wide viability appraisals must ensure that, if an increased biodiversity net-gain is justified, deliverability of employment sites is not adversely affected.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	?	0	?	--	Like their effects on the employment and housing objectives above, the effects of Options A and B will depend on the selected development sites. Option C will have a neutral effect as 10% net gain is a mandatory requirement. The effects of option D would be uncertain as development briefs and masterplans will determine whether an increase in the mandatory net-gain is required. An increase in biodiversity net-gain is likely to effect viability of sites and reduce contributions for other infrastructure. Consequently, it may have a major negative effect on this objective.	Sites selected should avoid adversely affecting biodiversity assets and have lower biodiversity value to reduce the amount of net-gain. Plan wide viability appraisals must ensure that, if an increased biodiversity net-gain is justified, deliverability of employment sites is not adversely affected.
4. Shopping Centres	0	0	0	?	-	Options A and B will have a neutral effect on this Objective as developments within shopping centres are unlikely to affect biodiversity assets or the wider network. The effects of option D would also be uncertain as development briefs and masterplans will determine whether an increase in the mandatory net-gain is required. The requirement to provide an increase in net-gain would affect the viability of some developments within the centres. Delivery on site may also be constrained by absence of opportunities within town centres to deliver biodiversity net-gain.	Plan wide viability appraisals must ensure that, if an increased biodiversity net-gain is justified, deliverability of development within centres are not adversely affected.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
5. Health and Well Being	+	+	0	?	+	Options A and B would both protect, create, and enhance biodiversity and natural greenspaces. However, option B would identify and protect the wider ecological networks, that include a numerous range and number of sites and their connections. Option C would be neutral as national policy would determine net-gain. The effects of option D would also be uncertain as development briefs and masterplans will determine whether an increase in the mandatory net-gain is required. Option E would provide more natural green space.	
6. Community Safety	0	0	0	0	0	All options will have a neutral effect on this objective as the reduction in crime and fear of crime, and the contribution to a safe and secure environment will depend on the layout and design of new developments.	Design and green infrastructure strategies should consider the design and layout of green infrastructure and measures that reduce crime or the fear of crime. Setting the context for development briefs, masterplans and supplementary plans where appropriate.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
7. Social Inclusion	+	+	0	?	+	Both options A and B would, through the protection, creation, and enhancement of habitats that complement cultural assets. They also provide opportunities for community and educational activities. Regarding net-gain (Options C to D), the delivery of more priority habitats will bring benefits for social inclusion. Options C will have a neutral effect as 10% net-gain is mandatory. Option D is unknown as any addition net-gain is deferred to development briefs and masterplans. Option E would deliver more and/or higher quality priority habitats. Improving social capital.	
8. Transport	+	+	0	?	+	Delivered alongside transport infrastructure, the creation, protection, and enhancement of biodiversity would assist the minimisation of transport's impacts on the environment. Tree planting for example would reduce noise and pollution levels. A network of multifunctional green spaces that enhance biodiversity could also deliver active travel transport infrastructure. Options C would have a neutral effect as 10% is mandatory. Option D's effects are unknown as any increase in net-gain will be set within development briefs and masterplans. Option E would deliver more priority habitats and therefore greater benefits as set out above.	

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
9. Brownfield Land	+	+	0	?	+	The protection and enhancement of biodiversity is likely to direct development (in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy) towards less sensitive sites. These are likely to be more brownfield. Some brownfield land will, due to their rarer ground conditions, may contain priority or protected species and these should be protected in accordance with their ecological value. Options C would have a neutral effect as 10% is mandatory. Option D's effects are unknown as any increase in net-gain will be set within development briefs and masterplans. Option E would help steer development away from higher quality habitats which will require even higher quality, or more priority habitats to achieve greater net-gain.	The Plan should make it clear that some priority habitats and species may exist within brownfield land and these should protected and enhanced in line with their ecological importance.
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	+	0	?	+	Options A and B seek to increase biodiversity, through the protection and enhancement of a network of habitats. This will assist the resilience of biodiversity to climate change, provide opportunities for carbon sequestration and increase ecosystem services. Option B would score higher if it were possible as this will identify those networks. Options C would have a neutral effect as 10% is mandatory. Option D's effects are unknown as any increase in net-gain will be set within development briefs and masterplans. Option E would increase natural habitats and as such would increase biodiversity's resilience to climate change, carbon sequestration, help people adapt to climate change and increase ecosystems services.	

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	+	0	?	+	The natural environment provides numerous ecosystem services that reduce pollution, including cleaning air and water and provided noise barriers. Options A and B would therefore have a minor positive effect. As with the objectives above, Option C would be neutral as national legislation requires 10% net-gain. Option D's effect are uncertain as it defers any increase above 10% to development briefs and masterplans. Option E would deliver more or higher quality habitats, with greater benefits	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	+	0	?	+	Options A and B will help minimise flood risk through the protection and creation of multifunctional BGI. They will also help conserve water and improve its quality. Regarding net-gain Option C is neutral as mandatory 10% will be legally required. Option D is unknown as it defers any possible increase to development briefs and masterplans. Option E will increase areas of natural greenspace that will assist mitigate flood risks.	

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	+	0	?	+	Options A and B will both protect and enhance biodiversity and the BGI network. Consequently, they will have a major positive effect on this objective. The identification of the ecological network (Option B) however, will bring greater benefits. Option C would not increase net-gains beyond those required by legislation. Consequently, its effects are neutral. Option D is unknown as it defers any increase in net gain to development briefs and masterplans. Option E would have a major positive effect as it would potentially achieve net gain above national legislation.	
14. Landscape	+	+	0	?	+	The protection and enhancement of biodiversity will have positive benefits for landscapes. Options A and B are therefore major positives. The identification of the ecological network (Option B) however, will bring greater benefits. As with Objective 15 above, Option C is, for the same reasons, neutral and Option D is unknown. Option E would bring benefits to landscape as it will deliver more habitats.	Habitats created should be appropriate to the landscape.

SA objectives	A	B	C	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	+	0	?	+	The protection and enhancement of biodiversity, as required in Options A and B will have major positive effects on this objective as it will, where appropriate, help conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings. They will also help maintain and strengthen local character and distinctiveness. Option C will have a neutral effect as 10% net-gain will be delivered in accordance with national legislation. Option D's effects are unknown as any increase in net gain and potential benefits to this objective are deferred to development briefs and masterplans. An increase in habitats generated because of between 10- 20% net-gain could have benefits for heritage conservation, as these could conserve heritage assets and their setting.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	+	0	?	+	Options A, B and E will contribute to the delivery of sustainable design as they will encourage the inclusion of priority habitats on sites. These habitats will also assist the delivery of SuDS, mitigate pollution and effects of climate change. They will also assist in the reduction of greenfield loss. Options C and D are either neutral or unknown as Option C defers to national policy and therefore is neutral and option D defers to development briefs and masterplans and is therefore unknown.	

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Topic Area 5: Natural Environment 5.2 Biodiversity	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
A - Retain policy which sets out how biodiversity will be increased over the plan period. This will be achieved by protecting and enhancing networks or habitats and species; avoiding the fragmentation of the blue and green infrastructure network; providing biodiversity features on site; supporting management of new and created habitats; apply the mitigation hierarchy. Designated sites will be protected and development on non-designated sites will only be permitted where harm outweighs the benefits.	?	?	?	0	+	0	++	+	+	++	+	++	++	++	++	++
B - Retain the broad policy approaches within the Aligned Core Strategy but identify ecological networks within the plan and establish policy protections where development may affect these networks.	?	?	?	0	++	0	++	+	+	++	+	++	++	++	++	++
C - Do not specify a biodiversity net gain amount.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D - Set 10% minimum biodiversity net gain and allow development briefs and masterplans the option to set higher % biodiversity net gain amount where feasible.	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
E - Set minimum biodiversity net-gain of 10-20% and allow development briefs and masterplans the option to set higher % biodiversity net gain amount where feasible.	-	-	--	-	++	0	+	+	+	++	+	+	++	+	+	++

CONCLUSIONS

The biodiversity policy options cover two themes, firstly the retention of the existing policy and identification of ecological networks (Options A or B) and delivery of biodiversity net-gain (Options C, D or E).

Regarding whether to retain the current policy (Option A) or include the identification of ecological networks, both scored the same against the SA Objectives. However, as it would assist the delivery of a connected network of natural greenspace, the identification of ecological network did have a major positive effect on health and wellbeing rather than just minor positive (Option A).

The appraisal of options for delivering net-gain clearly shows that Option C (not specifying a biodiversity net gain requirement) would have a neutral impact as the Government has legislated a requirement for 10% in biodiversity net-gain and it will be required without a policy on net-gain.

Option D's effects (allowing development briefs and masterplans where feasible to set a higher % net-gain) are unknown as subsequent plans may or may not set a greater net-gain requirement.

The appraisal of Option E (setting a minimum net-gain of between 10-20%) did however enable conclusions to be made regarding its effects on the SA objectives. It is likely that it would have negative effects on the delivery of housing and economic objectives as it could affect viability. However, this is tested in the plan wide viability appraisal and will depend on the sites selected (sites with priority habitats will require more net gain to offset any harm to these habitats). Conversely, Option E does have positive effects on all the other objectives, including health and wellbeing, transport, brownfield land, pollution, flooding, natural environment, landscape, built environment and natural resources.

Overall, while identifying ecological networks under Option B provides greater benefits for health and wellbeing compared to Option A, the key distinction lies in the biodiversity net-gain approaches. Option E delivers the most extensive environmental and social benefits across the objectives, although it introduces potential risks to housing delivery and economic viability. In contrast, Option C results in largely neutral effects due to national requirements, and Option D remains uncertain as outcomes depend on future plan-making

Topic Area 6: Open Space and Recreational Facilities

- 6.1 Culture, Tourism and Sport
- 6.2 Protection of Open Space
- 6.3 Provision of New Open Space
- 6.4 Local Green Space
- 6.5 Greenwood Community Forest and Sherwood Forest National Nature Reserve
- 6.6 Tourist Accommodation
- 6.7 Equestrian Development

6.1 Culture, Tourism and Sport

Identification Of Reasonable Alternatives

Options	Is it a realistic alternative?
Retain the approach within ACS Policy 13 by directing new cultural and tourism facilities of local importance towards Arnold and local centres where feasible. Existing facilities will be protected.	Yes
Retain protections of existing facilities. Do not however identify a hierarchy of leisure facilities (national, regional and local) and their preferred locations. Establish a more flexible approach to the location of facilities and set plan wide criteria that should be applied to all cultural, tourism and sporting facilities.	Yes
Do not have a policy	No – It is a NPPF requirement

6.1 Culture, Tourism and Sport

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES FOR APPRAISAL:

- A - Retain the approach within ACS Policy 13 by directing new cultural and tourism facilities of local importance towards Arnold and local centres where feasible. Existing facilities will be protected.
- B - Retain protections of existing facilities. Do not however identify a hierarchy of leisure facilities (national, regional and local) and their preferred locations. Establish a more flexible approach to the location of facilities and set plan wide criteria that should be applied to all cultural, tourism and sporting facilities.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	As both options focus on policy approach for culture, tourism and sporting facilities, it is considered that they would have no implications for the objective.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	+	Both options would be likely to have a minor positive impact on the objective as additional support for the culture / leisure / sport sectors may generate additional jobs / diversity of jobs and reduce unemployment, although the extent of this is unknown. Option B may result in fewer employment opportunities due to the removal of support for large-scale sporting facilities although support for a greater number of types of development, such as accommodation for tourists may still result in a minor positive, through the provision of additional employment opportunities.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	0	As both options focus on policy approach for culture, tourism and sporting facilities, it is considered that they would have no implications for the objective.	
4. Shopping Centres	+	+	Both options are likely to lead to an improvement of the vitality of Arnold town centre and local centres as a result of supporting the creation and improvement of culture, tourism and sporting facilities.	

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
5. Health and Well Being	+	+	Both options are likely to result in a positive impact on the objective including by increasing the opportunities for recreational physical activity and potentially also the enhancement of the quality of existing open space or blue-green infrastructure	For both options, opportunities to promote the enhancement of blue-green infrastructure should be encouraged.
6. Community Safety	?	?	The protection and improvement of culture, tourism and sporting facilities within Arnold Town and local centres may indirectly lead to a reduction in antisocial behaviour / crime, by providing disadvantaged groups with greater opportunities for recreation. However, overall, the impact of both options upon the objective is unknown.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	+	Both options would result in a major positive impact upon the objective, as they will facilitate the protection and enhancement of existing cultural assets including culture, tourism and sporting facilities as well as improving access to and encouraging community activities.	
8. Transport	+	+	Both options are likely to have at least a minor positive impact, as locating new facilities within or adjoining Arnold town or local centres is likely to ensure that such facilities are able to be accessed via modes of transport other than the private car. It is recognised that tourist accommodation outside the centres would not reduce journeys undertaken by private car due to limited accessibility to services and facilities.	For option B, ensure that new development is located close to existing transport infrastructure or a new transport network is established to minimise the impact on the environment. Ensure measures to encourage alternative modes of transport are in place and good accessibility to services and facilities.
9. Brownfield Land	?	?	It is considered that both options would have an unknown impact upon the objective.	Support existing and new facilities which maximise the use of brownfield land.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	?	It is considered that both options would have an unknown impact upon the objective. It is likely that additional development will result in additional energy usage.	Need a policy relating to energy and climate change for new development in order to reduce energy usage. Support on-site renewable energy generation where appropriate.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	?	It is considered that both options would have an unknown impact upon the objective.	Need a policy relating to pollution and air quality for new development.
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	?	It is considered that both options would have an unknown impact upon the objective.	Need a policy relating to flooding and water quality for new development, in particular to ensure new development is suitably located outside of flood risk areas, conserve water and avoid impact of new development upon water quality.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	+	Both options could result in a minor positive impact upon the objective through the protection or enhancement of open space or blue-green infrastructure which are linked to cultural and sport facilities.	For both options, need to ensure that increased access to existing open space or blue-green infrastructure does not cause harm to biodiversity if access is greater than the capacity that can be supported without disturbance to wildlife or damage to habitats.
14. Landscape	?	?	It is considered that both options would have an unknown impact upon the objective.	Avoid new development within sensitive landscape character areas.
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	+	Both options are likely to have a positive impact upon the built and historic environment objective as they will support the conservation and enhancement of designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings. Both options will also provide better opportunities for people to access and understand local heritage and to participate in cultural activities. Both options will also protect or improve access to and enjoyment of the historic environment. Would promote heritage based sustainable tourism.	Protect heritage assets and include opportunities for enhancement of the historic environment.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	?	It is considered that the impact of both options is unknown.	Ensure the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques in new development and avoid loss of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land to development.

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 6: Open Space and Recreational Facilities 6.1 Culture, Tourism and Sport	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
Retain the approach within ACS Policy 13 by directing new cultural and tourism facilities of local importance towards Arnold and local centres where feasible. Existing facilities will be protected.	0	+	0	+	+	?	++	+	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	?
Retain protections of existing facilities. Do not however identify a hierarchy of leisure facilities (national, regional and local) and their preferred locations. Establish a more flexible approach to the location of facilities and set plan wide criteria that should be applied to all cultural, tourism and sporting facilities.	0	+	0	+	+	?	++	+	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	?

Conclusions

The appraisal of alternative approaches to this Policy has highlighted some positive benefits against several of the objectives.

Both options are likely to lead to an improvement of the vitality of Arnold and local centres as a result of supporting the creation and improvement of culture, tourism and sporting facilities within or adjoining the centres.

Both options are likely to result in a positive impact on the objective including by increasing the opportunities for recreational physical activity and potentially also the enhancement of the quality of existing open space or blue-green infrastructure.

6.2 Protection of Open Space

How to protect open space (and deal with deficiencies).

Reason – Aligned Core Strategy Policy 16. Evidence for the Aligned Core Strategy confirms the Council's intention to set out detailed policy in the Local Planning Document, Open Space Supplementary Planning Document and Leisure documents.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy based on existing Local Development Plan Policy LPD 20 to protect existing open space.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, infrastructure, innovation or enterprise.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	++	Positive impact on opportunities for recreational physical activity.	
6. Community Safety	+	Positive impact on crime with secured open space management and maintenance.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Protection of open space supports community activities and social interaction.	
8. Transport	0	Existing facilities only; no change to accessibility or travel patterns.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Scope for renewable energy schemes as part of open space provision.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Protection of open space contributes to environmental quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	Includes protection of sustainable drainage systems.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-	+	Improves quality of existing open space and green infrastructure.	

Green Infrastructure			
14. Landscape	+	Positive impact on visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No change to local character or heritage assets.	Use open space to enhance heritage assets.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource management.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Use Open Space SPD and refer to the Policies Map incorporating Green Infrastructure.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Reduced opportunities for recreational physical activity.	
6. Community Safety	-	Loss of open space could result in loss of diversionary activities.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced opportunities for community activities and social interaction.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy provision or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Reliant on national policy only to protect environmental quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	No protection of open space could increase flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-	-	Reliant on national policy only; potential loss of open space and green infrastructure.	

Green Infrastructure			
14. Landscape	-	Loss of open space could negatively affect landscape character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	No protection of open space could negatively affect local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource management.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 5, reflecting strong benefits for health and well-being through the protection and provision of open space. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, indicating additional benefits for community safety, social inclusion, energy and climate change, pollution and air quality, flooding and water quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and landscape. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, and 14, indicating potential adverse effects on health, community safety, social inclusion, environmental quality, biodiversity, and landscape where reliance is placed on national policy and the Open Space SPD alone without a detailed local policy framework. Objective 8 was assessed as uncertain due to potential variability in access and connectivity outcomes. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects.

Overall, Option A provides clear benefits through the protection of open space, supporting health, social and environmental objectives, while Option B performs negatively across several key objectives due to the absence of a detailed local policy framework.

6.3 Provision of New Open Space

How to provide new open space, sports and recreational facilities and new provision based on up-to-date assessment.

Reason – to address paragraph 104 of National Planning Policy Framework. Policy 16 of the Aligned Core Strategy refers to increasing the quality of open spaces and increasing the percentage of population with access to Green Infrastructure assets.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy based on existing Local Planning Document Policy LPD 21 to require the provision of 10% open space to serve new residential development.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, infrastructure, innovation or enterprise.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	++	Provision of 10% open space allows flexibility in land use and supports physical activity.	
6. Community Safety	+	Provides diversionary activities.	Ensure design minimise anti-social behaviour.
7. Social Inclusion	++	Improves access to open space and encourages community activities and social interaction.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Provision of open space supports climate change mitigation.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Protection of open space contributes to environmental quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	May include sustainable drainage systems.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-	++	Provides new open space and enhances green infrastructure.	

Green Infrastructure			
14. Landscape	+	Impact depends on policy wording and design quality.	Criteria to ensure fits in with landscape.
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on existing heritage; new open space can reflect local context.	Policies to protect existing heritage.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource management.	

Option B – include a policy (different percentages for different types

Provide different percentages for other types of open space based on local needs e.g. open space, allotments, sport pitches, parks, playing area, landscaping etc.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on qualifications, type of jobs, or land available for development/infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	Not relevant to open space provision.	
5. Health and Well Being	++	Setting percentage could be less flexible but impact unknown.	
6. Community Safety	+	Provides diversionary activity.	Ensure design minimise anti-social behaviour.
7. Social Inclusion	++	Will protect and enhance existing cultural assets. Improve access to and encourage community activities; improve ethnic and intergenerational relations.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	Not relevant; new open space likely greenfield.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Provision of different types of open space helps prevent climate change.	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	May include sustainable drainage systems.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	++	Include provision of new open space; setting percentage could be less flexible but impact unknown.	
14. Landscape	+	Depends on policy wording and design.	Criteria to ensure fits in with landscape.
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on existing heritage; possible benefit of new village greens if reflecting local context.	Policies to protect existing heritage
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	Include provision of new open space; protection aspect protects greenfield from development.	

Option C – no policy (do nothing)

Use Open Space SPD and refer to the Policies Map incorporating Green Infrastructure.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Lack of specific local guidance could reduce opportunities for recreation and wellbeing.	
6. Community Safety	0	Reduced potential for diversionary activity through recreational facilities.	Ensure design minimise anti-social behaviour.
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced opportunities for community facilities, cultural assets and social interaction.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on the use of brownfield land.	

10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No specific contribution from open space towards climate adaptation or mitigation.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on pollution or air quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No specific guidance on incorporating sustainable drainage systems.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Reliant on national policy only; less provision of new open space and green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No specific guidance on landscape integration of new open space.	Criteria to ensure fits in with landscape.
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on existing heritage assets.	Policies to protect existing heritage.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource management.	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 5, 7, and 13, reflecting strong benefits for health and well-being, social inclusion, and biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure through the provision of new open space and recreational facilities. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 6, 10, 11, 12, and 14, indicating additional benefits for community safety, energy and climate change, pollution and air quality, flooding and water management, and landscape character. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting the policy's focused role in delivering open space and green infrastructure.

Option B scored major positives for Objectives 5, 7, and 13, reflecting similar benefits for health, social inclusion, and biodiversity. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 6, 10, 12, and 14, indicating benefits for community safety, energy and climate change, flooding and water management, and landscape. Objective 11 recorded a neutral effect, reflecting some variation in outcomes for pollution and air quality depending on the type of open space provided. Other objectives were neutral, consistent with the targeted focus of the policy.

Option C scored minor negatives for Objectives 5, 7, and 13, indicating potential adverse effects on health, social inclusion, and biodiversity where there is no specific local policy and reliance is placed solely on the Open Space SPD and existing policy maps. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting the limited influence of the policy framework on other sustainability outcomes.

Overall, Option A provides clear benefits for health, social inclusion, and green infrastructure, while Option B delivers similar benefits with flexibility. Option C performs negatively for key social and environmental objectives due to the absence of a dedicated local policy.

6.4 Local Green Space

How to assess, enhance and protect locally significant Green Infrastructure.

Reason – to meet guidance in National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 106 to 108 and Aligned Core Strategy Policy 16. Evidence to the Aligned Core Strategy confirmed the Council's intention to include designation of non strategic sites.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to protect local Green Infrastructure (i.e. non strategic sites) and designate on the Policies Map.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	Unknown impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	Unknown impact on land available for development, infrastructure, innovation or enterprise.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Protecting and enhancing local Green Infrastructure encourages activity and benefits health and wellbeing.	
6. Community Safety	?	Unknown impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Improves satisfaction with community activities and access.	
8. Transport	+	Positive impact on walking and cycling routes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Green Infrastructure can support climate adaptation and mitigation, including urban tree planting and habitat connectivity.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Green Infrastructure provides environmental benefits including air quality improvements.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	Potential for sustainable drainage systems and flood protection; protects areas from development.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	++	Positive impact on Green Infrastructure and biodiversity; protects geological and ecological habitats.	
14. Landscape	++	Enhances visual amenity and landscape character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	Depends on identification of valued landscapes; can provide access to local heritage.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	Protects greenfield land and potentially agricultural land; supports sustainable resource management.	

Option B – do nothing

Aligned Core Strategy protects strategic Green Infrastructure only.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, infrastructure, innovation or enterprise.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Fewer opportunities for recreational use and access to green space could reduce health benefits.	
6. Community Safety	0	No change to crime or community safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced opportunities for community activities and social interaction in local green spaces.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No change.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No change.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No change.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Lack of local designation may limit protection and enhancement of locally significant green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No change.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No change.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No change.	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 13 and 14 and minor positives for Objectives 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15 and 16. These scores reflect benefits for biodiversity, landscape, health, social inclusion, transport connectivity and environmental quality.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 5, 7 and 13, indicating potential loss of protection for health, community access and the natural environment.

Overall, Option A provides wide-ranging social and environmental benefits, while Option B performs negatively for several key objectives.

6.5 Greenwood Community Forest

Consider a policy to support development that aligns with the objectives of the Greenwood Community Forest.

Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 152, which recognises community forests and regional parks as opportunities to improve the environment, enhance landscapes, provide green infrastructure, and support recreation, biodiversity, and sustainable economic and social development. The policy aims to promote woodland creation, green space provision, and sustainable use in line with the missions of Greenwood Community Forest.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to protect local Green Infrastructure and designate on Policies Map.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Supports local tourism and forestry-related economic activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Contributes to sustainable local economic development and green infrastructure investment.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	++	Improves opportunities for recreation and active lifestyles.	
6. Community Safety	+	Accessible green spaces provide diversionary activities and community cohesion.	
7. Social Inclusion	++	Enhances community engagement, recreation, and social interaction.	
8. Transport	0	No direct impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Supports climate adaptation through tree planting and green infrastructure.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on pollution or air quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	Tree and woodland planting can contribute to sustainable drainage and flood mitigation.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	++	Supports woodland creation, habitat enhancement, and green infrastructure provision.	
14. Landscape	++	Enhances landscape character and visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	Supports landscape enhancement and protects cultural heritage.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	Promotes sustainable management of woodland and water resources.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Refer to the National Planning Policy Framework and neighbourhood plans.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No direct impact on tourism or forestry-related economic activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No additional contribution to local economic development or green infrastructure investment.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Fewer opportunities for recreation and access to green space, reducing potential health benefits.	
6. Community Safety	0	Reduced potential for diversionary activities through accessible green space.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced support for community engagement, recreation, and social cohesion.	
8. Transport	0	No direct impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No contribution to climate adaptation via tree planting or green infrastructure.	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on pollution or air quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No guidance on using green infrastructure for flood mitigation.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Limited local control over woodland creation, habitat enhancement, and green infrastructure provision.	
14. Landscape	-	Fewer opportunities to enhance landscape character and visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	Limited enhancement or protection of landscape and cultural heritage.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No additional protection or sustainable management of woodland and water resources.	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 5, 7, 13 and 14 and minor positives for Objectives 2, 3, 6, 10, 12, 15 and 16. This reflects strong benefits for health, social inclusion, biodiversity, landscape, employment and environmental quality.

Option B did not score significant positives or negatives, except minor negatives for Objectives 5, 7, 13 and 14, as reliance on national policy alone would not provide additional local support for these initiatives.

Overall, Option A demonstrates substantial environmental and social benefits, while Option B remains neutral across most objectives.

6.6 Tourist Accommodation

Consider a policy to manage tourist accommodation in Gedling Borough.

Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 88, which supports sustainable rural tourism and leisure development that benefits local communities and businesses, while protecting the character of the countryside and respecting Green Belt policies. The policy ensures tourist accommodation is appropriately located, designed, and does not adversely affect local amenity.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to manage tourist accommodation and ensure it is compatible with local amenity.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Supports local jobs in tourism and hospitality sectors.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Contributes to rural economic growth and business development.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Supports recreation and wellbeing through tourism opportunities.	
6. Community Safety	0	No direct impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Supports local communities through tourism and leisure opportunities.	
8. Transport	?	Impact on transport network depends on location and visitor numbers.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	Design and location criteria help limit impacts on environment and biodiversity.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No direct impact on flood risk; standard planning controls apply.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	Design and location criteria help limit impacts on environment and biodiversity.	
14. Landscape	+	Ensures development is sympathetic to countryside and visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	Ensures accommodation respects the character of the area and design guidance.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No direct impact on water, soil, or air resources; no impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Refer to the National Planning Policy Framework, neighbourhood plans, and other guidance, without a specific local policy on tourist accommodation

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Limited guidance may reduce support for local tourism-related jobs.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Limited guidance may reduce support for rural economic development and tourism growth.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	Fewer planned opportunities for recreation and visitor wellbeing.	
6. Community Safety	0	No direct impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced support for community and visitor activities.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network; may affect rural roads and visitor movements.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No direct impact on flood risk; standard controls apply.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	-	Lack of local designation could result in adverse impacts on local green infrastructure and biodiversity.	
14. Landscape	0	No specific guidance to ensure sympathetic design in the countryside.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	Reduced guidance may lead to development that is less sympathetic to local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No direct impact on water, soil, or air resources; no impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 2, 3, 5 and 7, reflecting benefits for employment, economic activity and health and wellbeing. Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 2, 3, 7 and 13, indicating potential impacts on air quality and biodiversity without the compensating social and economic benefits seen under Option A.

Overall, Option A provides some economic and health benefits, while both options present environmental constraints.

6.7 Equestrian Development

Consider a policy to manage equestrian development in Gedling Borough.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 88, which supports sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit local communities and businesses, while respecting the character of the countryside and Green Belt policies. The policy ensures equestrian development is appropriately located, designed, and does not adversely affect local amenity or biodiversity.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to manage equestrian development and ensure it is compatible with local amenity.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Supports rural businesses and equestrian-related employment opportunities.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Contributes to rural economic development through leisure and tourism.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Provides opportunities for recreation and physical activity through equestrian use.	
6. Community Safety	0	No direct impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Supports community engagement and rural leisure activities.	
8. Transport	?	Impacts on transport network depend on location and visitor numbers.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Protects Local Wildlife Sites and limits adverse impacts on biodiversity.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	Standard planning controls apply; no direct impact on flood risk.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Protects Local Wildlife Sites and limits adverse impacts on biodiversity.	
14. Landscape	+	Maintains openness and character of Green Belt and countryside.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No direct impact on water, soil, or air resources; no impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Refer to the National Planning Policy Framework without a specific local policy on equestrian development.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	Limited guidance could reduce support for equestrian-related jobs.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	Limited guidance may reduce contribution to rural economic development.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Fewer planned opportunities for recreation and physical activity.	
6. Community Safety	0	No direct impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced support for rural leisure activities and community engagement.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network; may affect rural roads.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or efficiency.	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	Potential for adverse impacts on Local Wildlife Sites and biodiversity if uncontrolled.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No direct impact on flood risk; standard controls apply.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	Potential for adverse impacts on Local Wildlife Sites and biodiversity if uncontrolled.	
14. Landscape	0	Risk of inappropriate development affecting Green Belt and countryside character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	Reduced guidance may result in less sympathetic design in rural areas.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No direct impact on water, soil, or air resources; no impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13 and 14 supporting employment, rural economic activity and health and wellbeing.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 5 and 7, indicating potential impacts on health and well-being and social inclusion.

Overall, Option A provides economic and health benefits, while both options raise environmental concerns.

Topic Area 7: Heritage

- 7.1 The Historic Environment
- 7.2 Designated Heritage Assets
- 7.3 Listed Buildings
- 7.4 Conservation Areas
- 7.5 Historic Landscapes, Parks and Gardens
- 7.6 Archaeology
- 7.7 Non-Designated Heritage Assets

7.1: The Historic Environment

Identification of reasonable alternatives

Options	Reasonable Alternative?
Retain the scope of the policy established under existing Policy 11 of the Aligned Core Strategy on historic environment. This policy conserves and enhances historic environment and assets, requiring decisions have regarding to wider social, cultural, economic and environmental objectives. Policy identifies a wide range of historic assets and features which should be conserved and enhanced. It also sets out a number of approaches that assist in the protection and enjoyment of the historic environment.	Yes.
Do not have a policy	No because it is a requirement of the NPPF. Paragraph 20 of the NPPF states that strategic policies should make provision for conservation and enhancement of the built and historic environment.
Retain the scope of policy established under existing Policy 11 of the Aligned Core Strategy and amend policy to recognise the role of heritage led regeneration.	Yes.

7.1 The Historic Environment

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

- A - Retain the scope of the policy established under existing Policy 11 of the Aligned Core Strategy on historic environment. This policy conserves and enhances historic environment and assets, requiring decisions have regarding to wider social, cultural, economic and environmental objectives. Policy identifies a wide range of historic assets and features which should be conserved and enhanced. It also sets out a number of approaches that assist in the protection and enjoyment of the historic environment.
- B - Retain the scope of policy established under existing Policy 11 of the Aligned Core Strategy and amend policy to recognise the role of heritage led regeneration.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	This policy will have no implications for housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	+	Both options would conserve and enhance the historic environment and assets, which could increase the assets contribution towards tourism and increase the employment opportunities generated from this.	The detailed design of future applications should ensure the historic environment is conserved and enhanced.
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	0	Both options will have no impact on economic structure and innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	0	The policy will have no implications for shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	+	Both options would improve and protect heritage assets, including historic parks and gardens, which could improve the quality of existing historic open spaces.	
6. Community Safety	0	0	The policy will have no implications on community safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	+	Option B recognises the role of heritage led regeneration, which can encourage the redevelopment of an area whilst enhancing the existing cultural assets in the plan area.	The detailed design of future applications should ensure the historic environment is conserved and enhanced.
8. Transport	0	0	The policy will have no implications for transport.	
9. Brownfield Land	+	+	Both policy options support the appropriate redevelopment of the historic environment and assets, making efficient use of brownfield land.	The detailed design of future applications should ensure the historic environment is conserved and enhanced.
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	0	The policy will have no implications to energy and climate change.	

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	0	The policy will have no implications on pollution and air quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	0	The policy will have no implications on flooding and water quality.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	+	Both options will improve and protect heritage assets, including historic parks and gardens, improving the quality of existing open spaces and providing opportunities to improve blue-green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	+	+	Both options will conserve and enhance heritage assets, which can strengthen the local landscape character of a settlement. Option B will have no impact on the landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	++	Both Option A and B will conserve and enhance heritage assets, strengthening local character and encouraging enjoyment of the historic environment. This will increase residents' access to heritage assets and improve understanding of heritage within the plan area. Option B will specifically support heritage-led regeneration and can significantly enhance heritage assets at risk.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	0	The policy will have no impact on natural resources and waste management.	

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 7: Heritage 7.1 The Historic Environment	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
A - Retain policy within the Aligned Core Strategies. This policy conserves and enhances historic environment and assets, requiring decisions have regarding to wider social, cultural, economic and environmental objectives. Policy identifies a wide range of historic assets and features which should be conserved and enhanced. It also sets out a number of approaches that assist in the protection and enjoyment of the historic environment.	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0
B - Recognise the role of heritage led regeneration.	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	++	0

Conclusions

The appraisal of the two alternative approaches to historic environment has highlighted the benefits of both options against the objective of the Built and Historic Environment, with Option B scoring a major positive.

The appraisal identified that Option A, which would retain the current policy approach, scored minor positives against six objectives. Option A would have no impact against the remaining objectives. This suggests that if the current policy was adopted, it would have a wide and beneficial impact.

The appraisal identified that Option B, which recognised the role of heritage led regeneration, scored minor positives against six objectives and scored one major positive against the objective of the Built and Historic Environment. It was found that Option B would have no impact against the rest of the objectives.

This suggests that Option A would have a limited, but beneficial impact if included within the policy approach. In conclusion, retaining the current approach whilst recognising the role of heritage led regeneration would comprise a sustainable strategy for the Historic Environment.

7.2 Designated Heritage Assets

How to protect the heritage assets within the Borough.

Reason – recommended by Historic England to provide further local detail to protect designated heritage assets.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to state that development which harms significance will not be acceptable unless robustly justified and to set out how harm will be assessed.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Heritage assets not necessarily cultural assets but could be.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	-	Heritage assets won't improve energy efficiency of buildings.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Reuse of existing heritage assets uses fewer raw materials than building new facilities.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Heritage assets not necessarily environment/Green Infrastructure etc but could be.	
14. Landscape	+	Could include landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	++	Meets the purpose of option.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on National Planning Policy Framework which provides guidance on how to consider the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Potential impact on employment arising from reduced tourist visits.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	-	Possible impact arising from the dereliction of heritage assets.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Possible impact arising from the dereliction of heritage assets.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in Green Infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact to character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Reliant on National Planning Policy Framework.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 15, reflecting strong benefits for the protection and enhancement of the built and historic environment through clearer local guidance on assessing and justifying harm. Minor positives were also recorded

for Objectives 7, 11, 13, and 14, indicating benefits for social inclusion, pollution and air quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and landscape.

However, Option A scored a minor negative for Objective 10, suggesting a potential constraint on energy and climate change outcomes where heritage considerations may limit certain forms of development or adaptation.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 2, 6, 7, and 15, indicating potential adverse effects on employment, community safety, social inclusion, and the built and historic environment where reliance is placed solely on national policy without additional local guidance.

Overall, Option A delivers clear and targeted benefits for heritage protection and related environmental objectives, while Option B performs negatively across several key objectives, demonstrating the value of including a local policy to safeguard designated heritage assets.

7.3 Listed Buildings

How to protect designated heritage assets.

Reason – recommended by Historic England to provide further local detail to protect designated heritage assets.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to state that development which harms significance will not be acceptable unless robustly justified and to set out how harm will be assessed.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Listed buildings not necessarily cultural assets, but could be.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	-	Listed buildings won't improve energy efficiency of buildings.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Reuse of existing listed buildings uses fewer raw materials than building new facilities.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Listed buildings not necessarily environment/Green Infrastructure etc, but could be.	
14. Landscape	+	Could include landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	++	Meets the purpose of option.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs which provides guidance on how to consider the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Potential impact on employment arising from reduced tourist visits.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	-	Possible impact arising from the dereliction of listed buildings.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Possible impact arising from the dereliction of listed buildings.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in Green Infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact to character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Reliant on National Planning Policy Framework.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objective 15, demonstrating strong protection for heritage and townscape character. Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 2, 6, 7 and 15, reflecting reduced certainty of protection without a local policy framework. Overall, Option A provides clearer benefits for heritage objectives.

7.4: Conservation Areas

How to protect the Conservation Areas within the Borough.

Reason – recommended by Historic England to provide further local detail to protect designated heritage assets.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to state that development which harms significance will not be acceptable unless robustly justified and to set out how harm will be assessed.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Conservation areas do not necessarily include cultural assets but could do.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on energy and climate change.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Reuse of existing stock results in the use of fewer raw materials compared with building new facilities.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Conservation areas do not necessarily include environment/Green Infrastructure etc but could do.	
14. Landscape	+	Could include landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	++	Meets the purpose of option.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on National Planning Policy Framework which provides guidance on how to consider the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Potential impact on employment arising from reduced tourist visits.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in Green Infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact to character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Reliant on National Planning Policy Framework.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 15, reflecting strong benefits for the built and historic environment through clear protection of Conservation Areas and guidance on assessing harm. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 7, 11, 13 and 14, indicating additional benefits for social inclusion, pollution and air

quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and landscape character. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting the focused scope of the policy on heritage protection.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 2 and 15, reflecting potential adverse effects on employment and the built and historic environment where reliance is placed solely on national policy without locally specific guidance. All other objectives were neutral.

Overall, Option A provides benefits for the protection of Conservation Areas and associated environmental and social objectives, while Option B performs negatively for heritage and employment outcomes due to the absence of a local policy framework.

7.5: Historic Landscapes, Parks and Gardens

How to protect historic landscapes, parks and gardens.

Reason – recommended by Historic England to provide further local detail to protect historic landscapes, parks and gardens.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to state that development which harms significance will not be acceptable unless robustly justified and to set out how harm will be assessed.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Tourist visits create employment opportunities.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Meets the purpose of option.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Not necessarily cultural assets but could be.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Positive effect through the protection of historic landscapes and green infrastructure.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	The reuse results in the use of fewer raw materials than building new facilities.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Meets the purpose of option.	
14. Landscape	+	Positive effect through the protection and enhancement of historic landscapes, parks and gardens.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	++	Meets the purpose of option.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on National Planning Policy Framework which provides guidance on how to consider the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Potential impact on employment arising from reduced tourist visits.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	-	Possible impact arising from the dereliction of assets.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Possible impact arising from the dereliction of assets.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in Green Infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	-	Negative effect due to insufficient protection of historic landscapes.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Reliant on National Planning Policy Framework.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 15, reflecting strong protection for the built and historic environment. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 2,

5, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 14, indicating additional benefits for health and wellbeing, social inclusion, energy and climate change, pollution and air quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure, and landscape.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 2, 6, 7, 14, and 15, suggesting reduced benefits for employment, community safety, social inclusion, landscape, and the historic environment where no local policy is in place.

Overall, Option A delivers clear heritage and environmental benefits, while Option B performs negatively for key historic and landscape objectives. This demonstrates that including a local policy provides more robust protection for historic landscapes, parks, and gardens.

7.6: Archaeology

How to protect the heritage assets within the Borough.

Reason – recommended by Historic England to provide further local detail to protect designated heritage assets.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to state that development which harms significance will not be acceptable unless robustly justified and to set out how harm will be assessed.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Could potentially create employment opportunities.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Heritage assets not necessarily cultural assets but could be.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on energy and climate change.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No impact on environment, biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No impact on environment, biodiversity and green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	+	Could include landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	++	Meets the purpose of option.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on National Planning Policy Framework which provides guidance on how to consider the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Potential impact on employment arising from reduced tourist visits.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in Green Infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact to character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Reliant on National Planning Policy Framework.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 15, reflecting strong benefits for the protection of built and historic environment assets. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 2, 7 and 14, indicating potential benefits for social inclusion and landscape outcomes through careful management of heritage assets.

Option B scored a minor negative for Objectives 2 and 15, highlighting potential adverse effects on employment opportunities and the built and historic environment where no local policy is in place.

Overall, Option A provides clear protection for heritage and landscape objectives, while Option B performs less positively, demonstrating that including a local archaeology policy offers stronger safeguards for designated heritage assets.

7.7: Non-Designated Heritage Assets

How to identify and protect non-designated heritage assets i.e. a local interest list.

Reason – to allow National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 216 to be addressed with more certainty (as recommended by Historic England). Paragraph 216 states "The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significant of the heritage asset".

Option A – include a policy

Include criteria to identify assets and include policy to assess development against.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs/business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Heritage assets not necessarily cultural assets but could be.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	-	Heritage assets won't improve energy efficiency of buildings.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Reuse of existing heritage assets uses less raw materials than building new facilities.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Heritage assets not necessarily environment/Green Infrastructure etc but could be.	
14. Landscape	+	Could include landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	++	Meets the purpose of option.	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	
--	---	------------------------------	--

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Identify assets on an ad-hoc basis and rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development, economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	-	Possible impact arising from the dereliction of non-designated heritage assets.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Possible impact arising from the dereliction of non-designated heritage assets.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No direct impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in Green Infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact to character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Rely on National Planning Policy Framework.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 15, supporting the protection of locally significant heritage assets. Option A also scored minor positives for Objectives 7, 11, 13 and 14, as well as a minor negative for Objective 10. Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 6, 7 and 15, indicating potential risks to non-designated heritage without specific policy guidance.

Overall, Option A provides clearer benefits for heritage objectives.

Topic Area 8: Design

8.1 Design and Enhancing Local Identity

8.2 Amenity

8.3 Residential Density

8.4 Residential Gardens

8.1 Design and Enhancing Local Identity

Identification of reasonable alternatives

Options	Reasonable Alternative?
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy that requires development to have regard to its local context including landscape and heritage and sets further design requirements through subsequent SPs.	Yes
Do not have a policy	No
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy that requires development to have regard to its local context, including landscape and heritage, and amend it to include a requirement to comply with the design codes provided in the appendices, alongside existing standards, such as: • National Model Design Code • BREEAM standards (2023) • 'Transport for New Homes: Checklist for New Housing Developments (2019) • Habinteg & RIBA / CAE: Inclusive Housing Design Guide (2024) • Design for Homes: Building for a Healthy Life (2020) • RIBA's 'Homes for All Ages' • Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Framework' (2023) • CIRIA 'The SuDS Manual' (2015) • 'Passivhaus Trust UK: Passivhaus Standard' • CPRE's design guides • Habinteg: Lifetime Homes Design Guide' (2011) • Design review panels	Yes

8.1 Design and Enhancing Local Identity

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

A - Retain policy approach that requires development to have regard to its local context including landscape and heritage and sets further design requirements through subsequent Supplementary Plans.

B - Retain policy approach as per the above but that also include a requirement to accord with the design codes provided in the appendices, alongside existing standards, such as:

- National Model Design Code
- BREEAM standards (2023)
- 'Transport for New Homes: Checklist for New Housing Developments (2019)
- Habinteg & RIBA / CAE: Inclusive Housing Design Guide (2024)
- Design for Homes: Building for a Healthy Life (2020)
- RIBA's 'Homes for All Ages'
- Natural England's 'Green Infrastructure Framework' (2023)
- CIRIA 'The SuDS Manual' (2015)
- 'Passivhaus Trust UK: Passivhaus Standard'
- CPRE's design guides
- Habinteg: Lifetime Homes Design Guide' (2011)
- Design review panels

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	The impact of both options (which focuses on landscape, heritage and design) is neutral.	Further strengthen option B by including a requirement to accord with those specific standards and design codes that relate to the provision of a range of housing.
2. Employment and Jobs	0	0	Both options will have a neutral effect on this objective.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	+	Both options would encourage high quality design to encourage graduates to live and work within the plan area.	Strengthen option B by including a requirement to accord with those specific standards and design codes that relate to design of office/employment premises.
4. Shopping Centres	?	?	For both options, high quality design may improve the vitality of shopping centres, but only where new development takes place so the overall impact is uncertain.	Option B could be further strengthened by including a requirement to accord with those specific standards that relate to shopping centres.
5. Health and Well Being	0	0	The impact of both options is neutral.	Strengthen option B by including a requirement to accord with those specific standards and design codes that improve accessibility to health services and accessibility to/provision of recreational facilities/open space.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
6. Community Safety	+	+	The impact of both options is to reduce crime through encouraging good design.	To further strengthen opportunities to improve community safety for option B, include a requirement to accord with those specific standards and design codes that reduce opportunities for crime, such as 'secured by design'
7. Social Inclusion	0	0	Both options will have a neutral effect on this objective.	
8. Transport	0	0	The impact of both options is neutral.	To further strengthen Option B and increase opportunities for making efficient use of existing transport infrastructure, include a requirement to accord with those specific standards that support active travel.
9. Brownfield Land	0	0	The impact of both options is neutral.	To further strengthen Option B and minimise impact on biodiversity, include a requirement to accord with those specific standards that minimise the impact on biodiversity.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	+	The general policy approach covers landscape, heritage and design, which is likely to address energy and climate change. Both options will therefore have a positive impact while Option B performs better as it includes a requirement to accord with existing standards that relate to efficient energy use.	Policies within the Strategic Plan should refer to informal planning guidance as well as SPDs. To further strengthen Option B, include a requirement to accord with those specific standards and design codes that relate to low carbon issues.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	0	The impact of both options is neutral.	To further strengthen Option B, include a requirement to accord with those specific standards that relate to pollution. In particular to encourage on site GI which can help improve air quality by absorbing particulate matter.
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	0	The impact of both options is neutral	To further strengthen Option B, include a requirement to accord with those specific standards that relate to flooding. In particular, responding to the effects of climate change and integrating on-site GI to help attenuate surface water run-off.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	0	The impact of both Options is neutral.	To further strengthen Option B, include a requirement that BGI should be embedded within development requirements. This should optimise opportunities to deliver environmental net-gain, active travel, recreational open space and the other benefits that BGI brings. Priority habitats should be created, connected protected and enhanced to improve the ecological network. Include a requirement to accord with those specific standards that relate to BGI.
14. Landscape	+	+	The general policy approach covers landscape, heritage and design, which is likely to address energy and climate change. Both options will therefore have a positive impact.	Further strengthen Option B by including a requirement to accord with those specific standards that relate to landscape character and protect important views and vistas, to positively impact on visual amenity.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	+	The general policy approach is to improve landscape, heritage and design. Both options will therefore have a positive impact.	Include a requirement to accord with those specific standards that protect and enhance the built and historic environment, in particular to maintain local character and protect the setting of heritage assets.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	0	The impact of option A is neutral.	Option B could be further strengthened by including a requirement to accord with those specific standards that promote the use of sustainable design.

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 8: Design 8.1 Design and Enhancing Local Identity	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
A - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy that requires development to have regard to its local context including landscape and heritage and sets further design requirements through subsequent SPs.	0	0	+	?	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	0
B - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy that requires development to have regard to its local context, including landscape and heritage, and amend it to include a requirement to comply with the design codes provided in the appendices, alongside existing standards.	0	0	+	?	0	+	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	+	+	0

CONCLUSION

The appraisal of alternative approaches to Design and Enhancing Local Identity has highlighted that both options would have a positive impact on many of the objectives that relate to design. Option B provides for reference being included in the policy to existing standards and design codes, and the impact of this on each objective depends on the precise standards referred to. Option B performs better in relation to the energy and climate change objective, as it includes requirements set out in the design codes and existing standards, which provide greater certainty and stronger guidance for development outcomes, low carbon issues and energy efficiency.

8.2 Amenity

Approach to amenity of adjacent properties.

Reason – to provide clarity on amenity and replace Local Planning Document Policy LPD 32 which is often used in determining planning applications. Policy LPD 32 states "Planning permission will be granted for development proposals that do not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents or occupiers, taking into account potential mitigation measures."

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to expand on amenity (not just residential).

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Amenity considerations may restrict the location of some employment-generating development.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Restrictions on development locations may limit flexibility for certain business and economic uses.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Protects wellbeing through consideration of daylight, overshadowing, noise, privacy, outlook and disturbance.	
6. Community Safety	?	Uncertain impact on crime; improved design could indirectly support safer environments.	
7. Social Inclusion	?	Potential to support inclusive environments, though effects are uncertain and dependent on implementation.	
8. Transport	-	May restrict where development can be located due to amenity impacts from transport-related activity (noise, traffic).	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific effect on prioritising brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Potential indirect effects through design and efficiency, but overall impact uncertain.	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to air or water pollution levels.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk or water quality.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure anticipated.	
14. Landscape	0	No direct impact on landscape character or visual amenity at a strategic level.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No direct impact on local character or heritage assets.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or use of natural resources.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

No policy.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	No amenity policy would place fewer restrictions on the location of employment-generating development.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	More flexibility for certain business and economic uses.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Lack of specific amenity guidance could result in variable protection of daylight, noise, privacy and living conditions, with uncertain health outcomes.	
6. Community Safety	?	Uncertain impact on crime; absence of amenity standards may affect perceptions of safety depending on design outcomes.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Potential reduced protection of residential and community	

		amenity may affect quality of environments, but impacts are uncertain.	
8. Transport	0	No impact.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific effect on prioritising brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	No clear influence on renewable energy provision or energy efficiency without local amenity guidance.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to air or water pollution levels.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk or water quality.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure anticipated.	
14. Landscape	0	No strategic impact on landscape character or visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on local character or heritage assets.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or natural resource use.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a minor positive for Objective 5, reflecting benefits for health and well-being through protection of amenity for nearby residents and occupiers. Minor negatives were recorded for Objectives 2, 3 and 8, indicating potential constraints on employment, economic structure and innovation, and transport where the policy may restrict certain forms of development. The remaining objectives recorded neutral or uncertain effects, reflecting the focused scope of the policy on amenity rather than wider social, environmental or economic outcomes.

Option B scored minor positives for Objectives 2 and 3, suggesting potential benefits for employment and economic structure through greater flexibility in development. However, minor negatives were identified for Objectives 5 and 7, reflecting possible adverse impacts on health and well-being and social inclusion where no local guidance on amenity is provided. Other objectives recorded neutral or uncertain.

Overall, Option A provides clear benefits for health and well-being while managing potential adverse impacts on development, whereas Option B performs negatively for health and social inclusion due to the absence of a local policy framework.

8.3 Residential Density

How to guide the density of residential development.

Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 130, which states that “plans should contain policies to optimise the use of land in their area and meet as much of the identified need for housing as possible... which should include the use of minimum density standards”.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to set a requirement for 30 dwellings per hectare with a higher target in areas close to shops and public transport.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	?	Impact on the range and type of housing depends on surrounding density and whether development contrasts with local context.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on the range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or on the type of jobs and qualifications required.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	Uncertain impact on health outcomes, dependent on design quality and access to open space and services.	
6. Community Safety	?	Unknown impact on crime levels; dependent on layout and design of higher density development.	
7. Social Inclusion	?	Potential effects on social interaction and community cohesion are uncertain and dependent on local context and design.	
8. Transport	++	Higher densities close to services and public transport could reduce reliance on private car journeys and support sustainable travel.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific influence on the reuse of brownfield land.	

10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Uncertain impact on renewable energy provision or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or water pollution levels.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Uncertain impact on flood risk and surface water management.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Unknown impact on biodiversity or Green Infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	?	Unknown impact on character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Neutral impact if surrounding density is 30dph. Otherwise negative impact as won't reflect local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	Higher densities help reduce the need for additional greenfield land, supporting more efficient use of land resources.	

Option B – different densities in different areas

Include a policy which sets a different density in different areas to reflect existing density of that area.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	?	The range and type of housing provided would depend on the different densities applied in different areas.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on the range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or on the type of jobs and qualifications required.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	Uncertain impact on health outcomes, dependent on design quality and local accessibility.	
6. Community Safety	?	Unknown impact on crime levels; dependent on layout and design of development.	

7. Social Inclusion	?	Potential effects on social interaction and community cohesion are uncertain and dependent on local context.	
8. Transport	++	Higher densities close to services and public transport could reduce reliance on private car journeys and support sustainable travel.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific influence on the reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Uncertain impact on renewable energy provision or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on water or air pollution levels.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Unknown as impact would depend on the density applied in different locations.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Uncertain impact on biodiversity and green infrastructure provision.	
14. Landscape	?	Uncertain impact on landscape character and visual amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	++	Will reflect local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	Impact would depend on the density applied in different locations.	

Option C – No policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework and determine density on a case by case basis.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Case-by-case decision making allows flexibility and control over residential density.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on the range of jobs or business activity.	

3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or on the type of jobs and qualifications required.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	Impact on health is uncertain and dependent on the location and design of individual sites.	
6. Community Safety	?	Unknown impact on crime levels; dependent on site-specific design and layout.	
7. Social Inclusion	?	Potential effects on social interaction and community cohesion depend on location and development form.	
8. Transport	-	Lack of control over density may result in higher density development in isolated locations.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific influence on the reuse of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Uncertain impact on renewable energy provision or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or water pollution levels.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Impact on flood risk is uncertain and depends on the location of individual sites.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Unknown impact on biodiversity and green infrastructure provision, dependent on site location.	
14. Landscape	?	Impact on character and visual amenity depends on site-specific context and design.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Density does not need to reflect existing density.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Lack of control over density could result in inefficient use of natural resources.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 8, reflecting strong benefits for transport through the promotion of higher residential densities in locations well served by shops and public transport. A minor positive was also recorded for

Objective 16, indicating potential efficiencies in the use of natural resources. However, Option A scored a minor negative for Objective 15, reflecting potential adverse impacts on the built and historic environment. Uncertain effects were recorded for Objectives 1, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13 and 14, reflecting uncertainty around housing delivery, health and wellbeing, community safety, social inclusion, climate change, flood risk, biodiversity and landscape outcomes.

Option B scored major positives for Objective 8 and Objective 15, reflecting benefits for transport as well as stronger alignment with the character of the built and historic environment through a more tailored, area-based approach. Uncertain effects were recorded across Objectives 1, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 16, as outcomes would depend on how density is applied in different locations.

Option C scored a minor positive for Objective 1, reflecting potential benefits for housing delivery. However, it also scored minor negatives for Objectives 8, 15 and 16, indicating potential adverse impacts on transport, the built and historic environment and resource efficiency in the absence of a clear policy framework. Uncertain effects were recorded for Objectives 5–7, 10, 12, 13 and 14.

Overall, Options A and B both perform positively for transport, with Option B also demonstrating clear benefits for the built and historic environment. Option C provides some flexibility for housing delivery but performs less positively for transport and environmental objectives.

8.4 Residential Gardens

How to protect residential gardens from inappropriate development.

Reason – to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 75, which states that local planning authorities should “consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area,” and to address local concerns.

Option A – include a Borough wide policy

Include a policy that sets out that the subdivision/loss of residential gardens for additional dwellings will not be permitted where development does not accord with the policy criteria.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	-	Borough-wide restriction on location of new dwellings may reduce opportunities for new housing and result in retention of unfit homes.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	Unknown impact on land available for development or infrastructure and on innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No change in access to health services or recreational opportunities.	
6. Community Safety	?	Unknown impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	?	Unknown impact on social inclusion and community cohesion.	
8. Transport	-	Limits number of new dwellings in existing built-up areas which could reduce opportunities for development in accessible locations.	
9. Brownfield Land	-	Limits the use of brownfield land for new housing.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Unknown impact on renewable energy generation or energy efficiency.	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	++	Protecting gardens prevents loss of permeable green land and helps reduce pressure on environmental quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	++	Protecting gardens from development reduces surface water runoff and flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity and Blue-Green Infrastructure	++	Protecting all residential gardens supports biodiversity and green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	?	No impact on character and amenity of wider landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	Retains existing local character with no adverse impact on the historic environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	Unknown impact on waste recovery and resource use.	

Option B – include a certain parts of Borough policy

Identify certain parts of the Borough where garden redevelopment is inappropriate (or appropriate).

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	?	Unknown impacts on housing supply and mix.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	Unknown impact on land available for development or infrastructure and on innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	Unknown change in access to health services or recreational open spaces.	
6. Community Safety	?	Unknown impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	?	Unknown impact on social inclusion and community cohesion.	
8. Transport	-	Restricting development in some existing built-up areas	Look at areas that restrict – exclude

		may reduce opportunities for development in accessible locations.	urban areas rear to services.
9. Brownfield Land	?	Unknown impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Unknown impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Allowing development in gardens in some parts of the Borough may have limited environmental effects depending on location and mitigation.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	Allowing development in gardens in some areas could increase surface water runoff, but impacts would be location-specific.	Look at areas with flood risk problem and protect.
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity and Blue-Green Infrastructure	+	Targeted protection supports biodiversity where most valuable, while allowing development in less sensitive areas.	
14. Landscape	?	Unknown impact on character and amenity of landscape depending on areas identified.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	++	Protects gardens only where necessary and may allow development that strengthens local character in appropriate locations.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	Unknown impact on waste recovery and resource use.	

Option C – no policy (do nothing)

No policy.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Positive impact on housing supply or mix.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	Site-by-site basis; unable to make a general assessment of	

		impact on land availability or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Increased pressure on health services or recreational open spaces.	
6. Community Safety	?	Unknown impact on crime; dependent on location and nature of development.	
7. Social Inclusion	?	Unknown impact on social inclusion and community cohesion; depends on site location.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network or modes; dependent on site location and accessibility.	
9. Brownfield Land	+	Potentially good use of brownfield land for new housing.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Unknown impact on renewable energy generation or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Unknown impact on flood risk; dependent on site characteristics.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity and Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Impact depends on location and environmental sensitivity of individual sites.	
14. Landscape	?	Unknown impact on landscape character and amenity; site-specific.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Unknown impact on local character and heritage assets; dependent on site location.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	Unknown impact on waste recovery and resource use.	

Conclusions

Option A, which includes a borough-wide policy to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, scored major positives for Objectives 11, 12, and 13, reflecting strong benefits for pollution and air quality, flood risk and water quality, and

biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure. A minor positive was also recorded for Objective 15, indicating benefits for the built and historic environment. Minor negatives were identified for Objectives 1, 8 and 9, suggesting potential constraints on housing delivery, recreation of brownfield land and transport outcomes.

Option B, which applies the policy to certain parts of the borough, scored minor positives for Objectives 11, 12, and 13 and a major positive for Objective 15, indicating environmental benefits and strong protection of the built and historic environment in targeted areas. A minor negative was also recorded for Objective 8, reflecting similar transport-related constraints.

Option C, which does not include a local policy, scored minor positives for Objectives 1 and 9, indicating benefits for housing and brownfield land use. A minor negative was identified for Objective 5, as garden development would increase pressure on health services and recreational open spaces. The fact that most objectives were assessed as uncertain reflects the lack of local guidance, making outcomes for environmental and social objectives less certain.

Overall, Options A and B perform positively for environmental and heritage objectives, with Option A delivering the strongest benefits for Objectives 11 to 13 across the borough. Option B provides targeted protection for built heritage (Objective 15) but with slightly reduced environmental benefits. Option C delivers uncertain outcomes across most objectives due to the absence of a local policy framework.

Topic Area 9: Housing Mix

9.1 Housing Size, Mix and Choice, and Affordable Housing

9.2 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

9.3 Specialist Accommodation

9.4 Housing Development on Unallocated Sites

9.5 Live Work Units

9.6 Self Build and Custom Homes

9.7 Extensions to Dwellings Not in the Green Belt

9.1 Housing Size, Mix and Choice

Identification of Reasonable Alternatives

Options	Reasonable Alternative?
Mix of sizes and types	
Retain the scope of the policy within the Aligned Core Strategies. Developments should provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes. Consideration should also be given to the needs of elderly residents. The mix of housing should be determined by local evidence, including housing needs assessments.	Yes.
Do not have prescriptive % requirements for open market house sizes and types.	Yes.
Include prescriptive % house size and type requirements for both affordable housing and open market housing.	Yes.
Do not have a policy	No. Paragraph 63 requires the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community to be assessed and reflected in planning policies.
Affordable housing	
Include an overall % target for affordable housing at local authority level.	Yes. Paragraph 64 requires policies to reflect the need for affordable housing.
Set tenure % target for affordable housing in policy at a housing submarket area.	Yes. Paragraph 64 requires policies to reflect the need for affordable housing. Paragraph 63 requires policies to specify the type of affordable housing required.
Standards	
Include a requirement for wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes.	Yes. Paragraph 135 requires policies to ensure developments have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users,

Options	Reasonable Alternative?
	which can be secured using the Government's optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing, where this would address an identified need for such properties.
Do not include policy requirement for wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes, and nationally described space standards.	Yes. The Council should not pursue if there is no evidence to support such a policy approach.
Include policy requirement for nationally described space standards.	Yes. Paragraph 135 requires policies to ensure developments have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, which can be secured through the use of the nationally described space standard, where the need for an internal space standard can be justified.

9.1 Housing Size, Mix and Choice, and Affordable Housing

Mix of sizes and types

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

A - Retain the scope of the policy within the Aligned Core Strategies. Developments should provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes. Consideration should also be given to the needs of elderly residents. The mix of housing should be determined by local evidence, including housing needs assessments.

B - Do not have prescriptive % requirements for open market house sizes and types.

C - Include prescriptive % house size and type requirements for both affordable housing and open market housing.

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	++	?	++	Option A would deliver a wide mix of housing, specifying appropriate housing for specific locations and requiring consideration for the elderly. This increases the range of housing delivered in the plan area and ensures the houses built in the plan area meet the residents' needs, which can all contribute to reducing homelessness. The effects of Option B on housing are unknown. Option C would prescribe requirements which would result in the mix of housing meeting the housing needs of the plan area, ensuring a range of housing is delivered, which can contribute to reducing homelessness.	The detailed design of future planning applications should ensure a range of homes are delivered to meet the housing needs of the plan area.
2. Employment and Jobs	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to employment and jobs.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	?	+	Option A indicates the housing mix which is appropriate for the location, ensuring employees of local businesses can live in a home appropriate for their needs.	The detailed design of future planning applications should ensure a range of homes are delivered to

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
				Option C's prescriptive approach would deliver a range of house sizes and types in the plan area, which would similarly deliver appropriate housing for employees of local businesses in the plan area. The effects of Option B on economic structure and innovation are unknown.	meet the housing needs of the plan area.
4. Shopping Centres	+	?	?	Option A specifies the type of housing appropriate for the centre. Providing the right housing mix will increase the number of residents living in the centre, which can increase footfall, improving the vitality of the centre. The effects of Option B and Option C on shopping centres are unknown.	The detailed design of future planning applications should ensure a range of homes are delivered to meet the housing needs of the plan area.
5. Health and Well Being	+	0	+	The effects of Option B on health and well being are unknown. Option A would deliver a wide mix of housing requiring consideration for the elderly, making a positive effect on their well-being and reducing health inequalities. Option C's prescriptive approach would deliver a range of types in the plan area, similarly meeting the needs of residents with different accessibility requirements.	
6. Community Safety	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications on community safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	?	+	The effects of Option B on social inclusion are unknown. Option A and C, whilst not meeting any of the criteria questions, will impact the overarching objective of social inclusion. Option A would deliver a wide mix of housing, specifying appropriate housing for specific locations and requiring consideration for the elderly. This increases the range of housing delivered in the plan area and	

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
				ensures the houses built in the plan area meet the residents' needs, improving social inclusion and reducing deprivation in the plan area. Option Cs prescriptive approach would deliver a range of house sizes and types in the plan area, similarly, meeting the needs of residents in the plan area, improving social inclusion and reducing deprivation in the plan area.	
8. Transport	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications for transport.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	0	0	The policy will have no implication for brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications on energy and climate change.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to pollution and air quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to pollution and air quality.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to the natural environment, biodiversity, or blue-green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to the landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to the built and historic environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	0	0	The policy has no implications to natural resources and waste management.	

Affordable Housing

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

D - Include an overall % target for affordable housing at local authority level.

E - Set tenure % target for affordable housing in policy at a housing submarket area.

SA objectives	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	++	++	Option D will deliver affordable housing in the plan area, increasing the affordability of housing for all social groups and contributing towards reducing homelessness. Option E will deliver a mix of affordable housing tenures in the plan area, increasing the range of affordable housing for all social groups, which can ensure the homes are fit for the affordable housing need of the residents.	The detailed design of future planning applications should ensure a range of affordable homes are delivered to meet the housing needs of the plan area.
2. Employment and Jobs	0	0	The policy will have no implications for employment and jobs.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	0	Option D will deliver affordable housing within the plan area, which will provide graduates with affordable properties to purchase, enabling them to live and work within the plan area. Option E will deliver a mixed tenure of affordable properties which will provide graduates different types of affordable properties to purchase which suit their situation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	0	The policy will have no implications for shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	?	The effects of all the options on health and wellbeing are unknown.	
6. Community Safety	0	0	The policy will have no implications for community safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	++	++	Whilst the policy options do not directly meet any of the criteria questions, all the options will impact the overarching objective of social inclusion. Option D will deliver affordable housing within the plan area, increasing residents' opportunity to purchase a house, improving social inclusion and reducing deprivation in the plan area.	

SA objectives	D	E	Commentary	Mitigation
			Option E will deliver a mix of affordable housing tenures, providing different routes into home ownership, increasing residents' opportunities to purchase a home, improving social inclusion.	
8. Transport	0	0	The policy will have no implications for transport.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	0	The policy will have no implications to brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	0	The policy will have no implications on energy and climate change.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	0	The policy will have no implications on pollution and air quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	0	The policy will have no implications on flooding and water quality.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	0	The policy will have no implications to the natural environment, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	0	The policy will have no implications on landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	0	The policy will have no implications to the built and historic environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	0	The policy will have no implications to natural resources and waste management.	

Standards

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

F - Include a requirement for wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes.

G - Do not include policy requirement for wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes, and nationally described space standards.

H - Include policy requirement for nationally described space standards.

SA objectives	F	G	H	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	+	0	+	The effects of Option G are unknown on housing. Options F and H would increase the range of housing to meet the varying needs of the people within the plan area.	The detailed design of future planning applications should ensure a range of housing types and sizes are delivered to meet the needs of the plan area.
2. Employment and Jobs	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications for employment and jobs.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications for economic structure and innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications for shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	++	?	+	The effects of Option G are unknown on health and well being. Option F will greatly reduce health inequalities as it will deliver accessible and adaptable homes, increasing the number of homes appropriate for older and disabled people.	The detailed design of future planning applications should ensure a range of housing types and sizes are delivered to meet the needs of the plan area.

SA objectives	F	G	H	Commentary	Mitigation
				Option H will reduce health inequalities as it will require housing to be of a certain size, ensuring appropriate living space for residents.	
6. Community Safety	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications on community safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	++	?	++	The effects on Option G are unknown on social inclusion. Options F and H, whilst not meeting any of the criteria questions, will significantly impact the overarching objective of social inclusion. Option F will greatly improve residents social inclusion by delivering homes that are accessible and adaptable, enabling residents who have a need to live within society in a home that meets their requirement. Option H will greatly improve residents social inclusion by delivering homes of an appropriate size, ensuring houses do not provide cramped living conditions, which can reduce deprivation in the plan area.	
8. Transport	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications for transport.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to energy and climate change.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications on pollution and air quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications on flooding and water quality.	

SA objectives	F	G	H	Commentary	Mitigation
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to the natural environment, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications on landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to the built and historic environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	0	0	The policy will have no implications to natural resources and waste management.	

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 9: Housing Mix 9.1 Housing Size, Mix and Choice, and Affordable Housing	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
Mix of Size and Types																
A - Retain the scope of the policy within the Aligned Core Strategies. Developments should provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes, with two or more-bedroom flats in the centres, innovative family housing on the centre's fringes. Elsewhere there should be a broader mix of housing. Consideration should also be given to the needs of elderly residents. The mix of housing should be determined by local evidence, including housing needs assessments.	++	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B - Do not have prescriptive % requirements for open market house sizes and types.	?	0	?	?	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C - Include prescriptive % house size and type requirements for both affordable housing and open market housing.	++	0	+	?	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Affordable Housing																
D - Include an overall % target for affordable housing at local authority level.	++	0	0	0	?	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Topic Area 9: Housing Mix 9.1 Housing Size, Mix and Choice, and Affordable Housing	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
E - Set tenure % target for affordable housing in policy at a housing submarket area.	++	0	0	0	?	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Standards																
F - Include a requirement for wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes.	+	0	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G - Do not include policy requirement for wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes, and nationally described space standards.	?	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
H - Include policy requirement for nationally described space standards.	+	0	0	0	++	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

CONCLUSION

The appraisal of alternative approaches for Housing Size, Mix and Choice, and Affordable Housing has highlighted the benefits the options will bring to the objectives they affected. None of the options scored a minor or major negative against any objective.

Mix of Size and Types

Regarding Options A-C which dealt with approaches to a Mix of Size and Types, Options A and C scored major positives against the Housing objective, which is to be expected given the nature of the policy. Options A and C also scored a minor positive against objective 3 and 7. Option A scored a minor positive against objective 4. However, the impact of Option C on objective 4 was assessed to be unknown as it is uncertain how Option C would impact shopping centres. The impact of Option B on objective 1, 3, 4 and 7 was assessed to be unknown as it is uncertain how having a prescriptive requirement would impact the objectives. For the remaining objectives, Option B was assessed to have no impact.

Overall, Options A and C perform most positively for housing, with additional benefits for economic structure and social inclusion. Option A provides slightly greater certainty of positive outcomes, including for Objective 4, while Option C introduces some uncertainty. Option B results in uncertain effects across several key objectives and provides no clear additional benefits.

Affordable Housing

Options D-E, which assessed the approaches to Affordable Housing, scored the same across all 16 objectives. The options scored major positives against the Housing and Social Inclusion objectives which is to be expected given the nature of the policy options. The impact of the options against the health and well being objective was assessed to be unknown, as it is uncertain what the impact of the policy options will be. The options did not impact any of the other objectives.

Overall, both options result in similar outcomes across all objectives, with some uncertainty in relation to health and wellbeing, and no clear distinction between them in sustainability terms.

Standards

Options F-H assessed the approaches to Standards. Option G did not consider requirements for wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes, and nationally described space standards. The impact of this option against objectives 1, 5 and 7 was assessed to be unknown since there would be no certainty. For the remaining objectives, option G was assessed to have no impact. Options F and H would include a requirement for wheelchair accessible and adaptable homes and nationally described space standards. Both options scored major positives against objective 7 and minor positives against objective 1 as they would both significantly improve

social inclusion and increase the range of housing provided. Option F scored a minor positive against objective 5 health and well being as it would reduce health inequalities. Option H scored a major positive against objective 5 health and well being as it was assessed to make a significant reduction in health inequalities.

Overall, Options F and H perform most positively, particularly in relation to social inclusion and housing, with Option H providing stronger benefits for health and wellbeing. Option G introduces uncertainty across key objectives due to the absence of specific standards and does not deliver the same level of positive outcomes.

9.2 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Identification of reasonable alternatives

Options	Reasonable Alternative?
Retain the scope of the policy within the Aligned Core Strategies which include pitch requirements that meet identified need, and include a criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications.	Yes
Do not include a policy.	No

9.2 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

- A - Retain the scope of the policy within the Aligned Core Strategies which include pitch requirements that meet identified need and include a criteria-based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications.

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	+	As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it would set a pitch requirement which would meet the needs of gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	As Option A focuses on policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that it would have no implications for the objective given the small scale of the need.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	As Option A focuses on policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that it would have no implications for the objective given the small scale of the need.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	As Option A focuses on policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that it would have no implications for the objective given the small scale of the need.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	It is considered that Option A would have a positive approach.	
6. Community Safety	0	It is considered that given the small scale of need Option A would have no implications for the objective.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it would help to provide for needs of specific groups, increasing opportunities for improving access to community and educational facilities.	

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
8. Transport	?	It is considered there is a small scale of need. As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that the option (which includes any allocations of sites and criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications) has an uncertain effect for the objective.	For Option A (criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications), ensure that new sites are located close to existing transport infrastructure or a new transport network is established to minimise the impact on the environment. Ensure measures to encourage alternative modes of transport are in place and good accessibility to services and facilities.
9. Brownfield Land	?	It is considered that there is a small scale of need. As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that the option (which includes any allocations of sites and criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications) has an uncertain effect for the objective.	For Option A (criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications), prioritise new sites in the urban area and on previously developed land in the Green Belt.
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	The scale of the need is small. As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that the option (which includes any allocations of sites and criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications) has no effect for the objective.	For Option A (criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications), include a criterion relating to energy and climate change in order to reduce energy usage.

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	It is considered that there is a small scale of need. As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that the option (which includes any allocations of sites and criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications) has no effect for the objective.	For Option A (criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications), include a criterion relating to pollution and air quality.
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	It is considered that there is a small scale of need. As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that the option (which includes any allocations of sites and criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications) has an no effect for the objective.	For Option A (criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications), include a criterion relating to flooding and water quality for new sites, in particular to ensure new development is suitable located outside of flood risk areas, conserve water and avoid impact of new development upon water quality.

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	It is considered that there is a small scale of need. As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that the option (which includes any allocations of sites and criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications) has an unknown effect for the objective.	For Option A (criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications), include a criterion to provide the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, protected species and blue-green infrastructure. Need to ensure that increased access to existing open space or blue-green infrastructure does not cause harm to biodiversity if access is greater than the capacity that can be supported without disturbance to wildlife or damage to habitats.
14. Landscape	?	It is considered that there is a small scale of need. As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that the option (which includes any allocations of sites and criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications) has an uncertain effect for the objective.	For Option A (criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications), include a criterion to avoid new sites within sensitive landscape character areas.
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	It is considered that there is a small scale of need. As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that the option (which includes any allocations of sites and criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications) has an uncertain effect for the objective.	For Option A (criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications), include a criterion to protect heritage assets from new sites and include opportunities for enhancement of the historic environment.

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	It is considered that there is a small scale of need. As Option A relates to the policy approach regarding provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, it is considered that the option (which includes any allocations of sites and criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications) has an uncertain effect for the objective.	For Option A (criteria based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications), include a criterion to ensure the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques on new sites and avoid loss of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land to development.

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 9: Housing Mix 9.2 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
	++	0	0	0	+	0	+	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?
Retain the scope of the policy within the Aligned Core Strategies which include pitch requirements that meet identified need and include a criteria-based policy approach for identification of sites through planning applications.																

CONCLUSION

The appraisal of alternative approaches to this Policy has highlighted that Option A has some positive benefits against three of the objectives.

Option A is likely to have a major positive impact on the housing objective. Option A is also likely to have a positive impact on both the health & well bring and social inclusion objectives.

In conclusion, Option A would comprise a sustainable strategy.

9.3 Specialist Accommodation

Whether to guide development of elderly/retirement homes.

Reason – to provide guidance on Aligned Core Strategy Policy 8.3 which states "... consideration should be given to the needs and demands of the elderly as part of overall housing mix, in particular in areas where there is a significant degree of under occupation and an ageing population".

Option A – include a criteria based policy

Include a criteria based policy to encourage elderly/retirement homes.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Increases range of options for an ageing population and rising number of people with dementia.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Creates employment in the care sector.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Potential for innovation in the care sector to meet a rising level of need.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	People in dedicated supported housing likely to have health needs identified quicker.	
6. Community Safety	+	Reduces fear of crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	More range of choices for older people and more opportunities for social activities, reducing loneliness and isolation.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	May have potential for more efficient communal utilities such as combined heat and power, rainwater harvesting and heat recovery.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Use the National Planning Policy Framework on site by site basis.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	Still provides homes for an ageing population.	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	Unknown impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	Unknown impact on qualifications or type of jobs and infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	Unknown impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No positive impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	?	Unknown impact on social.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 10, reflecting benefits for housing delivery, employment, economic activity, health and wellbeing, community safety, social inclusion, and contributions to climate change objectives. These positives arise from the targeted support for elderly and retirement homes, which helps meet local demographic needs.

Option B scored neutral or uncertain outcomes for most objectives. This indicates that relying solely on the National Planning Policy Framework would provide fewer coordinated benefits and leave outcomes dependent on individual site decisions.

Overall, Option A offers social, housing and economic benefits through a structured policy approach, while Option B delivers limited positive effects and greater uncertainty across key objectives.

9.4 Housing Development on Unallocated Sites

Approach to residential development on unallocated sites and conversion/change of use to residential.

Reason – consultation response. There was significant support for continuing with the current approach of permitting residential development on unallocated sites (windfall sites).

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to permit residential development on unallocated sites and conversion/change of use to residential use.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Will provide a range of housing depending on size of sites and buildings.	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site and type of land use.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site and type of land use.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site.	
9. Brownfield Land	?	Site by site impact – depends on location and previous land use.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Depends on proposals.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site and type of land use.	
14. Landscape	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Site by site impact – depends on building or location of site.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Use the National Planning Policy Framework and the Aligned Core Strategy on site by site basis.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	If no policy, then presumption in favour of sustainable development will apply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site and type of land use.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site and type of land use.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site.	
9. Brownfield Land	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site and previous land use.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Depends on proposals.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site and type of land use.	
14. Landscape	?	Site by site impact – depends on location of site.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Site by site impact – depends on building or location of site.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a minor positive for Objective 1, reflecting benefits for housing delivery by providing a clear local policy framework for residential development on unallocated sites. All other objectives for Option A are either uncertain (?) or neutral (0), indicating limited or unclear effects on employment, economy, environment and community outcomes.

Option B scored neutral for Objective 1 and Objective 4, with uncertainty (?) across most other objectives. This suggests that relying solely on national policy and site-by-site decisions would provide less certainty in supporting housing delivery.

Overall, Option A provides some benefit for housing through a local policy approach, while Option B remains largely neutral with uncertainty across most objectives.

9.5 Live Work Units

What approach should be taken on live work units.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 86(e), which states that planning policies should “be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and allow for new and flexible working practices and spaces to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.”

Option A – include a criteria based policy

Include a criteria based policy for live work units.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Increases the range of housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	More space for start-up businesses which would improve diversity of employment.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	May provide type required and space for “high knowledge sector” start-ups; may be attractive to graduates.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	++	Eliminates need for commuting.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	+	Gives more flexibility in re-use of historic buildings.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Use the National Planning Policy Framework on a site by site basis.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No change to current approach.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	Won't discourage space for start-up businesses.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	Won't discourage type required or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in Green Infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on local character or historic environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	-	Reliant on national policy only to manage natural resources and waste.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 8 and minor positives for Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 15, reflecting benefits for housing, employment, economic structure and innovation, transport, and the built and historic environment through the provision of flexible live work units. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting the focused scope of the policy and limited wider environmental or social impacts.

Option B recorded neutral effects for most objectives, reflecting reliance on national policy and site-by-site assessment. A minor negative was recorded for Objective 16, indicating potential adverse effects on natural resources and waste management where no locally specific policy guidance exists to manage potential impacts associated with live work development.

Overall, Option A provides benefits for housing, employment, innovation, transport, and the built and historic environment, while Option B performs negatively for natural resource management due to the absence of a local policy framework.

9.6 Self Build and Custom Homes

What approach should be taken on self build and custom build homes.

Reason – consultation response's preference for the use of the criteria based policy to assess self build and custom build homes.

Option A – include a criteria based policy

Include a criteria based policy for self build and custom build homes.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	Provides individualised homes.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on qualifications, type of jobs or economic structure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	-	Potential for most applications to be in villages, with more car dependency.	Could be addressed by criteria.
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	More incentive to build homes to higher efficiency standards.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact to character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No change to local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	Potential to encourage sustainable design and construction.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Use National Planning Policy Framework on a site by site basis.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No change to current approach.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on qualifications, type of jobs or economic structure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on the use of brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact to character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No change to local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or use of natural resources.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 10 and 16, reflecting potential benefits for energy and climate change and for natural resources and waste management through the promotion of self build and custom build homes that can incorporate sustainable design and resource efficiency. A minor negative was

recorded for Objective 8, reflecting the potential for additional travel demand associated with dispersed self build development. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting the focused nature of the policy.

Option B recorded neutral effects across all objectives, reflecting that a lack of local policy would not provide the required local guidance or criteria to manage self build and custom build homes, leaving outcomes for most sustainability objectives uncertain.

Overall, Option A provides clear benefits for energy efficiency and resource management through locally guided self build and custom build development, while Option B leaves outcomes largely neutral due to the absence of a local policy framework.

9.7 Extensions to Dwellings Not in the Green Belt

Approach to residential extensions in non-Green Belt land.

Reason – there is a need for a policy on extensions outside the Green Belt.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy for residential extensions in the built up area i.e. in non–Green Belt land.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	May restrict range of housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on qualifications, type of jobs or economic structure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No change in access to health services.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land use.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Impact on greenfield land is minimal.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	More control over reduction of soft areas for run off.	Could allow conditions on drainage to be imposed.
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Site by site impact – extending into gardens but less development on Green Belt land.	
14. Landscape	?	Site by site impact – unable to make general assessment.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	++	Allows the Council to manage impacts of extensions on local character.	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	
--	---	------------------------------	--

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Use the National Planning Policy Framework on site by site basis.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Range of housing will be increased if the Council does not have a policy more restrictive than the NPPF.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on qualifications, type of jobs or economic structure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on town or local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No change in access to health services.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Larger extensions could allow multi-generation families to live together and care for older people.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land use.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Negative impact on water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	-	Reducing soft areas for run off and increasing hard surfacing.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Site by site impact – extending into gardens but less development on Green Belt land.	
14. Landscape	?	Site by site impact – unable to make general assessment.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	May lead to loss of control over design and uncontrolled impact on local character.	Need to build in criteria to protect.

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery.	
--	---	------------------------------	--

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 15, reflecting the benefits of a local policy in protecting and enhancing the built and historic environment. Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 11 and 12, indicating more control over potential impacts on air quality and flooding in relation to new extension proposals. Objectives 13 and 14 are uncertain, which reflects limited evidence on potential effects on biodiversity and landscape.

Option B scored minor positives for Objectives 1 and 7, indicating limited benefits for housing delivery and social inclusion. However, Option B scored a minor negative for Objective 15 and similar minor negatives for Objectives 11 and 12, reflecting weaker protection for heritage and environmental safeguards where reliance is placed solely on national guidance. Objectives 13 and 14 remain uncertain.

Overall, Option A provides stronger protection for the built and historic environment but carries minor environmental risks, while Option B supports limited social and housing benefits but provides weaker local safeguards for heritage and environmental objectives.

Topic Area 10: Employment

- 10.1 Employment Provision and Economic Development
- 10.2 Retention of Employment and Employment Uses
- 10.3 Employment Development on Unallocated Sites
- 10.4 Expansion of Existing Employment Uses Not in the Green Belt
- 10.5 Agricultural and Rural Diversification
- 10.6 Local Labour Agreements

10.1 Employment Provision and Economic Development

Identification of reasonable alternatives

Options	Reasonable Alternative (Yes or No)
Do not have a policy	No. Paragraph 20 of the NPPF states that strategic policies should make sufficient provision for employment, retail and other commercial development to support the economic strategy for the area.
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy by providing sites that are attractive to the market in terms of accessibility, environmental quality and size and establish the minimum amount of employment land and office space based on the Employment Land Study 2021 (and 2026 refresh). This includes: • Providing for a range of employment sites • Allocations for new industrial and office floorspace • Economic development as part of sustainable urban extensions	Yes
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy by establishing the minimum amount of employment land and office space required and amend policy to include a criteria-based policy approach for the determination of strategic employment sites for logistics and distribution.	Yes
Office Development	
Retain the existing policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy which focuses office development in the City, and the town and local centres of Arnold and Carlton, and in Sustainable Urban Extensions.	Yes

Options	Reasonable Alternative (Yes or No)
Retain the existing policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy and amend policy to focus office development in Arnold and Carlton only.	Yes
Retain the existing policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy and amend policy to focus office development at Sustainable Urban Extensions only.	Yes
Retain policy approach withing the Aligned Core Strategy which also places emphasis on office development for the science and knowledge-based economy.	Yes
Sites	
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy and amend to refer to the need for a wide range of sites especially for small medium enterprises including start up and incubator space.	Yes
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy which safeguards good quality existing employment sites and releases the sites that do not meet the criteria.	Yes
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy and amend policy to refer to the need to safeguard poor quality employment sites for regeneration purposes.	Yes
Distribution and Logistics	
Retain existing policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy and in terms of strategic logistics uses, identify sites which meet identified need for such uses.	Yes
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy and, in terms of strategic logistics uses, meet <u>none</u> of the need for such uses.	Yes
In addition to addressing need for strategic distribution and logistics uses, make provision for new strategic logistics development in accordance with the wider strategy i.e. based on urban concentration.	Yes
In addition to addressing the <u>need</u> for strategic distribution and logistics uses, make provision for new strategic distribution and logistics development in areas that have good access to road and rail infrastructure.	Yes

10.1 Employment Provision and Economic Development

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

A - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy by providing sites that are attractive to the market in terms of accessibility, environmental quality and size and establish the minimum amount of employment land and office space based on the Employment Land Study 2021 (and 2026 refresh). This includes:

- Providing for a range of employment sites
- Allocations for new industrial and office floorspace
- Economic development as part of sustainable urban extensions

B - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy by establishing the minimum amount of employment land and office space required and amend policy to include a criteria-based policy approach for the determination of strategic employment sites for logistics and distribution.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	Options A and B are neutral as delivering land for employment and offices is unlikely to directly influence the housing stock.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	+	Both options address the strategic distribution of development across the plan area, including employment. Both options will deliver the required employment land. Gedling is unable to meet its own employment need identified in the 2026 ELS Refresh (Option A) and dependent on some of this need being accommodated in the City. Option B includes the criteria for the determination of strategic employment sites for logistics and distribution.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	++	+	Both options perform positively against this objective. Major positive for option A because the preferred approach on employment provision and economic development encourages economic growth and allocate sites across the plan area which would provide land and buildings required by businesses. However, it is unclear for option B whether land and buildings will be of a type required by businesses.	Include policy criteria for option B to ensure the required infrastructure is provided.
4. Shopping Centres	0	0	It is considered that this would have no implications for the objective.	

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
5. Health and Well Being	?	?	Depending on the form and layout of new economic development, it may have some impacts on health and well-being. It is expected that large economic development including sites would provide new open space or enhance the quality of existing open space or blue-green infrastructure which could provide opportunities for recreational physical activity	Ensure that new development does not affect access to health services and provide new open space or enhance the quality of existing open space or blue-green infrastructure. Ensure that increased access to existing open space or blue-green infrastructure does not cause harm to biodiversity if access is greater than the capacity that can be supported without disturbance to wildlife or damage to habitats.
6. Community Safety	0	0	Options A and B are neutral as delivering land for employment and offices is unlikely to directly influence community safety.	Policies should include criteria that ensure safe routes for employees to access new employment provision.
7. Social Inclusion	0	0	It is considered that this would have no implications for the objective.	Ensure that new development does not affect existing cultural assets and facilities or provide opportunities for new assets and facilities.
8. Transport	?	?	Depending on the location of provision, both options have the potential to use and/or develop the transport network to minimise impact on the environment.	Policy should maximise use of existing infrastructure.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
9. Brownfield Land	?	?	Depending on the location of provision, both options have the potential to make efficient use of brownfield land.	Policy and site selection should maximise use of existing brownfield land.
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	?	Depending on the form and layout of new economic development, it may have some impacts on energy and climate change.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan relating to energy and climate change for new development in order to reduce energy usage. Water efficiency measures would need to be incorporated.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	?	Depending on the form and layout of new economic development, it may have some impacts on pollution and air quality.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan relating to pollution and air quality for new development.
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	?	Depending on the form and layout of new economic development, it may have some impacts on flooding and water quality.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan relating to flooding and water quality for new development, in particular to ensure new development is suitably located outside of flood risk areas, conserve water and avoid impact of new development upon water quality.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	?	Depending on the form and layout of new economic development, it may have some impacts on natural environment, biodiversity, blue-green infrastructure.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan to provide the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, protected species and blue-green infrastructure. Need to ensure that increased access to existing open space or blue-green infrastructure does not cause harm to biodiversity if access is greater than the capacity that can be supported without disturbance to wildlife or damage to habitats.
14. Landscape	?	?	Depending on the form and layout of new economic development, it may have some impacts on landscape.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan to ensure new development does not cause harm to landscape character.
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	?	Depending on the form and layout of new economic development, it may have some impacts on built and historic environment. It is recognised that the form and layout or size of economic development could be limited due to heritage assets nearby. There may be opportunities for heritage-led regeneration projects.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan to protect heritage assets from new development and include opportunities for enhancement of the historic environment.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	?	Depending on the form and layout of new economic development which require land release from the greenfield land as not all could be provided on brownfield land.	Ensure the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques in new development and avoid loss of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land to development.

Office development

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

- C - Retain the existing policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy which focuses office development in the City, and Arnold and local centres and in Sustainable Urban Extensions.
- D - Retain the existing policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy and amend policy to focus office development in Arnold and Carlton only.
- E - Retain the existing policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy and amend policy to focus office development at Sustainable Urban Extensions only.
- F - Retain policy approach withing the Aligned Core Strategy which also places emphasis on office development for the science and knowledge-based economy.

SA objectives	C	D	E	F	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	0	0	All options are neutral as delivering land for employment and offices is unlikely to directly influence the housing stock.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	+	+	+	Major positive as all options encourage economic growth and allocate sites across the plan area which would create new jobs, involving the diversity and quality of jobs. All options will deliver the required employment land for office use. Option F specifically seeks to meet the needs of the science and knowledge-based economy.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	+	+	+	Major positive as all options encourage economic growth and allocate sites across the plan area which would create new jobs, involving the diversity and quality of jobs. Option F specifically seeks to meet the needs of the science and knowledge-based economy.	
4. Shopping Centres	+	+	+	?	Options C, D and E will deliver development in sustainable locations including the town and local centres and in SUEs and therefore likely to support the vitality of existing and proposed shopping centres. Option F will have an uncertain impact as the focus is on the type of development delivered rather than the location, so development may not be focused on town and local centres.	

SA objectives	C	D	E	F	Commentary	Mitigation
5. Health and Well Being	?	?	?	?	Depending on the form and layout of new economic development, it may have some impacts on health and well-being. It is expected that large economic development including strategic sites would provide new open space or enhance the quality of existing open space or blue-green infrastructure which could provide opportunities for recreational physical activity.	Ensure that new development does not affect access to health services and provide new open space or enhance the quality of existing open space or blue-green infrastructure. Ensure that increased access to existing open space or blue-green infrastructure does not cause harm to biodiversity if access is greater than the capacity that can be supported without disturbance to wildlife or damage to habitats.
6. Community Safety	0	0	0	0	All options will have a neutral effect on this objective. Policies that manage the design of new development would have a greater impact on achieving this objective.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	0	0	?	For options C, D and E, it is considered that there would have no implications for the objective. Option F will have an uncertain impact as the focus is on the type of development delivered rather than the location.	Strategic policy criteria should include requirements that developments deliver sustainable and prosperous communities.

SA objectives	C	D	E	F	Commentary	Mitigation
8. Transport	+	+	+	?	Options C and D score major positive against this objective as they would utilise existing transport infrastructure within Arnold and local centres. Option E would help develop transport networks in sustainable locations. Option F will have an uncertain impact as the focus is on the type of development delivered rather than the location.	Ensure that new development of a lesser scale is located close to existing transport infrastructure or a new transport network is established to minimise the impact on the environment. Ensure measures to encourage alternative modes of transport are in place and good accessibility to services and facilities.
9. Brownfield Land	+	+	0	?	Options C and D refer to Arnold and local centres which have the potential to make use of brownfield land within the urban area. Options E is likely to result in the use of greenfield land. Option F will have an uncertain impact as the focus is on the type of development delivered rather than the location.	Strategic policies should ensure that impacts on biodiversity interests are minimised.
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	?	?	+	All options relate to the location of development rather than design. Option F relates to meeting the needs of high technology users and is most likely to address the policy criteria.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan relating to energy and climate change for new development in order to reduce energy usage. Water efficiency measures would need to be incorporated.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	?	?	0	Options C, D and E relate to the location rather than the nature of development. Option F relates to meeting the needs of high technology users and is least likely to increase levels of pollution.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan relating to pollution and air quality for new development.

SA objectives	C	D	E	F	Commentary	Mitigation
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	?	?	?	All options will have an uncertain impact on this objective as it will depend on the locations of development.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan relating to flooding and water quality for new development, in particular to ensure new development is suitably located outside of flood risk areas, conserve water and avoid impact of new development upon water quality.
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	?	?	?	Options C, D and E relate to the broad location of new development. Whilst locations within the main built-up area would be less likely to contain woodland or green space, levels of biodiversity could still be high depending on the nature of the site. Development of greenfield sites at sustainable urban extensions could reduce the loss of greenfield land and priority habitats. Option F will also have an uncertain impact as the focus is on the type of development delivered rather than the location.	Strategic policies should embed BGI within development requirements. This should optimise opportunities to deliver environmental net-gain, recreational open space and the other benefits that BGI brings. Priority habitats should be created, connected protected and enhanced to improve the ecological network.

SA objectives	C	D	E	F	Commentary	Mitigation
14. Landscape	?	?	?	?	Options C, D and E relate to the broad location of new development. Whilst locations within the main built-up area would be less likely to impact on landscape character, the impact on visual amenity will depend on the specific site for development. Option F will also have an uncertain impact as the focus is on the type of development delivered rather than the location.	Informed by site appraisals, strategic site policies in the Strategic Plan should promote landscape protection and enhancement. Landscape and visual impacts of development in urban fringe locations could be reduced by integrating it with the existing urban area and by avoiding fringe locations that have sensitive landscape features and/or are valued for their visual amenity.
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	?	?	?	Options C, D and E relate to the broad location of new development. All locations have the potential to impact on townscapes and the setting of settlements depending on the site selected. Option F will also have an uncertain impact as the focus is on the type of development delivered rather than the location.	All options would benefit from strategic policies which address the protection and enhancement of local character, distinctiveness and heritage assets
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	+	?	?	Options C and D would direct development to locations within the main urban area, least likely to comprise the best and most versatile agricultural land and the loss of greenfield land. Option E effects on this objective will depend on the locations of development. Option F will also have an uncertain impact as the focus is on the type of development delivered rather than the location.	All options would benefit from strategic policies which address the use of raw materials, promote sustainable design and construction and the protection of best and most versatile land.

Sites

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

G - Assess policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategies and amend to refer to the need for a wide range of sites especially for small medium enterprises including start up and incubator space.

H - Assess policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategies which safeguards good quality existing employment sites and releases the sites that do not meet the criteria.

I - Assess policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategies and amend policy to refer to the need to safeguard poor quality employment sites for regeneration purposes.

SA objectives	G	H	I	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	0	All options are neutral as delivering land for employment and offices is unlikely to directly influence the housing stock.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	+	+	Option G seeks to improve the diversity and quality of jobs. All options have the potential to reduce unemployment.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	+	?	Option G promotes sites for specific forms of development. Option H safeguards good quality sites that are likely to be attractive to business.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	0	0	It's considered that none of the options would impact on this objective.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan to ensure the vitality of existing centres not affected by new development.

5. Health and Well Being	?	0	0	For option G, depending on the form and layout of new economic development, it may have some impacts on health and well-being. Options H and I are neutral as are unlikely to directly influence health and wellbeing.	In order to improve the spatial strategy's benefits to health and wellbeing, the chose approach should incorporate requirements that development creates, protects and enhances blue and green infrastructure and that health facilities are provided where necessary.
6. Community Safety	0	+	-	Option G will have a neutral effect on this objective. Option H releases poor quality employment sites that may be contributing to an unsafe built environment. Option I specifically safeguards these sites and therefore scores a single negative.	Strategic policy criteria should include criteria that address design and layout, providing safe communities.
7. Social Inclusion	0	0	0	All options are neutral as are unlikely to directly influence social inclusion	Strategic policy criteria should include requirements that developments deliver sustainable and prosperous communities.
8. Transport	0	0	0	All options will have a neutral impact.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	+	+	Option H releases poor quality employment land for other uses. Option I similarly safeguards poor quality employment land for regeneration. Both would have a positive impact on this criteria.	Policy criteria should minimise the impact on biodiversity.
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	0	0	Depending on the nature of new employment provision, it is likely that provision will result in additional energy use. There are opportunities for new provision through Option G to support renewable energy generation.	Policies within the Strategic Plan should improve the energy efficiency of new buildings, and renewable energy generation.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	+	?	Option G promotes start up and incubator space, which is also less likely to increase levels of pollution.	

				Option H releases poor quality employment sites which is likely to improve pollution levels. Option I safeguards these sites for regeneration which would have an uncertain impact.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	?	?	Option G's effects on this objective will depend on the location of development. Options H and I will also have an uncertain impact as it will depend on the location of sites and the nature of their reuse.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	?	?	The effects of Options G, H and I on this objective will depend on the locations of development and the policy criteria.	Strategic policies should embed BGI within development requirements. This should optimize opportunities to deliver environmental net-gain, active travel, recreational open space and the other benefits that BGI brings.
14. Landscape	?	0	0	The impact of Option G is uncertain depending on the sites selected. Poor quality employment sites are more likely to be within the existing built-up area and hence their redevelopment through options H and I would have a neutral impact on landscape.	Informed by site appraisals, strategic site policies in the Strategic Plan should promote landscape protection and enhancement. Landscape protection and enhancement policy criteria should be included in the Strategic Plan. Landscape and visual impacts of development in urban fringe locations could be reduced by integrating it with the existing urban area and by avoiding fringe locations that have sensitive

					landscape features and/or are valued for their visual amenity.
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	?	?	By redeveloping existing sites, options H and I would have an uncertain impact on the built and historic environment, depending on the nature of new development. Option G is also uncertain, depending on the sites selected.	All options would benefit from strategic policies which address the protection and enhancement of local character, distinctiveness and heritage assets
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	+	+	The impact of option G is uncertain depending on the location of sites selected. Options H and I will positively impact on this objective as they reuse employment site for other purposes, thereby protecting BMV and avoiding the loss of greenfield land.	All options would benefit from strategic policies which address the use of raw materials, promote sustainable design and construction and the protection of best and most versatile land.

Distribution and logistics

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

- J - Retain existing policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy and in terms of strategic logistics uses, identify sites which meet identified need for such uses.
- K - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy and, in terms of strategic logistics uses, meet none of the need for such uses.
- L - In addition to addressing need for strategic distribution and logistics uses, make provision for new strategic logistics development in accordance with the wider strategy i.e. based on urban concentration.
- M - In addition to addressing the need for strategic distribution and logistics uses, make provision for new strategic distribution and logistics development in areas that have good access to road and rail infrastructure.

SA objectives	J	K	L	M	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	0	0	All options are neutral as delivering land for employment and offices is unlikely to directly influence the housing stock.	
2. Employment and Jobs	++	++	++	++	All options increase employment opportunities. Options J, L and M also meet the need for strategic distribution and logistics sites.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	++	++	++	++	All options perform positively against this objective. Major positive for options J, L and M because the approach on employment provision and economic development encourages economic growth and allocate strategic sites across the plan area which would provide land and buildings required by businesses. Option K provides for new employment development, just not for	

					strategic logistics uses, so still has a major positive impact.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	0	0	0	It's considered that none of the options would impact on this objective.	A policy would be required in the Gedling Local Development Plan to ensure the vitality of existing centres not affected by new development.
5. Health and Well Being	?	?	?	?	All options deliver new employment development. As such, depending on the form and layout of new economic development, it may have some impacts on health and well-being.	In order to improve the spatial strategy's benefits to health and wellbeing, the chosen approach should incorporate requirements that development creates, protects and enhances blue and green infrastructure and that health facilities are provided where necessary.
6. Community Safety	0	0	0	0	All options will have a neutral effect on this objective.	Strategic policy criteria should include criteria that address design and layout, providing safe communities.
7. Social Inclusion	0	0	0	0	All options are neutral as are unlikely to directly influence social inclusion	Strategic policy criteria should include requirements that developments deliver sustainable and prosperous communities.
8. Transport	?	?	+	++	Neither options J or K refer to location and the impact is therefore uncertain. Both L and M have the opportunity to make efficient use of existing infrastructure in the built-up areas, but the specific reference in option M to infrastructure that is particularly suitable for logistics development results in a higher score.	
9. Brownfield Land	?	?	?	?	Neither options J and K refer to location and the impact on brownfield sites are therefore uncertain. The impact of options L and M depends on the sites selected so will again be uncertain.	

10. Energy and Climate Change	?	?	?	?	Depending on the nature of new employment provision, it is likely that provision will result in additional energy use.	Policies within the Strategic Plan should improve the energy efficiency of new buildings, and renewable energy generation.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	0	-	0	Option K would result in less new development (no strategic logistics) being delivered so the impact would be less. Option L is likely to have the greatest impact on existing areas of congestion and pollution around the city centre.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	?	-	?	Option L is likely to have the greatest impact on existing areas with a higher risk of flooding around the city centre.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	?	?	?	The effect of all four options is uncertain as locations are either unspecified or specific sites are unknown.	Strategic policies should embed BGI within development requirements. This should optimise opportunities to deliver environmental net-gain, active travel, recreational open space and the other benefits that BGI brings.
14. Landscape	?	?	?	?	The effect of all four options is uncertain as locations are either unspecified or specific sites are unknown.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	?	?	?	The effect of all four options is uncertain as locations are either unspecified or specific sites are unknown.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	?	?	?	The effect of all four options is uncertain as locations are either unspecified or specific sites are unknown.	

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF APPRAISALS

Topic Area 10: Employment 10.1 Employment Provision and Economic Development 10.2 Retention of Employment and Employment Uses	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
A – Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy by providing sites that are attractive to the market in terms of accessibility, environmental quality and size and establish the minimum amount of employment land and office space based on the Employment Land Study 2021 (and 2026 refresh). This includes: • Providing for a range of employment sites • Allocations for new industrial and office floorspace • Economic development as part of sustainable urban extensions	0	++	++	0	?	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
B – Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy by establishing the minimum amount of employment land and office space required and amend policy to include a criteria-based policy approach for the determination of strategic employment sites for logistics and distribution.	0	++	+	0	?	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?

Office development																
C - Retain the existing policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy which focuses office development in the City, and the town and local centres of Arnold and Carlton, and in Sustainable Urban Extensions.	0	++	++	++	?	0	0	++	++	?	?	?	?	?	?	+
D - Retain the existing policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy and amend policy to focus office development in Arnold and Carlton only.	0	++	++	++	?	0	0	++	++	?	?	?	?	?	?	+
E - Retain the existing policy approach as set out in the Aligned Core Strategy and amend policy to focus office development at Sustainable Urban Extensions only.	0	++	++	++	?	0	0	+	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
F - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy which also places emphasis on office development for the science and knowledge-based economy.	0	++	++	?	?	0	?	?	?	+	0	?	?	?	?	?
Sites																
G - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy and amend to refer to the need for a wide range of sites especially for small medium enterprises including start up and incubator space.	0	++	++	0	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	?	?	?	?	?
H - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy which safeguards good quality existing employment sites and	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	++	0	+	?	?	0	?	++

releases the sites that do not meet the criteria.																
I - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy and amend policy to refer to the need to safeguard poor quality employment sites for regeneration purposes.	0	+	?	0	0	-	0	0	++	0	?	?	?	0	?	++
Distribution and Logistics																
J - Retain existing policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy and in terms of strategic logistics uses, identify sites which meet identified need for such uses.	0	++	++	0	?	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
K - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategy and, in terms of strategic logistics uses, meet none of the need for such uses.	0	++	++	0	?	0	0	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	?
L - In addition to addressing need for strategic distribution and logistics uses, make provision for new strategic logistics development in accordance with the wider strategy i.e. based on urban concentration.	0	++	++	0	?	0	0	+	?	?	-	-	?	?	?	?
M - In addition to addressing the need for strategic distribution and logistics uses, make provision for new strategic distribution and logistics development in	0	++	++	0	?	0	0	++	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	?

areas that have good access to road and rail infrastructure.																
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

CONCLUSIONS

The appraisal of alternative approaches to Employment has highlighted that all options would have a positive impact on several of the objectives, particularly those that related to employment land. Due to the uncertainty around sites, a criteria based approach to delivering strategic warehousing and logistics scores less well than the identification of sites but this could be addressed by appropriate mitigation, namely setting clear criteria that minimise negative impacts.

All options relating to new office development score well, particularly those that focus new development in the City, and the local centres including Arnold and Carlton, and in SUEs. Mitigation should be put in place to address potential flooding issues.

In terms of the three options that refer to sites, the assessment indicates that all options would have a generally positive impact. Promoting sites scores particularly well, given the nature of those sites, when compared to a more general option of promoting a wide range of sites for small and medium enterprises. Retaining poor quality employment sites scores less well than redeveloping these sites, particularly in terms of the impact on community safety and air quality.

In relation to distribution and logistics, both options are scored the same. However, option L, meeting all identified need for logistics, would have greater positive impact on the delivery employment land. In terms of where logistics development is located, whilst both options N and O have the potential to locate new development in areas served by existing infrastructure option O would better meet the needs of logistics development by potentially being located away from the city centre (minimising impact on pollution and flood risk) and benefitting from good access to the road and rail network.

10.2 Retention of Employment and Employment Uses

Consider a policy to retain employment uses, particularly in accessible and deprived areas, where specific criteria are met.

Reason - to provide guidance in line with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Aligned Core Strategy, which seek to support sustainable economic growth, protect existing employment land, safeguard jobs while allowing flexibility for alternative uses where sites are no longer viable, and ensure a sufficient range and choice of sites for business development.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to support employment development on suitable unallocated sites, subject to criteria.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	++	Strong protection of employment land supports job retention and growth.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	++	Maintains a range and choice of employment sites and supports business needs and economic resilience.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town centres; retail uses controlled through sequential approach.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health outcomes.	
6. Community Safety	0	No direct impact on crime or safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Supports access to local employment opportunities, including for less skilled workers.	
8. Transport	+	Retention of employment sites can reduce commuting distances and support sustainable travel patterns.	
9. Brownfield Land	+	Encourages reuse and continued use of existing employment sites and premises.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact, although reuse of existing sites may reduce need for new development.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	Potential impacts managed through criteria and existing regulations.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No direct impact on flood risk.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact; development largely within existing employment areas.	
14. Landscape	0	Employment areas generally located within or around urban areas with limited landscape impact.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	Potential impacts managed through criteria requiring protection of heritage assets.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No direct impact on resource use or waste management.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework without a specific local policy to retain employment land and premises.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Increased risk of loss of employment land leading to reduced job opportunities.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Potential erosion of employment land supply may weaken economic diversity and resilience.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health outcomes.	
6. Community Safety	0	No change.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced access to local employment opportunities, particularly for lower-skilled workers.	
8. Transport	0	No clear impact; potential for increased commuting if employment land is lost.	
9. Brownfield Land	-	Greater risk of loss of existing employment sites to alternative uses.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	Less support for efficient use of existing sites.	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact.	
14. Landscape	0	No direct impact.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No direct impact.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No direct impact.	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 2 and 3, reflecting strong benefits for employment, job retention and economic resilience through the protection of employment land and provision of a range of sites for business development. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 7, 8 and 9, indicating benefits for social inclusion, sustainable travel patterns and the reuse of existing employment sites.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 2 and 3, reflecting the risk of loss of employment land and a reduction in economic diversity and resilience where no local policy is in place. Further minor negatives were identified for Objectives 7 and 9, indicating reduced access to local employment opportunities and an increased risk of losing brownfield employment sites to alternative uses.

Both options scored neutral across the remaining objectives, indicating no significant effects in relation to environmental, health or heritage considerations.

Overall, Option A demonstrates clear economic and social benefits through the retention of employment uses, while Option B presents disadvantages in terms of job provision, economic resilience and the protection of existing employment land.

10.3 Employment Development on Unallocated Sites

Consider a policy to allow employment development on unallocated sites where specific criteria are met.

Reason – to provide guidance in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to support sustainable economic growth, encourage entrepreneurship and allow flexibility for business development, while ensuring that development does not adversely affect amenity, highway safety or the Green Belt.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to support employment development on suitable unallocated sites, subject to criteria.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	++	Provides opportunities for business growth and jobs	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Strengthens and diversifies the local economy; supports start-ups and small businesses	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health	
6. Community Safety	0	No direct impact on crime	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Supports local employment opportunities	
8. Transport	0	Highway impacts managed through criteria	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or climate change	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on pollution or air quality	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	0	Limited impact due to locational controls	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No direct impact on heritage or design	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No direct impact on resource use or waste recovery	
--	---	--	--

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on allocated employment sites and general national policy, without allowing employment development on unallocated sites.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No impact on housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Reduced flexibility for employment provision	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Greater reliance on allocated sites only; fewer opportunities for start-ups and small businesses	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No change	
6. Community Safety	0	No change	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No change	
8. Transport	0	No change	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific encouragement of brownfield land for employment uses	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No change	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No change	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact	
14. Landscape	0	No change	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No change	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No change	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 2 and a minor positive for Objectives 3 and 7, reflecting clear benefits for employment growth, economic innovation and social inclusion through the provision of additional business opportunities on suitable unallocated sites. No notable negatives were recorded, indicating that the policy could deliver these benefits without significant adverse impacts on other objectives.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 2 and 3, reflecting the potential limitation on local employment and economic development opportunities if unallocated sites are not made available. All other objectives scored neutral, suggesting that reliance on national policy and allocated sites would avoid environmental or social impacts but would not actively support additional economic growth.

Overall, Option A provides stronger economic and social benefits through increased local employment and innovation opportunities, whereas Option B limits these benefits by relying solely on existing allocations and national guidance.

10.4 Expansion of Existing Employment Uses Not in the Green Belt

Consider whether to make specific provision for non-business class sectors including on existing employment areas.

Reason - to meet the requirement of paragraphs 85 to 86 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which state that “planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt” and that policies should “set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth”.

Option A – continue with current policy

Retain Local Planning Document Policy LPD 46 which allows for expansion, conversion or redevelopment of existing employment areas for employment uses (other than main town centre uses).

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	Relates to employment areas only; no increase in housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	++	Improves diversity and quality of jobs	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	++	Provides land and buildings required by businesses; new offices may encourage graduates to live and work locally	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion	
8. Transport	?	Depends on proposals; may generate additional vehicle trips for office or business development	
9. Brownfield Land	0	Employment areas are within urban areas and are all brownfield; no loss of biodiversity or green infrastructure	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Depends on proposals	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution	

12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Depends on location; e.g., Colwick Industrial Estate is prone to flooding	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	Employment areas are brownfield; no direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	0	Within urban areas; no impact on character or amenity	
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Depends on location; some sites have Listed Buildings, impact depends on scale/type of proposals	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	

Option B – continue with current policy but include other non-employment uses

Amend Policy 46 of the Local Planning Document to include other non-employment uses including industrial or commercial training facilities; community facilities; specialised leisure uses which cannot be accommodated in centres because of their scale and/or operational impacts; essential public utilities development; and ancillary facilities and services which support the functioning of the site including child care facilities, for example nurseries.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	Relates to employment areas only; no increase in housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	++	Improves diversity and quality of jobs	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	++	Provides land and buildings required by businesses; may include training facilities encouraging graduates to live and work locally	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres	
5. Health and Well Being	++	Depends on proposals; could involve health or physical activity related uses	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime	

7. Social Inclusion	++	Depends on proposals; could involve new community-related uses	
8. Transport	?	Depends on proposals; may generate additional vehicle trips (e.g., nurseries, leisure uses)	
9. Brownfield Land	0	Employment areas are brownfield; no loss of biodiversity or green infrastructure	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Depends on proposals	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Depends on location; e.g., Colwick Industrial Estate is prone to flooding	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	Employment areas are brownfield; no direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	0	Within urban areas; no impact on character or amenity	
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Depends on location; some sites have Listed Buildings, impact depends on type of proposals	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	

Option C – include a criteria based policy

Include a criteria based policy to judge non business class on merit.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	Relates to employment areas only; no increase in housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	++	Improves diversity and quality of jobs	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Depends on criteria; could include new industrial or commercial training facilities, encouraging graduates to live and work locally	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres	

5. Health and Well Being	+	Depends on criteria; could involve health or physical activity related uses	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Depends on criteria; could involve new community-related uses	
8. Transport	?	Depends on criteria; may generate additional vehicle trips for certain non-business uses	
9. Brownfield Land	0	Employment areas are brownfield; no loss of biodiversity or green infrastructure	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Depends on proposals	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Depends on location; e.g., Colwick Industrial Estate is prone to flooding	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	Employment areas are brownfield; no direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	0	Within urban areas; no impact on character or amenity	
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Depends on location; some sites have Listed Buildings, impact depends on type of proposals	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 2 and 3, reflecting strong support for employment growth and economic innovation through the expansion and redevelopment of existing employment areas. All other objectives scored neutral or uncertain, indicating minimal environmental or social impacts.

Option B also scored major positives for Objectives 2 and 3, while additionally achieving minor positives for Objectives 5 and 7, reflecting benefits for health, wellbeing and social inclusion arising from the inclusion of community facilities, training uses, and other non-employment activities. However, other objectives remained neutral or uncertain, suggesting that environmental impacts are largely unchanged compared to Option A.

Option C scored a major positive for Objective 2 and minor positives for Objectives 3, 5 and 7, reflecting more flexible economic and social benefits when assessing non-business class uses on a criteria-based approach. Other objectives were neutral or uncertain, indicating limited environmental impacts.

Overall, all three options support economic growth (Objective 2) and innovation (Objective 3). Option B and C provide additional minor benefits for social inclusion and health (Objectives 5 and 7) compared to Option A, while no option raises significant negative effects on environmental objectives.

10.5 Agricultural and Rural Diversification

Consider the approach for a specific policy on agricultural and other land based rural businesses.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 88, which states that planning policies and decisions should enable “the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed, new buildings” and the “development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses”.

Option A – include a policy

Retain Local Planning Document Policy LPD 47 to support agricultural and other rural land based diversification.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	++	Promotes agricultural businesses and diversification; improves diversity and quality of jobs	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	++	Supports land and buildings required by rural businesses; generates training and encourages staff to live/work locally	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct impact on social inclusion	
8. Transport	?	Depends on proposals; isolated locations could increase car use	
9. Brownfield Land	?	Depends on proposals; new buildings may involve greenfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on energy or renewable energy	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	Depends on proposals; new buildings may have minor impacts	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Depends on location/proposals; new buildings could affect flood risk	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Depends on proposals; new buildings may impact biodiversity or green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	?	Depends on location/proposals; converted or new buildings could affect landscape character	
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Depends on location/proposals; may affect heritage or local character	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Depends on proposals; may improve diversity and quality of jobs	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Depends on proposals; could involve new jobs with farm or tourism skills, encouraging staff to live/work locally	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct impact on social inclusion	
8. Transport	?	Depends on proposals; new businesses in isolated locations may require more car use	
9. Brownfield Land	?	Depends on proposals; new buildings may involve greenfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	Depends on proposals; new buildings may have minor impacts	

12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	Depends on location/proposals; new buildings could affect flood risk	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Depends on proposals; new buildings may impact biodiversity or green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	?	Depends on location/proposals; converted or new buildings could affect landscape character	
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Depends on location/proposals; may affect heritage or local character	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 2 and 3, reflecting strong support for employment, economic growth and the diversification of rural land-based businesses. These benefits arise from a locally tailored policy that encourages both conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new development in rural areas.

Option A scored neutral for Objectives 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 16, indicating no significant effects on housing, shopping, health, community safety, social inclusion, energy or resource management. Several objectives, including 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15, were uncertain due to site-specific factors and potential local environmental or transport impacts.

Option B scored minor positives for Objectives 2 and 3, reflecting some support for rural economic activity under national guidance, but less strongly than a dedicated local policy. Option B also scored neutral or uncertain across the remaining objectives, indicating limited influence on housing, social, environmental and transport considerations.

Overall, Option A provides stronger benefits for rural employment and economic development through a local policy, while Option B offers more limited advantages under national policy alone, with similar uncertainties for other objectives.

10.6 Local Labour Agreements

Consider the approach to secure local labour agreements.

Reason – part of Gedling Borough Council's Economic Development priority.

Option A – include a policy

Retain Local Planning Document Policy LPD 48 to secure local labour agreements through S106 planning obligations on new employment developments.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply as this relates to new employment development	
2. Employment and Jobs	++	Creates new jobs for local people	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	++	Generates training and jobs with specific skills; supports people working locally	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct impact on social inclusion	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on reuse of brownfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage or built environment	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	
--	---	---	--

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on National Policy.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply as this relates to new employment development	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Depends on proposals; may create new jobs for local people	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Depends on proposals; may generate training or jobs with specific skills, supporting local employment	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on town or local centres	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No direct impact on social inclusion	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on reuse of brownfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct change to water or air pollution	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage or built environment	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	

Conclusions

Option A scored major positives for Objectives 2 and 3, reflecting that a local policy would actively support employment opportunities and strengthen economic growth through secured local labour agreements. No other objectives were affected, indicating a focused benefit on economic outcomes without environmental or social trade-offs.

Option B scored minor positives for Objectives 2 and 3, showing that reliance on national or existing strategic policy would still support employment and economic development, but less strongly than a dedicated local policy. All other objectives scored neutral, indicating no wider impacts.

Overall, Option A provides stronger benefits for economic and employment objectives, while Option B achieves similar outcomes but at a reduced level of impact.

Topic Area 11: Retail and Community Facilities

- 11.1 Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Boundaries
- 11.2 Development within Town and Local Centres
- 11.3 Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles
- 11.4 Upper Floors
- 11.5 Impact Assessment Threshold
- 11.6 Development within Small Parades
- 11.7 Shopfront Development

11.1 Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Boundaries

Identification of Reasonable Alternatives

Options	Is it a realistic alternative?
Amend the existing policy to allow for greater flexibility in uses, encouraging a mix of non-retail uses.	Yes
Retain the scope of the policy established in the Aligned Core Strategies and review whether out of town retail parks should be included in the retail network and hierarchy.	No. Paragraph 90 of the NPPF requires planning policies to support the role that town centres play at the heart of local communities and to take a positive approach to their growth, management and adaptation.
Do not have a policy.	No. Paragraph 91 of the NPPF requires planning policies to define a network and hierarchy of town centres and promote their long-term vitality and viability. Retaining the previous policy approach without updating it would not ensure the hierarchy reflects current circumstances.
Do include a policy which states that Centres should only focus on shopping/retail uses.	No. Paragraph 90 of the NPPF recognises that a diverse range of uses supports their vitality and viability. Restricting centres only to retail uses would not reflect this approach.

11.1 Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Boundaries

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

A - Amend the existing policy to allow for greater flexibility in uses, encouraging a mix of non-retail uses.

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	+	There is more potential for housing if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	There is more potential for employment if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	There is more potential for employment if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	
4. Shopping Centres	++	There is more potential for vibrancy and vitality if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	
5. Health and Well Being	+	There is more potential for health uses if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime or safety	
7. Social Inclusion	+	There is more potential for social inclusion if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	
8. Transport	+	There is more potential for linked trips and reduced use of the car if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	
9. Brownfield Land	+	There is more potential for reuse of brownfield land if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	There is more potential for linked trips and reduced use of the car if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	There is more potential for linked trips and reduced use of the car if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk or water quality	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity	
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	There is more potential for reuse of buildings if a greater diversity of uses is encouraged	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0		

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 11: Retail and Community Facilities 11.1 Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Boundaries	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
Amend the existing policy to allow for greater flexibility in uses, encouraging a mix of non-retail uses	+	+	+	++	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0

Conclusions

Allowing for greater flexibility in uses, encouraging a mix of non-retail uses will increase diversity. This will also improve the vitality and viability of the centres.

A broader mix is likely to increase the potential for more housing and jobs.

Greater diversity is likely to increase linked trips and reduce the use of the car.

11.2 Development within Town and Local Centres

Consider a policy to manage development within Town and Local Centres to protect their vitality, viability and character.

Reason – to provide guidance in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to support the vitality and viability of town centres, promote a diverse range of uses, maintain active frontages and ensure development supports sustainable patterns of growth.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to manage development within Town and Local Centres, ensuring it supports vitality, footfall, design quality and amenity.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Supports retail, service and leisure employment	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Strengthens town centre economic function	
4. Shopping Centres	++	Protects vitality and viability, promotes diverse uses, maintains active frontages	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Accessible centres support walking and access to services	
6. Community Safety	+	Active frontages and evening uses improve natural surveillance	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Supports diverse uses and community activity	
8. Transport	+	Centres are accessible by public transport and active travel	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Supports sustainable locations and reduced car reliance	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	0	No direct impact on wider landscape	
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	Protects character and promotes high-quality design	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Refer to the National Planning Policy Framework and other policies, without a specific local policy for Town and Local Centres.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Increased risk to retail vitality and employment within town and local centres.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Potential weakening of town and local centre economic role and function.	
4. Shopping Centres	-	Reduced ability to protect vitality and viability or manage mix of uses and active frontages.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Reduced opportunity to promote accessible centres that support walking and access to services.	
6. Community Safety	0	No change.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced support for diverse community uses.	
8. Transport	0	No change in accessibility or travel patterns.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	Less support for sustainable development patterns and reduced car reliance.	

11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No change to landscape character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Increased risk of inappropriate design and loss of character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 4, reflecting strong support for the vitality and functionality of town and local centres. Option A also scored minor positives for Objectives 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 15, indicating benefits for employment, economic activity, health, community safety, social inclusion, transport, climate change mitigation and the built environment.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 15, reflecting reduced support for employment, economic activity, shopping centres and built environment quality when relying solely on national policy. Most other objectives were neutral under Option B.

Overall, Option A provides a comprehensive range of social, economic and environmental benefits through proactive local policy, while Option B presents some disadvantages for key economic and town centre objectives.

11.3 Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles

Identification Of Reasonable Alternatives

Options	Is it a realistic alternative?
Retain policy approach within Aligned Core Strategies that seeks to support new or extended community facilities and sets out location criteria.	Yes
Do not have a policy	No - Paragraph 88 of the NPPF states that planning policies should enable the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities and paragraph 96 refers to planning policies supporting healthy lifestyles, for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities and local shops.
Retain policy approach within Aligned Core Strategies but include more extensive policy in relation to 'Healthy Lifestyles'.	Yes
Retain policy approach within Aligned Core Strategies but make the policy more restrictive in relation to the loss of community facilities.	Yes

11.3 Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES FOR APPRAISAL:

A - Retain policy approach within Aligned Core Strategies that seeks to support new or extended community facilities and sets out location criteria.

B - Retain policy approach within Aligned Core Strategies but include more extensive policy in relation to 'Healthy Lifestyles'.

C - Retain policy approach within Aligned Core Strategies but make the policy more restrictive in relation to the loss of community facilities.

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	0	It is considered that the options would have no implications for the objective.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	+	+	It is considered that all options are minor positives as they will either protect or support existing facilities which provide jobs. For option B, it is uncertain what additional impact may result from having a more extensive focus on healthy lifestyles.	Support proposals which protect or propose additional jobs and employment opportunities.
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	+	+	All options would either support new and extended facilities or protect existing facilities which is a minor positive as it would support the provision of buildings required by these facilities. For option B, it is uncertain what additional impact may result from having a more extensive focus on healthy lifestyles.	
4. Shopping Centres	++	++	++	Existing policy states all community facilities should be located within city centre, town centres or other centres. All options are considered to have a major positive impact as they would support community facilities in these locations.	

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
5. Health and Well Being	+	++	+	All options would have at least a minor positive impact upon this objective, although option B would potentially have a major positive impact upon the objective, through the focus on 'healthy lifestyles'.	For all options, opportunities to promote the enhancement of health services, recreational activities and access to open space should be encouraged.
6. Community Safety	?	?	?	The impact on community safety is considered to be uncertain for all options although community facilities can help to contribute to a secure built environment depending on the type of facility.	Ensure that new or extended facilities consider crime in their design.
7. Social Inclusion	++	++	++	All options would be likely to have a major positive impact upon the objective as existing cultural assets including community facilities would be likely to be protected and enhanced.	
8. Transport	++	++	++	Existing policy states all community facilities should be located within city centre, town centres or other centres and be in locations accessible by a range of sustainable transport modes suitable to the scale and function of the facility and be located alongside or shared with other local community facilities. Options A and C would increase or protect access to local facilities and therefore reduce the need to travel, including by private car. For option B, it is likely that a focus on healthy lifestyles may also include reducing the need to travel by car.	Seek to ensure that facilities can be accessible by alternative (non-private car) modes of transport, particularly active travel measures which may have additional health benefits.
9. Brownfield Land	?	?	?	It is considered that the options would have an unknown impact upon the objective. All options may focus community facilities on existing sites but this may impact the location of other uses (e.g. housing).	Support existing and new facilities which maximise the use of brownfield land.
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	?	+	It is considered that Options A and B would have an unknown impact upon the objective as it depends on the type and location of any new or extended facilities. Option C would seek to retain existing facilities and buildings which would reduce energy use associated with the construction of new buildings.	Need a policy relating to energy and climate change for new development in order to reduce energy usage. Support on-site renewable energy generation where appropriate.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	+	+	Existing policy states all community facilities should be located within city centre, town centres or other centres and be in locations accessible by a	Need to consider air quality in relation to healthy lifestyles.

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
				range of sustainable transport modes suitable to the scale and function of the facility and be located alongside or shared with other local community facilities. All options would be likely to have a positive impact upon the objective as the protection and enhancement of community facilities would reduce the need to travel, thereby contributing to reduction in many types of pollution. For Option B, a focus on health is also likely to include consideration of air quality.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	?	?	?	It is considered that all options would have an unknown impact upon the objective.	Need a policy relating to flooding and water quality for new development, in particular to ensure new development is suitably located outside of flood risk areas, conserves water and avoids impact of new development upon water quality.
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	?	0	It is considered that option C would have no implications for the objective. Option B may encourage and improve the blue-green infrastructure network through enhancing accessibility. Option A may have an impact on the natural environment depending on the type and location of any new or extended facilities.	For all options, need to ensure that increased access to existing open space or blue-green infrastructure does not cause harm to biodiversity if access is greater than the capacity that can be supported without disturbance to wildlife or damage to habitats.
14. Landscape	?	?	0	For Options A and B, it is considered the impact is uncertain as it depends on the type and location of any extended or new facilities.	Ensure new or extended facilities consider landscape and visual amenity.
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	+	+	All options would be likely to have a positive impact upon the objective through the protection and enhancement of any local heritage assets and facilities to help people access and understand local heritage and to participate in cultural activities.	Policy to include opportunities for enhancement of the historic environment.

SA objectives	A	B	C	Commentary	Mitigation
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	?	?	It is considered that all options would have an unknown impact upon the objective. Option C, which protects existing facilities, may reduce the impact on the consumption of raw materials and waste resulting from having to build replacement facilities. For Options A and B, new and extended facilities may have an impact on natural resources depending on their type and location.	Ensure that new or extended facilities use sustainable design, materials and construction techniques.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Topic Area 11: Retail and Community Facilities 11.3 Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
Option A – Retain existing ACS approach	0	+	+	++	+	?	++	++	?	?	+	?	?	?	+	?
Option B – Include more extensive policy in relation to Healthy Lifestyles	0	+	+	++	++	?	++	++	?	?	+	?	?	?	+	?
Option C – Make policy more restrictive in relation to loss of community facilities	0	+	+	++	+	?	++	++	?	+	+	?	0	0	+	?

CONCLUSION

The appraisal of alternative approaches for Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles has highlighted that all of the options have a number of positive impacts, with no negative impacts being identified.

All options had a neutral impact on Objective 1 and a minor positive impact in relation to Objectives 2 and 3, with the potential to either protect or create jobs being highlighted.

All options had a major positive in relation to Objective 4 as the protection or enhancement of community facilities will help to protect the vitality and viability of shopping centres.

For Objective 5, the focus of Option B on healthy lifestyles was considered to be a major positive, with Options A and C scoring minor positives. All options had a major positive for Objective 7, with the importance of local services for social cohesion being highlighted.

For Objective 8, all options scored a major positive with references made to the location of services within existing centres which are primarily well served by public transport and therefore reduce the need to travel by car.

For Objective 10, Option C scored a minor positive due to the increased emphasis on protecting existing facilities and therefore reducing the need to build new facilities elsewhere. For Options A and B it was considered that the impact would depend on the location and type of facilities.

For Objective 11, all Options scored a minor positive as protecting or enhancing local services was considered to reduce the need to travel by car due to the location of existing services.

For Objectives 13 and 14, the impact for Options A and B was considered to be uncertain as the impact of any new services and facilities may have an impact, depending on the type and location of development. For Option C, it was considered to be neutral as a focus on preserving existing facilities would not have an impact on these Objectives.

For Objective 15, all Options would have a minor positive impact with specific reference made to the protection and enhancement of any local heritage assets and facilities to help people access and understand local heritage.

The impact on Objectives 6, 9, 12 and 16 were uncertain for all options as it would depend on the type and location of the services and facilities.

Overall, all options deliver broadly similar positive outcomes, with differences primarily relating to the emphasis on healthy lifestyles and the balance between new provision and the protection of existing services. Option B performs most strongly in relation to health and wellbeing, while Option C provides greater certainty in terms of protecting existing facilities. On balance, Option B scores more positively overall due

to its stronger focus on promoting healthy lifestyles alongside supporting local services.

11.4 Upper Floors

Role of residential and upper floors

Reason - to meet the requirement of National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 90, which states that planning policies and decisions should support the role that town centres play at the heart of local communities by taking a positive approach to their growth, management and adaptation and that policies should “recognise that residential development often plays an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres and encourage residential development on appropriate sites”.

Option A – include a policy

Roll forward Policy LPD 51 of the Local Planning Document which adopts a flexible approach.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Encourages change of use of upper floors to residential.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Policy S3 encourages continued use of offices and employment uses.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Supports efficient use of upper floors and may have a positive impact on innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	+	Residential uses help support footfall and vitality of town centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	++	Residential uses within town centres are within walking distance of community facilities and activities.	
8. Transport	++	Residential uses in town centres reduce reliance on the car and benefit from good access to public transport networks.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	+	Encourages change of use of upper floors to residential through national policy.	
2. Employment and Jobs	?	Depends on proposals and whether upper floors remain in employment use.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	Depends on proposals and market demand for different uses.	
4. Shopping Centres	+	Residential uses may help support footfall and vitality of town centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	++	Residential uses within town centres are within walking distance of community facilities and activities.	
8. Transport	++	Residential uses in town centres reduce reliance on the car and benefit from access to good transport networks.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No impact on renewable energy or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment,	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	

Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure			
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on heritage or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, reflecting benefits for housing, employment, economic growth and shopping centre vitality. It also scored major positives for Objectives 7 and 8, indicating significant benefits for social inclusion and transport connectivity. All other objectives scored neutral, showing minimal environmental or resource impacts.

Option B scored minor positives for Objectives 1 and 4, and major positives for Objectives 7 and 8, similar to Option A. There is some uncertainty for Objectives 2 and 3, reflecting that the economic and employment benefits may be less clearly realised when relying solely on national policy. All other objectives scored neutral, indicating little difference in environmental or resource effects compared with Option A.

Overall, both options provide clear benefits for social inclusion and transport, with Option A providing slightly more certainty for economic and employment objectives, while environmental and resource impacts remain neutral for both.

11.5 Impact Assessment Threshold

Consider a policy to require impact assessments for certain retail and leisure developments outside defined centres.

Reason - to provide guidance in line with the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance, which seek to protect the vitality and viability of town and local centres, promote the sequential approach, and ensure out-of-centre development does not have a significant adverse impact on existing centres.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to require Impact Assessments for retail and leisure development above locally defined thresholds.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Protects existing retail and leisure employment.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Supports the vitality and viability of town and local centres.	
4. Shopping Centres	++	Protects town and local centres by applying the sequential test and preventing harmful out-of-centre development.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Supports accessible centres and encourages walking trips.	
6. Community Safety	+	Supports active centres and improved natural surveillance.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Protects town and local centres as community hubs.	
8. Transport	+	Encourages town centre locations and sustainable travel choices.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Encourages sustainable locations and reduces reliance on the private car.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment,	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	

Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure			
14. Landscape	0	No impact on landscape character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No direct impact on heritage or design.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance, without a locally defined impact assessment threshold.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Increased risk to town and local centre employment.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Potential harm to the vitality and viability of centres.	
4. Shopping Centres	-	Reduced protection for town and local centres from out-of-centre development.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	Reduced opportunity to support accessible centres.	
6. Community Safety	0	No change.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced protection of centres as community hubs.	
8. Transport	0	No change.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	-	Less support for sustainable development patterns.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	

14. Landscape	0	No change to landscape character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No change to heritage or design.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 4, reflecting its role in protecting the vitality and viability of town and local centres through locally defined impact assessment thresholds. It also scored minor positives for Objectives 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10, indicating benefits for employment, economic structure, health, community safety, social inclusion, transport and energy considerations.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 2, 3, 4, 7 and 10, reflecting that relying solely on national policy would not provide additional local guidance to support economic development or protect local shopping centres. All other objectives scored neutral.

Overall, Option A provides a strong framework for managing retail and leisure development, supporting both economic and social objectives, while Option B presents some disadvantages for employment, economic structure and town centre vitality.

11.6 Development within Small Parades

Consider a policy to manage development within and adjacent to small parades of shops.

Reason – to provide guidance in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to support the vitality and viability of local shopping areas, ensure development is of an appropriate scale, and protect residential amenity and local character.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to manage development within and adjacent to small parades, supporting local services while protecting amenity and character.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Supports local retail and service employment opportunities.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Strengthens local retail provision and supports the local economy.	
4. Shopping Centres	-	May impact on vitality of local centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Supports access to local convenience services and walkable neighbourhoods.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Supports local services and community interaction.	
8. Transport	+	Reduces the need to travel to larger centres and supports local trips by foot.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Supports walkable, local service provision and reduced car use.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	

14. Landscape	0	No impact on the wider landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Refer to the National Planning Policy Framework and other policies, without a specific local policy for small parades.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	-	Increased risk to local retail and service employment.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Potential weakening of the viability of small parades and the local economy.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Reduced support for local access to services.	
6. Community Safety	0	No change.	
7. Social Inclusion	-	Reduced protection of local community facilities.	
8. Transport	0	No change.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	-	Less support for sustainable local provision and reduced car use.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No change to landscape character.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Increased risk of inappropriate scale or design and loss of local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 10, reflecting benefits for employment, economic activity, health, safety, social inclusion, transport and climate change mitigation. These scores indicate that a local policy would support the vitality and viability of small parades while maintaining local character and residential amenity. Option A scored a minor negative for Objective 4 indicating that there could be reduced support for local shopping areas.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 2, 3, 5, 7, 10 and 15, indicating that without a specific local policy, there could be reduced support for employment, economic activity, local shopping areas, health and well-being, social inclusion and protection of the built environment. All other objectives scored neutral, showing that national guidance alone provides no additional local benefit or disadvantage in these areas.

Overall, Option A provides a wide range of social, economic and environmental benefits by guiding development within small parades, while Option B presents minor disadvantages for key objectives related to local economy and heritage protection.

11.7 Shopfront Development

Consider a policy to manage the design of shopfront development.

Reason - to provide guidance in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, which identifies high quality design as a core planning principle, and to ensure consistency with the adopted Shopfront Supplementary Planning Document.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to ensure shopfront development meets agreed design standards.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Supports attractive commercial environments and retail activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Supports the vitality and viability of town and local centres.	
4. Shopping Centres	+	Improves the quality and attractiveness of shopping environments.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	+	Design guidance can improve safety and natural surveillance.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Enhances the quality of town centre environments for all users.	
8. Transport	+	By increasing the vitality of local centres reduces the need to travel to larger centres and supports local trips by foot.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Supports walkable, local service provision and reduced car use.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	+	Improves streetscape and townscape quality.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	Protects building character and heritage assets.	

16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	
--	---	--	--

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework and Shopfront Supplementary Planning Document, without a specific shopfront policy in the local plan.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No impact on housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No direct change to employment levels.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	-	Potential weakening of the attractiveness and competitiveness of centres.	
4. Shopping Centres	-	Reduced control over shopfront quality may harm the appeal of shopping environments.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No change.	
6. Community Safety	0	No change.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	Reduced quality of town centre environments.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No change in relation to renewable energy or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	-	Potential harm to streetscape and townscape character.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Increased risk of poor-quality shopfront design affecting heritage and local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14 and 15, reflecting benefits for employment, economic structure, shopping centres, community safety, social inclusion, landscape, energy use and climate change, the built and historic environment through the implementation of consistent shopfront design standards.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 3, 4, 14 and 15, indicating that reliance on national policy alone would provide weaker guidance, with potential risks to economic performance, local character, landscape and heritage quality. All other objectives scored neutral for both options.

Overall, Option A provides clear benefits for economic, social and environmental objectives by establishing a local policy framework, while Option B carries some disadvantages for key objectives relating to design, heritage and local vitality.

Topic Area 12: Transport

- 12.1 Managing Travel Demand
- 12.2 Transport Infrastructure Priorities
- 12.3 Parking Standards
- 12.4 Cycle Routes, Recreational Routes and Public Rights of Way
- 12.5 Park and Ride
- 12.6 Highway Safety

12.1 Managing Travel Demand

Identification of Reasonable Alternatives

Options	Reasonable Alternative?
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategies which requires development is accessible by sustainable transport. A hierarchical approach requires: reductions in travel by private car; improvements to sustainable transport are provided early; optimisation of the existing highway network to prioritise sustainable transport; and management measures then highways capacity enhancement if sustainable transport measures are not adequate.	Yes.
Retain policy that requires developments are accessible by sustainable transport (public transport and wider cycle and pedestrian routes). Make the policy more prescriptive, requiring measures which restrict the use of the private cars for local journeys, prioritise sustainable transport, including pedestrian and cycle friendly streets, and promote the principles that underpin 'low traffic' and 20 minute neighbourhoods.	Yes.
Do not have a policy.	No. Paragraph 108 requires transport issues to be considered from the earliest stages of plan making so that the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed.

12.1 Managing Travel Demand

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

- A - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategies which requires development is accessible by sustainable transport. A hierarchical approach requires: reductions in travel by private car; improvements to sustainable transport are provided early; optimisation of the existing highway network to prioritise sustainable transport; and management measures then highways capacity enhancement if sustainable transport measures are not adequate.
- B - Retain policy that requires developments are accessible by sustainable transport (public transport and wider cycle and pedestrian routes). Make the policy more prescriptive, requiring measures which restrict the use of the private cars for local journeys, prioritise sustainable transport, including pedestrian and cycle friendly streets, and promote the principles that underpin 'low traffic' and 'compact and connected' neighbourhoods.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	0	0	The policy will have no implications for housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	+	Both policy options require development to be accessible by sustainable transport, with option A achieving this through a hierarchical approach and option B delivering this through prescriptive measures. Both policy options will improve residents' ability to travel to work by reducing the reliance on the private car, which can reduce barriers to employment.	The detailed design of future applications should incorporate walking and cycling routes into and out of the site. Legal agreements or planning conditions should be used to secure contributions towards sustainable transport.
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	0	The policy will have no implications for economic structure and innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	+	+	Both policy options will require new developments to deliver sustainable transport which will increase residents' ability to access	The detailed design of future applications should incorporate

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
			shopping centres without the use of the private car, improving the centres vitality by increasing footfall.	walking and cycling routes into and out of the site. Legal agreements or planning conditions should be used to secure contributions towards sustainable transport.
5. Health and Well Being	+	+	Both policy options will require new developments to deliver sustainable transport which will improve residents' ability to physically access health services, particularly those who do not have access or cannot access a private car.	The detailed design of future applications should incorporate walking and cycling routes into and out of the site. Legal agreements or planning conditions should be used to secure contributions towards sustainable transport.
6. Community Safety	0	0	The policy will have no implications for community safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	+	Both policy options will require new developments to deliver sustainable transport which will improve residents' ability to access and engage with community activities by reducing reliance on the private car, improving social capital and inclusion.	
8. Transport	++	++	Both policy options require development to be accessible by sustainable transport, with option A achieving this through a hierarchical approach and option B delivering this through prescriptive measures. Both policy options would lead to a reduction in journeys undertaken in the private car as alternate modes of transport would be encouraged. This will subsequently minimise the impact the transport network has on the environment as it would reduce the carbon emissions released by the private car. Both policy options could utilise the existing transport infrastructure and enhance it to support sustainable transport such as appropriate cycle and bus lanes.	The detailed design of future applications should incorporate walking and cycling routes into and out of the site. Legal agreements or planning conditions should be used to secure contributions towards sustainable transport.

SA objectives	A	B	Commentary	Mitigation
9. Brownfield Land	0	0	The policy will have no implications on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	+	Both policy options require development to be accessible by sustainable transport which will reduce greenhouse gas emissions through a reduction in the use of the private car.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	+	Both policy options require development to be accessible by sustainable transport, which will result in a reduction in travel by the private car, which will reduce air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	0	The policy will have no implications on flooding and water quality.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	0	The policy will have no implications on the natural environment and blue and green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	0	The policy will have no implications on landscape.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	0	The policy will have no implications to the built and historic environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	+	Both policy options require development to be accessible by sustainable transport, which would reduce the use of the private car, reducing the consumption of raw materials.	

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 12: Transport 12.1 Managing Travel Demand	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
A - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategies which requires development is accessible by sustainable transport. A hierarchical approach requires: reductions in travel by private car; early improvements to sustainable transport; optimisation of the existing highway network to prioritise sustainable transport; and management measures then highways capacity enhancement if sustainable transport measures are not adequate.	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	++	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+
B - Retain policy that requires developments are accessible by sustainable transport (public transport and wider cycle and pedestrian routes). Make the policy more prescriptive, requiring measures which restrict the use of the private cars for local journeys, prioritise sustainable transport, including pedestrian and cycle friendly streets, and promote the principles that underpin 'low traffic' and 'compact and connected' neighbourhoods.	0	+	0	+	+	0	+	++	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+

CONCLUSIONS

The appraisal of the two alternative approaches for Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand scored the same against the 16 objectives. Both options propose to retain the existing policy approach to require development to be accessible by sustainable transport, but Option A would achieve this through a hierarchical approach and Option B would achieve this through prescriptive measures.

Neither Option A nor Option B scored negatively against any of the objectives. Both options scored a major positive against the transport objective, scored 7 minor positives, and for the remaining objectives it was assessed that the two options would have no impact.

In conclusion, both policy options would have a beneficial impact upon not only the transport objective, but a number of other objectives. Options would secure a sustainable strategy for managing travel demand.

12.2 Transport Infrastructure Priorities

Identification Of Reasonable Alternatives

Options	Reasonable Alternative
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategies which requires new infrastructure to deliver the principles of Policy 3, Policy 14 and the priorities of the Local Transport Plan. Infrastructure should encourage non-private car modes of transport. The policy should identify a list of specific infrastructure essential to the delivery of the Strategic Plan.	Yes.
Do not have a policy	No. Paragraph 108 requires transport issues to be considered from the earliest stages of plan making so that opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure are realised.

12.2 Transport Infrastructure Priorities

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

A - Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategies which requires new infrastructure to deliver the principles of Policy 3, Policy 14 and the priorities of the Local Transport Plan. Infrastructure should encourage non-private car modes of transport. The policy should identify a list of specific infrastructure essential to the delivery of the Strategic Plan.

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	+	The policy option will deliver transport infrastructure that is essential to delivering the Strategic Plan, including transport infrastructure to support the proposed housing allocations.	Mitigation will be identified as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
2. Employment and Jobs	+	The policy option will deliver essential transport infrastructure. This will improve residents' ability to travel to work due to the delivery of infrastructure for the private car and non-private car modes of transport, which can reduce barriers to employment.	Mitigation will be identified as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	The policy will have no implications on economic structure and innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	+	The policy option will deliver essential infrastructure for cars and non-private car modes of transport which will increase residents' ability to access shopping centres, improving the centres vitality by increasing footfall.	Mitigation will be identified as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
5. Health and Well Being	+	The policy option will deliver essential infrastructure for cars and non-private car modes of transport which will increase residents' ability to access health services.	Mitigation will be identified as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
6. Community Safety	0	The policy will have no implications on community safety.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	The policy option will deliver essential infrastructure for cars and non-private car modes of transport which will improve residents' ability to access community activities.	Mitigation will be identified as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
8. Transport	++	The policy option will deliver essential infrastructure for cars and non-private car modes of transport which will enhance the existing transport infrastructure and increase the accessibility of services and facilities in the area. The policy option will encourage non-private car modes of transport which will reduce journeys undertaken by the private car and minimise the impact of car use on the environment by improving walking and cycling infrastructure.	Mitigation will be identified as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
9. Brownfield Land	0	The policy will have no implications on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	-	The policy option will deliver essential infrastructure for cars and non-private car modes of transport. This will include the delivery of infrastructure for walking and cycling, which will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. However, it will also deliver infrastructure for the private and non-private car and buses, which all contribute towards greenhouse gas emissions.	Mitigation will be identified as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	The policy option will deliver essential infrastructure for cars and non-private car modes of transport. This will include the delivery of infrastructure for walking and cycling, which will contribute to reducing air pollution. However, it will also deliver infrastructure for the private and non-private car and buses, which all contribute to air pollution.	Mitigation will be identified as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	The policy will have no implications on flooding and water quality.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	The policy will have no implications on the natural environment and blue green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	The policy will have no implications on landscape.	

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	The policy will have no implications on the built and historic environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	The policy will have no implications on natural resources and waste management.	

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 12: Transport 12.2 Transport Infrastructure Priorities	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
Retain policy approach within the Aligned Core Strategies which requires new infrastructure to deliver the principles of Policy 3, Policy 14 and the priorities of the Local Transport Plan. Infrastructure should encourage non-private car modes of transport. The policy should identify a list of specific infrastructure essential to the delivery of the Strategic Plan.	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	++	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0

CONCLUSIONS

The appraisal of retaining the policy approach for Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities has highlighted the benefits for multiple objectives, with the option being scored major positive for transport, and minor positive for five other objectives. However, the option scored minor negative against the Energy and Climate Change objective and the Pollution and Air Quality objective. This recognises that whilst the policy does encourage the delivery of infrastructure for sustainable modes of transport, the option will also support the delivery of infrastructure for the private car, which will negatively impact these two objectives.

12.3 Parking Standards

What approach should be taken to residential car parking standards.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 112, which states "If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account: the accessibility of the development; the type, mix and use of development; the availability of and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles".

Option A – include a Gedling specific policy

Include a Gedling specific policy incorporating the key elements of the Highway Design Guide and Gedling Parking Provision for Residential and Non-Residential Developments Supplementary Planning Document.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on employment or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	+	Contributes to safe, secure areas through surveillance by design.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	-	Providing adequate parking encourages car use.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Potential to include electric vehicle charging points.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	

14. Landscape	0	No impact on character or amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	Allows management of cars' impact on design and local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the Highway Design Guide and Parking Provision for Residential and Non-Residential Developments Supplementary Planning Document.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on employment or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land available for development or infrastructure.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	-	Stress over inadequate parking provision may negatively impact mental health.	
6. Community Safety	-	More opportunities for car crime where cars are parked away from homes rather than on allocated driveways.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	0	No impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact to character or amenity.	

15. Built and Historic Environment	-	Inadequate parking could negatively affect design and local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Conclusions

Regarding residential car parking standards, Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 6, 10 and 15, reflecting benefits for community safety, energy efficiency, and the built and historic environment through a locally tailored policy for parking standards. However, Option A scored a minor negative for Objective 8, indicating potential constraints on transport efficiency or accessibility in some locations.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 5, 6 and 15, reflecting risks to health, community safety and the built environment if reliance is placed solely on national guidance without a Gedling-specific policy. All other objectives scored neutral, showing no significant differences between the approaches in terms of housing, employment, economic or environmental outcomes.

Overall, Option A provides targeted local benefits for safety, energy and heritage, while Option B presents minor disadvantages for key social and environmental objectives due to the lack of a local policy framework.

What approach should be taken to non-residential car parking standards.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 112, which states "If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account: the accessibility of the development; the type, mix and use of development; the availability of and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles".

Option A – include a policy

Include a Gedling specific policy incorporating the key elements of the Highway Design Guide and Gedling Parking Provision for Residential and Non-Residential Developments Supplementary Planning Document.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on employment or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Provides required infrastructure for non-residential development.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social.	
8. Transport	+	Providing required parking infrastructure would minimise environmental impact and support accessibility.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	

14. Landscape	0	No impact to character or amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the Highway Design Guide and Parking Provision for Residential and Non-Residential Developments Supplementary Planning Document.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on employment or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Provides required infrastructure but less local guidance than Option A.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion.	
8. Transport	+	Required parking infrastructure is provided, reducing environmental impacts.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or impact on efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	

14. Landscape	0	No impact to character or amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on local character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 3 and 8, reflecting benefits for economic structure and innovation and for transport by providing clear guidance on non-residential parking standards tailored to local circumstances. The remaining objectives recorded neutral effects.

Option B also scored minor positives for Objectives 3 and 8, indicating similar benefits for economic structure and transport through reliance on the existing Highway Design Guide and Parking Provision Supplementary Planning Document. All other objectives recorded neutral effects, reflecting that the approach would continue to provide guidance on parking without introducing additional local policy mechanisms.

Overall, Option A provides targeted local guidance for parking that supports economic and transport objectives, while Option B maintains the same outcomes through reliance on existing guidance without introducing a new policy.

12.4 Cycle Routes, Recreational Routes and Public Rights of Way

Protect sites and routes i.e. cycle routes recreational routes and public rights of way.

Reason - to provide guidance on National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 111, which states "Local planning authorities should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice". Also to address paragraph 105 of National Planning Policy Framework which states "Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails."

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy based on the existing Local Planning Document Policy LPD 58 and identify additional sites and routes.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	+	Improves access to employment opportunities for people without or unable to afford a car.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	Cycle infrastructure attractive to graduates and improves access to colleges; may encourage innovative transport solutions.	
4. Shopping Centres	+	Easier access to shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	++	Promotes cycling, increasing physical activity and wellbeing.	
6. Community Safety	0	No direct impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Easier access to community facilities and activities.	
8. Transport	++	Encourages sustainable transport, reduces car journeys, and environmental impacts.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No direct impact on renewable energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	++	Reduced car use lowers air pollution.	

12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No loss of biodiversity or increase in green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact to landscape character or amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on local heritage or built character.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on the National Planning Policy Framework.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on infrastructure or innovative transport solutions.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	?	Unknown impact on health, e.g., physical activity from cycling.	
6. Community Safety	?	Unknown impact on crime or safety along routes.	
7. Social Inclusion	?	Unknown impact on access to community facilities or social inclusion.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network, mode choice, or sustainable travel uptake.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	No increase in renewable energy or energy efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Will increase car use if cycling not promoted.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	?	Unknown impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	?	Unknown impact on landscape character or amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Unknown impact on heritage or built environment.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use.	

Conclusions

Regarding cycle and recreational routes, Option A scored major positives for Objectives 5, 8 and 11, reflecting clear benefits for air quality, health and wellbeing and transport through improved cycle routes and public access. It also scored minor positives for Objectives 2, 3, 5, 7 and 11, indicating additional social and economic benefits, including increased employment opportunities, better access to community facilities and shopping centres, support for innovation, social inclusion, and improved air quality.

Option B scored a minor negative for Objective 11, uncertain for Objectives 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13 and 14, and neutral for the remaining objectives, reflecting reliance on national policy without specific local guidance. The lack of a local policy means there is less certainty about the delivery of health, transport, social and environmental benefits.

Overall, Option A provides stronger positive outcomes across health, transport and social objectives, whereas Option B leaves several key objectives uncertain and dependent on national policy.

Regarding public rights of way, Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 5 and 8, reflecting benefits for health and transport through improved access to public rights of way and promotion of walking and cycling. Objectives 6 and 7 were uncertain, indicating potential but unquantified benefits for community safety and social inclusion. All other objectives scored neutral, showing no significant environmental or resource impacts.

Option B scored neutral across almost all objectives, with uncertainty for Objective 8, reflecting reliance on national policy and separate legislation to protect public rights of way. Without a local policy, there is less scope to actively enhance accessibility or provide additional local facilities.

Overall, Option A provides modest social and health benefits through enhanced access and active travel opportunities, while Option B maintains baseline protection but does not deliver additional local improvements.

12.5 Park and Ride

What approach should be taken on future Park and Ride provision?

Reason – consultation response argues for a Park and Ride site to address existing problems of traffic congestion.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion or community activity.	
8. Transport	+	Depends on location, design, operation; could reduce congestion and improve connectivity.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Could reduce CO ₂ emissions depending on location and design.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	Potential to reduce air pollution depending on location, design, operation.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk.	Flood runoff mitigation required.
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	--	A large car park could negatively affect biodiversity or green infrastructure depending on location.	

14. Landscape	--	Could have negative impact on landscape character depending on location.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	?	Unknown impact on local character/heritage depending on location.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	+	Potential to reduce resource use (air quality improvements, low emission electric buses) depending on location and operation.	Dedicated route for buses.

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Rely on paragraph 154 of National Planning Policy Framework which states "Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are: ...local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location".

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No increase in housing supply – area is not allocated for housing.	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No impact on range of jobs or business activity.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	?	Unknown impact on economic structure or innovation.	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No impact on shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	0	No direct impact on health.	
6. Community Safety	0	No impact on crime.	
7. Social Inclusion	0	No impact on social inclusion or community activity.	
8. Transport	?	Unknown impact on transport network or modes.	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No impact on land type; may require Green Belt location.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	Unknown impact on renewable energy or efficiency.	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	?	Unknown impact on water or air pollution.	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flooding.	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure.	
14. Landscape	0	No impact on character and amenity.	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No impact on local character/heritage.	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	Unknown impact on land or resource use.	

Conclusions

Option A scored minor positives for Objectives 8, 10, 11 and 16, reflecting benefits for transport, energy and climate change, pollution management, and resource efficiency. However, it scored major negatives for Objectives 13 and 14, indicating potential adverse impacts on biodiversity, blue-green infrastructure and landscape character. Objective 15 is uncertain, highlighting potential effects on the built and historic environment.

Option B recorded uncertainty for five objectives (Objectives 3, 8, 10, 11 and 16), reflecting that reliance on national policy alone would not provide clear guidance on the location or design of Park and Ride facilities. This uncertainty could lead to a reduced ability to manage environmental and transport impacts effectively.

Overall, Option A provides clear benefits for transport and environmental management objectives but presents significant environmental risks, while Option B leaves many outcomes uncertain due to lack of local policy direction.

12.6 Highway Safety

Consider a policy to ensure development proposals do not adversely affect highway safety, movement, or accessibility.

Reason – to update and replace existing Local Planning Document Policy LPD 61 (Highway Safety) and to provide guidance in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires development to achieve safe and suitable access for all users and to prioritise inclusive, safe and accessible movement.

Option A – include a policy

Include a policy to ensure development proposals do not have a detrimental effect on highway safety, patterns of movement and the access needs of all people.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No direct impact on jobs or business activity	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land availability or infrastructure provision	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres	
5. Health and Well Being	+	Encourages safer highways, walking and cycling	
6. Community Safety	+	Safer layouts can reduce opportunities for accidents and antisocial behaviour	
7. Social Inclusion	+	Improves accessibility for all users, including vulnerable groups	
8. Transport	++	Directly improves highway safety and movement for all modes	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	+	Supports modal shift and reduced car dependency	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	0	No direct impact on air or noise pollution	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk	
13. Natural Environment,	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure	

Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure			
14. Landscape	0	No direct impact on character or amenity	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No direct impact on heritage or built environment	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	

Option B – no policy (do nothing)

Refer to the Highway Design Guide without a specific local policy on highway safety within Gedling Borough.

SA Objectives	Score	Commentary notes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	0	No direct impact on housing supply	
2. Employment and Jobs	0	No direct impact on jobs or business activity	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	0	No impact on land availability or infrastructure provision	
4. Shopping Centres	0	No direct impact on shopping centres	
5. Health and Well Being	0	Reduced opportunity to promote safer active travel	
6. Community Safety	0	No change in safety outcomes	
7. Social Inclusion	0	Reduced emphasis on inclusive access	
8. Transport	-	Lack of local guidance may lead to poorer safety outcomes	
9. Brownfield Land	0	No specific impact on brownfield land	
10. Energy and Climate Change	0	Less support for modal shift	
11. Pollution and Air Quality	-	Lack of local control could increase pollution due to increased traffic	
12. Flooding and Water Quality	0	No impact on flood risk	

13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	0	No direct impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure	
14. Landscape	0	No direct impact on character or amenity	
15. Built and Historic Environment	0	No direct impact on heritage or built environment	
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	0	No impact on waste recovery or resource use	

Conclusions

Option A scored a major positive for Objective 8, reflecting strong benefits for transport through improved highway safety, accessibility and movement. Minor positives were also recorded for Objectives 5, 6, 7 and 10, indicating additional benefits for health and wellbeing, community safety, social inclusion, and climate change mitigation through safer and more inclusive travel patterns.

Option B scored minor negatives for Objectives 8 and 11, and neutral scores for all other objectives, reflecting reduced control over highway safety and transport management where reliance is placed solely on national guidance and the Highway Design Guide.

Overall, Option A provides various advantages in terms of highway safety, transport, and inclusive access, while Option B performs less positively due to the lack of a local policy framework to manage potential impacts.

Topic Area 13: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

13.1 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Identification of reasonable alternatives

Options	Is it a realistic alternative?
Assess a policy which sets out key infrastructure requirements and sets out funding mechanisms for key infrastructure required which will include transport infrastructure, public transport, health, education, open space and training and employment measures (This would be a merging of existing Core Strategies policies 18 and 19).	Yes
Do not have a policy	No - the NPPF states that Local Plans need to ensure sufficient provision is made for infrastructure and should set out the contributions expected from development.

13. Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Reasonable alternatives for appraisal:

A - Assess a policy which sets out key infrastructure requirements and sets out funding mechanisms for key infrastructure required which will include transport infrastructure, public transport, health, education, open space and training and employment measures (This would be a merging of existing Core Strategies policies 18 and 19).

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
1. Housing	+	The option would help to ensure that the infrastructure required for housing, such as transport, schools and health facilities, is identified. The option incorporates developer contributions and funding mechanisms which would increase the certainty of these being delivered.	Ensure that infrastructure requirements can be funded without making development unviable.
2. Employment and Jobs	+	The option incorporates developer contributions and funding mechanisms, may require additional training and employment measures.	
3. Economic Structure and Innovation	+	The option would help to ensure that the infrastructure required to support the modern economic structure, such as transport infrastructure, is funded and delivered. Incorporating developer contributions and funding mechanisms would increase the certainty of these being delivered.	Ensure that infrastructure requirements can be funded without making development unviable.
4. Shopping Centres	?	The impact upon the objective is uncertain, although developer contributions and new transport infrastructure, may support existing shopping centres.	
5. Health and Well Being	++	The option would help to ensure that new health services, opportunities for recreation and new open space or blue-green infrastructure are funded and delivered. Incorporating developer contributions and funding mechanisms, would increase the certainty of these being delivered.	.
6. Community Safety	?	The impact of the policy is uncertain but may include enhancements to the public realm which may help to contribute to ensuring a safe and secure built environment.	

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
7. Social Inclusion	++	The option would help to ensure that existing cultural assets and community facilities are protected and enhanced and that new educational facilities are funded and delivered, allowing for a more holistic approach. It would also identify the infrastructure required which may include community facilities.	
8. Transport	++	Identifying transport priorities would help to ensure that developer contributions fund public transport infrastructure which would increase accessibility to services and facilities. The option provides scope to establish which facilities would be delivered through planning conditions and which should be met through financial contributions. There may be facilities, such as public transport services, as well as strategic infrastructure arising as a result of cumulative growth, that would be more efficiently delivered through developer contributions.	Ensure priority is given to improving existing transport infrastructure and for measures which reduce journeys undertaken by private car.
9. Brownfield Land	?	It is considered that the option would have an unknown impact upon the objective. The approach may focus infrastructure (e.g. health and education) on existing sites but this may impact the location of other uses (e.g. housing).	Consider providing infrastructure on brownfield land where feasible.
10. Energy and Climate Change	?	The option may help to fund and deliver community energy systems and indirectly increase the use of renewable energy. Measures may also help to reduce journeys by private cars to developments.	Ensure new infrastructure seeks to limit additional energy use and is provided in energy efficient buildings.
11. Pollution and Air Quality	+	The option will help to deliver public transport infrastructure, including public transport, footpaths and cycleways, which would help to reduce levels of air, noise and other types of pollution, by reducing the number of journeys made by the private car.	Ensure priority is given to measures which seek to reduce air, noise and other types of pollution.
12. Flooding and Water Quality	+	The option will help to deliver environmental improvements and blue-green infrastructure which may reduce flood risk.	Ensure consideration is given to minimising flood risk when new infrastructure is provided.
13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure	++	The option would help to ensure that the existing natural environment, including biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure is protected and enhanced and that new opportunities for open space and blue-green infrastructure networks are funded and delivered.	Need to ensure that increased access to existing open space or blue-green infrastructure does not cause harm to biodiversity if access is greater than the capacity that can be supported without

SA objectives	A	Commentary	Mitigation
			disturbance to wildlife or damage to habitats. Other forms of infrastructure need to protect the natural environment, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure.
14. Landscape character.	?	The impact upon the objective is uncertain as it depends on the type and location of the infrastructure.	Ensure that new infrastructure takes into consideration landscape character.
15. Built and Historic Environment	+	The option could potentially help to provide funding to increase the access to, and enjoyment, of the historic environment, for example through contributions to cultural facilities.	Include opportunities for enhancement of the historic environment.
16. Natural Resources and Waste Management	?	The impact upon the objective is uncertain.	Ensure new infrastructure seeks to minimise the use of raw materials and promotes sustainable design.

SUMMARY TABLE

Topic Area 13: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	1. Housing	2. Employment and jobs	3. Economic structure and innovation	4. Shopping centres	5. Health and well-being	6. Community safety	7. Social inclusion	8. Transport	9. Brownfield land	10. Energy and climate change	11. Pollution and air quality	12. Flooding and water quality	13. Natural environment, biodiversity and BGI	14. Landscape	15. Built and historic environment	16. Natural resources and waste management
Option A - Policy sets out key infrastructure requirements and sets out funding mechanisms for key infrastructure	+	+	+	?	++	?	++	++	?	?	+	+	++	?	+	?

CONCLUSIONS

Only one option was considered as part of the appraisal. The Option scored minor positives in relation to Objectives 1,2 and 3 with importance of providing infrastructure and setting requirements for developer contributions being highlighted in relation to housing, employment and economic development.

The impact on Objective 4 was uncertain as it would depend on the type and location of infrastructure in respect of whether it would impact shopping centres. Objectives 6, 9 10, 14 and 16 were also considered to be uncertain.

Objective 5 was a major positive as it would help to ensure that new health services, opportunities for recreation and new open space or blue-green infrastructure are funded and delivered.

Objective 7 was also a major positive due to the benefits to community facilities and educational facilities which help to support social inclusion.

Objective 8 was a major positive as identifying transport priorities would help to ensure that developer contributions fund public transport infrastructure which would increase accessibility to services and facilities.

The impact on Objective 11 was a minor positive due to the potential of delivering public transport infrastructure, including footpaths and cycleways, which would help to reduce levels of air, noise and other types of pollution, by reducing the number of journeys made by the private car.

Objective 12 also scored a minor positive as the Option it would help to deliver environmental improvements and blue-green infrastructure which may reduce flood risk.

Objective 13 was a major positive as it would ensure that new opportunities for open space and blue-green infrastructure networks are funded and delivered.

Objective 15 was a minor positive as it could provide funding to increase the access to, and enjoyment, of the historic environment, for example through contributions to cultural facilities.