

Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework

SUSTAINABILITY
APPRAISAL
OF THE
PUBLICATION
CORE STRATEGY
AND DEVELOPMENT
MANAGEMENT
POLICIES



SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE PUBLICATION
CORE STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES



BASSETLAW
DISTRICT COUNCIL
NORTH NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

November 2010

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Methodology	3
3. Sustainability Objectives, Baseline and Context	8
4. Previous Stages of Sustainability Appraisal	14
5. Sustainability Appraisal of Publication Core Strategy	22
6. Implementation	43

Appendices

1. Compliance with SEA Directive
2. Sustainability Appraisal Matrices of Spatial Vision and Compatibility
Analysis of Strategic Objectives
3. Sustainability Appraisal Matrices of Settlement Hierarchy, Core Strategy
Policies and Development Management Policies

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Non-technical summary

Purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process is a way of ensuring that plans and programmes relating to the development and use of land are compatible with the aims of sustainable development. Sustainable development is about ensuring that the needs of everyone can be met now, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Put simply, sustainability looks at balancing a range of competing environmental, social and economic objectives when making decisions about the development and use of land.

This report outlines the methodology and main findings of the SA undertaken on the policy options that have been proposed during the initial stages of consultation on the Core Strategy for Bassetlaw's Local Development Framework (LDF). The LDF will, ultimately, provide a long-term vision for, and set out a policy framework that will guide future decisions about, development in Bassetlaw District. The Core Strategy sets out the spatial vision and spatial objectives for the development of the District, along with a range of Development Management topics. It is anticipated that the Core Strategy will be adopted in summer 2011.

Sustainability Context and Baseline Characteristics

Throughout Summer 2009 a sustainability scoping assessment was carried out by Bassetlaw District Council officers to help ensure that the SA covered the key sustainability issues that are relevant to the future development of the Bassetlaw area. Relevant plans and programmes were reviewed to develop a wider understanding of the issues and priorities for Bassetlaw, along with a description of the current social, environmental and economic characteristics of the area.

Key Trends

In order to assess what options would be most sustainable for the future development of Bassetlaw the key sustainability issues affecting the LDF were identified. These have been separated into social, economic, environmental, and spatial issues, although there is inevitably overlap between them. For example certain issues, such as climate change, have environmental, economic, social and spatial implications.

The key issues identified in this report comprise:

- Social – housing supply; crime and community safety; health and recreation; and provision of social capital.
- Economic – business development (existing and new) and job creation; site and infrastructure provision; and town and rural centres.
- Environmental – preventing loss of priority habitats; protection and enhancement of the green infrastructure; protecting the historic environment; minimising flood risk; efficient use of resources; and minimising the impacts of climate change.
- Spatial – maximise use of previously developed land; maintaining the character of rural areas; and establishing a strong network of settlements with good access to jobs and services.

Summary of the likely significant effects of the Publication Draft

The SA has provided a process of refinement of the content of the Core Strategy, highlighting a number of areas on which to improve the sustainability of the Vision, Objectives, Core policies and Development Management policies.

The appraisal highlighted the following significant effects of the Publication Core Strategy:

- A wide distribution of development, primarily focusing on urban growth, although targeting rural needs;
- Delivering the greatest proportion of growth in existing centres that have services and facilities that can meet the needs of a growing population;
- A commitment to redeveloping previously developed land prior to any greenfield development, although loss of some greenfield sites will be inevitable due to insufficient brownfield land to meet housing targets;
- Regeneration of former coalmining communities;
- Protection and enhancement of the historic environment and green infrastructure;
- Greater consideration of design in relation to new development; and
- Ensures development responds to the effects of climate change and makes prudent use of natural resources.

1.2 Difference the process has made to date

The Sustainability Appraisal process has played a central role in the development of the Bassetlaw District Council Core Strategy. It identified the likely significant effects of different options, which served to inform decisions about the approaches to be taken forward to or developed for the Preferred Options stage. This process of iteration has been important in the development of clear and concise policies and the development of suggested mitigation measures.

Most importantly, the Sustainability Appraisal process has given officers, decision makers and the wider community the opportunity to consider formally issues of sustainability alongside the plan making process. While this has not meant that all issues have been or can be resolved through the LDF process, it has served to raise greater awareness of the potential problems and trends that will face the District in the future.

Although consultation on the Scoping Report highlighted a number of issues that were subsequently addressed, further consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Options Core Strategy and Development Management Policies did not bring forward any significant concerns about the long-term sustainability of the proposals contained within the draft document.

1.3 How to comment on the report

The District Council welcomes any comments that you may have on this document. To make your views known, please send your representations to the Planning Policy Team, Bassetlaw District Council, Queen's Buildings, Potter Street, Worksop, S80 2AH or by email to future.plans@bassetlaw.gov.uk by 5pm on 20 December 2010.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal

The process of plan making has always relied on the choices between different options for the development and use of land through the planning system. The requirement to produce Sustainability Appraisal Reports under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 seeks to ensure that the decision-making process takes into account the key objectives of sustainable development. These are:

- Social progress which meets the needs of everyone;
- Effective protection of the environment
- Prudent use of natural resources; and
- Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a systematic process undertaken during the preparation of a plan, programme or strategy. The role of the SA is to assess the extent to which the emerging policies and proposals will help to achieve relevant social, economic and environmental objectives. In doing so, it will provide an opportunity to consider ways in which the plan can contribute to improvements in social, economic and environmental conditions as well as a means of identifying and addressing any adverse effects that policies and proposals might have.

The overall aim of the SA process is to help ensure that the Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework (LDF) and Development Plan Documents (DPDs) that it contains make an effective contribution to the pursuit of sustainable development.

This report sets out the methodology used to undertake the appraisal, an assessment of policies and the conclusions and recommendations that have emerged through the process.

2.2 Relationship to Strategic Environmental Assessment

The European Directive 2001/42/EC requires an Environmental Assessment of plans and programmes prepared by public authorities that are likely to have a significant effect upon the environment. The process is referred to as Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and covers relevant plans and programmes whose formal preparation began after July 2004. Among the documents to which this requirement will apply are land use plans that cover wide areas. The Directive therefore requires that the documents that make up the emerging Bassetlaw LDF must be assessed.

At the same time, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a SA of all emerging DPDs. However, the Planning Act 2008 has now removed the requirement for carrying out SA of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). As the guidance explaining this requirement makes clear, SA and SEA are a similar, yet distinct process involving a number of explicit steps. The differences between these processes lie in the fact that the SEA focuses solely on environmental effects whereas SA is concerned with all social, economic and environmental considerations.

The SA Report uses an approach that addresses the requirements of the SA process and the SEA Directive simultaneously by giving full consideration to environmental issues as well as addressing the range of socio-economic concerns. In terms of the specific requirements of the Directive, the Scoping Report and the SA Report for the draft Local Development Documents will together meet the need of the

Environmental Report setting out the significant effects on the environment of implementing the draft plan (and the reasonable alternatives considered).

2.3 Approach to the SA

The *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* requires all DPDs and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), together forming the LDF, to be accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). In accordance with *Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004* ('the Regulations'), this Sustainability Appraisal should incorporate the requirements of *Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive 2001/42/EC*.

The SA and SEA are distinct. There is, however, a large amount of overlap between the European requirements and those of the SA. This allows the processes to be combined and consequently, for the purposes of this document, the combined process will be referred to as the SA. This SA will be undertaken in accordance with Government guidance, ensuring that the requirements of the SEA Directive are met. This SA report forms the consultation draft of the environmental report required under Article 5 of *Directive 2001/42/EC*. A table demonstrating the compliance of the SA process undertaken to date with the requirements referred to in Article 5 (1), which are listed as parts (a) to (j) in Annex 1 of that Directive, is given at Appendix 1.

The principal elements of the SA process can be summarised as follows:

- Collecting and presenting baseline information;
- Reviewing other relevant plans, programmes and strategies;
- Predicting the significant effects of the plan and addressing them during its preparation;
- Identifying reasonable plan options and their effects;
- Involving the public and authorities with social, environmental and economic responsibilities as part of the assessment process; and
- Monitoring the actual effects of the plan during its implementation.

Who carried out the SA?

The Council's Planning Policy Team has carried out the draft Final SA of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD in-house.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

Given the specific legal requirements for Habitats Regulations Assessment work, a screening assessment of the Preferred Options was undertaken in order to assess the likely effects of the proposed policies on Natura 2000 sites. In line with Natural England's recommendations on the process, this is a working draft that may be revisited at various stages throughout the period of plan preparation. Following the Preferred Options stage, a supplement has been added to the screening assessment that takes account of the additional policy and policy amendments that have been made in the Publication Core Strategy. The findings of this process are reported in the Bassetlaw Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening report.

2.4 Uncertainties and risks

Sustainability Appraisal is an uncertain process which requires assumptions to be made regarding the impacts of the policies proposed on the basis of limited or inadequate data. Most of the impact predictions made in this report are therefore

subject to some uncertainty and entail risks.

There are two main uncertainties within the report. Firstly, although the countywide template provided a robust basis, the limited availability of baseline data in some more localised cases makes it difficult to identify the current situation and the likely impact future development may have. Secondly, as the Core Strategy sets out strategic policy, it is often difficult to identify sustainability impacts as these will depend on the exact location, scale and design of individual proposals. The Site Allocations DPD, which will follow on from this DPD, will be subject to a comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal in order to identify and mitigate against sustainability impacts on a site-by-site basis.

Uncertainties relating to baseline data will be resolved through monitoring. Uncertainties associated with impact prediction will be addressed at the planning application stage where more specific information is available and the actual impacts can be identified. Some impacts will be more clearly identified and mitigated against through the forthcoming Site Allocations DPD and Area Action Plan DPDs.

Uncertainty about behavioural change

Some predictions (changes in crime levels and perceived community safety) are based upon assumptions about behavioural change, which is notoriously difficult to judge.

Risk of changes to policy

This appraisal has been made in the context of policy options developed within a higher-level policy framework. It is entirely likely that this framework may change during the lifetime of the Core Strategy, which may well entail changes to local policy, and thus sustainability impacts, that cannot be anticipated. The recent revocation of Regional Spatial Strategies is a prime example of this.

Mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects

The SA Report must include measures to prevent, reduce or offset significant potentially adverse effects that may arise when implementing the Core Strategy. In the SA, mitigation refers to any approach which is aimed at avoiding, preventing, reducing or compensating for significant adverse impacts on the sustainability objectives. In addition, the concept of mitigation covers broader issues such as the enhancement of positive effects where relevant.

Mitigation should be a last resort, with the emphasis being on avoidance of adverse effects as the initial approach. Where this is not achievable, methods to reduce the scale or severity of the effect should be examined.

Mitigation can take a variety of forms, including:

- Refining policies in order to improve the likelihood of positive effects and to minimise adverse effects. This has mainly involved rewording of policies or additions to text.
- Technical measures, such as design principles, to be applied during implementation. Where such measures are suggested other policies within this DPD that will help minimise adverse impacts are cross-referenced.
- Contingency arrangements for dealing with possible adverse effects.

2.5 Appraising the Core Strategy Publication Draft

The method used for the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Preferred Options and this Publication Draft comprises the following:

- Identifying relevant baseline information, including other plans or programmes that influence the Core Strategy’s proposals and policies
- Using the SA Framework with professional expertise and drawing upon selected information in the above review of plans and programmes, and the baseline information
- Commenting on the specific parts of the Core Strategy where specific potential short-term and long-term impacts are identified and, where possible, making recommendations for proposed mitigation or enhancement.
- Identifying secondary, cumulative or synergistic impacts that the policies may have on the SA Objectives.

The appraisal process involved reviewing the Spatial Strategy options put forward in the Issues & Options Paper, against the SA Objectives (SAOs), before a undertaking detailed SA of the Core Strategy Vision, Strategic Objectives and the Spatial Strategy Preferred Option (PO), with its associate Core Policies and Development Management Policies. Each of the POs were assessed against the full SA Framework objectives and commentary was provided on how the PO would meet and/or progress the SAOs, making recommendations for enhancement and mitigation and where appropriate. Having consulted on this document and the DPD itself, relevant changes were made before re-appraising the Core Strategy Publication Draft against the SAOs.

Appraisal Criteria

The following criteria were used to assess the level of compatibility of the proposed Vision and Strategic Objectives:

KEY	
Compatible	✓
Neutral/No Impact	—
Incompatible	✗
Uncertain Impact	?

To make a more thorough assessment of their potential impacts, Core Strategy policies and Development Management policies were considered against more detailed criteria and the potential differences between the short-term (S) and long-term (L) effects when implemented. The appraisal criteria are as follows:

KEY

Strong positive impact	✓✓
Positive impact	✓
Neutral/No Impact	—
Negative impact	×
Strong negative impact	××
Uncertain impact	?

3. SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, BASELINE AND CONTEXT

3.1 Introduction

The Scoping Report formed the initial part (Stage A) of the SA process. This section summarises the process undertaken by the Council and the key issues, problems, objectives and opportunities for sustainable development and spatial planning that were identified as a result. The full details of the review of relevant plans and programmes, the baseline information, and the characterisation and sustainability characteristics of the Bassetlaw area contained in the SA Scoping Report which can be viewed at:

http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/services/environment_and_planning/planning/planning_policy/local_development_framework/baseline_assessment.aspx

3.2 Links to other Plans, Policies and Programmes

The first stage in the SA was the identification of relevant plans and programmes, and their associated objectives, that may have a bearing on the LDF. These documents exist at several levels and thus were considered in turn in the following sequence:

- International;
- National (UK/England);
- Regional (East Midlands)/Sub-Regional;
- County (Nottinghamshire)/South Nottinghamshire;
- Related Borough-wide documents.

This review is detailed in Appendix A of the SA Scoping Report.

This review highlighted some significant implications for the content of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy, particularly in identifying the links and ‘trickle down’ between other plans and strategies, and in identifying other potential sources of baseline information and monitoring data.

Key themes for the SA to address include:

- **Social** – housing supply; crime and community safety; health and recreation; and provision of social capital
- **Economic** – business development (existing and new) and job creation; site and infrastructure provision; and town and rural centres
- **Environmental** – preventing loss of priority habitats; protection and enhancement of the green infrastructure; protecting the historic environment; minimising flood risk; efficient use of resources; and minimising the impacts of climate change
- **Spatial** – maximise use of previously developed land; maintaining the character of rural areas; and establishing a strong network of settlements with good access to jobs and services.

3.3 Baseline Characteristics

Collection of baseline information is required under Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation, and is fundamental to the SA process to provide a background to, and evidence base for, identifying sustainability problems and opportunities in the Bassetlaw area, and providing the basis for predicting and

monitoring effects of the Core Strategy. This information is summarised below and detailed in Section 4 of the Scoping Report.

3.4 Key Sustainability Issues for Bassetlaw

The review of plans and programmes and the analysis of baseline data identified key sustainability issues that the SA and Core Strategy will be required to address. These issues are priorities for sustainability arising from the particular characteristics, pressure and opportunities facing Bassetlaw.

Social

- Supply of affordable homes
- Adequate supply of land for housing
- Reduce crime levels, minimise risk and increase community safety
- Improve amounts of access to open space, recreational and health facilities
- Minimise risks to health
- Facilitate development of social capital

Economic

- Support growth and development of existing businesses
- Provision of a range of quality sites, infrastructure and wider environment for business development
- Vibrant town and rural centres
- Support development of innovative and knowledge-based businesses

Environmental

- Prevent loss of priority habitats
- Protect and enhance the District's green infrastructure
- Avoid un-necessary development in flood risk areas
- Ensure the efficient use of resources
- Minimise the impacts of climate change

Spatial

- Provide job opportunities in sustainable locations
- Maximise re-use of previously developed land
- Maintain the character of rural areas
- Establish a strong and sustainable network of settlements with good access to essential services

3.5 The SA Framework

The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives (SAOs) identified in the Scoping Report are broadly reflective of, and cover the issues set out by, the objectives in the SA report for the East Midlands Regional Plan. The Regional Spatial Strategy initially formed the basis for much of the LDF and although now revoked, still represents a sound body of evidence for this DPD and Sustainability Appraisal.

A total of 14 SAOs have been identified. These are set out in Figure 1 below. Each objective has an indicator or target that will be monitored over the lifetime of the LDF to ensure that key sustainability issues are being addressed. The sustainability objectives seek to address and progress the main sustainability issues and opportunities identified as important for Bassetlaw. The decision-making criteria assist by clarifying the detail of the issues, improving objectivity and ensuring that the appraisal is relevant to the Core Strategy and the indicators will form the framework

by which the policy objectives of the Core Strategy and other DPDs will be assessed. In order to ensure that the assessment framework is manageable, the indicators have been selected (from the wide range used to develop the baseline) for being suitably reflective of the broad thrust of the relevant objective.

Figure 1: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives, Criteria and Indicators

Objective	Decision making criteria	Indicators
1. To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Bassetlaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups? • Will it reduce homelessness? • Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing (no. of units) • House prices; housing affordability • Homelessness • Housing completions (type and size) • Housing tenure • LA stock declared non decent • Sheltered accommodation
2. To improve health and reduce health inequalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce health inequalities? • Will it improve access to health services? • Will it increase the opportunities for recreational physical activity? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life expectancy at birth • New/enhanced health facilities
3. To provide better opportunities for recreation and for people to value and enjoy the Bassetlaw's cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it provide new open space? • Will it improve the quality of existing open space? • Will it help people to increase their participation in cultural activities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open spaces managed to green flag award standard • New and enhanced open space (ha) • Number of Museum/heritage attractions
4. To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it provide safer communities? • Will it reduced crime and the fear of crime? • Will it contribute to a safe secure built environment? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crimes – by category and total
5. To promote and support the development and growth of social capital across the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve access to, and resident's satisfaction with community facilities and services? • Will it encourage engagement in community activities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community centres • Gains/losses of community facilities • Leisure centres • Libraries/mobile library stops
6. To protect the natural environment and increase biodiversity levels across the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and in particular avoid harm to protected species? • Will it help protect and improve habitats? • Will it increase, maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? • Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management? • Will it protect or contribute to the enhancement of the landscape character? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local/National nature reserves (ha/1000 population) • Local wildlife sites (Biological SINCS) with management plans • SSSIs (% in favourable condition) • Woodland areas/new woodland (ha)
7. To protect and enhance the historic built environment and cultural heritage assets in Bassetlaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it protect and enhance existing cultural assets? • Will it protect and enhance heritage assets and their setting? • Will it protect or contribute to the enhancement of the townscape character? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Listed Buildings (all grades)/number and percentage at risk (all grades) • Number of Scheduled Monuments/number and percentage at risk • Number of Registered Parks and Gardens/number and percentage at risk

Objective	Decision making criteria	Indicators
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of conservation areas • Percentage of conservation areas with up-to-date character appraisals
<p>8. To protect and manage prudently the natural resources of the district including water, air quality, soils and minerals</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve water quality? • Will it protect and conserve water resources? • Will it improve air quality? • Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials? • Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques? • Will it minimise the loss of soils to development? • Will it maintain and enhance soil quality? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenfield land lost (ha) • Carbon dioxide emissions (tonnes per capita per annum) • Households in flood zones 2 & 3 • No. of employment developments and housing developed on PDL • Density of dwellings • Developments incorporating SUDS • Planning applications granted contrary to advice of EA • Biological/chemistry levels in rivers, canals and freshwater bodies • Production of primary and secondary/recycled aggregates
<p>9. To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce household waste? • Will it increase waste recovery and recycling? • Will it assist or facilitate compliance with the waste hierarchy (i.e. reduce first, then re-use, recover, recycle, landfill)? • Will it assist in maximising the use of recycled and secondary materials (including aggregates)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total amount of waste produced (tonnes) • Amount of residual household waste produced • Capacity of new waste management facilities as alternatives to landfill • % household waste composted, land filled, recycled, used to recover energy
<p>10. To minimise energy usage and to develop the district's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve energy efficiency of new buildings? • Will it support the generation and use of renewable energy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy consumed from renewable sources (MW) • Energy use (gas/electricity) by end user • Renewable energy capacity installed by type (MW)
<p>11. To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to ensure that all journeys are undertaken by the most sustainable mode available</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it utilise and enhance existing transport infrastructure? • Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment? • Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternative modes of transport? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility to education sites, employment sites, health care, leisure centres, open space, shopping centres • Development of transport infrastructure that assists car use reduction • New major non-residential development with travel plans • People using car and non-car modes of travel to work
<p>12. To create high quality employment opportunities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs? • Will it reduce unemployment? • Will it increase average income levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit claimants • VAT business registration rate, registrations, de-registrations • Businesses per 1000 population • Employment rate • Number of jobs • New floor space • Shops, vacant shops • Unemployment rate

Objective	Decision making criteria	Indicators
13. To develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it increase levels of qualification? • Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 year olds achieving 5 or more GCSEs at Grade A* - C • 19 year olds qualified to NVQ level 2 or equivalent • 21 year olds qualified to NVQ level 3 or equivalent • Working age population qualifications
14. To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure, including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses? • Will it improve the diversity of jobs available? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed business development floorspace • Land developed for employment • Employment land lost • Employment land allocated • Profile of employment by sector

The internal compatibility of the SAOs has been tested to identify any particular tensions or inconsistencies.

Figure 2: Internal Compatibility of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

1															
2	✓														
3	-	-													
4	✓	-	✓												
5	✓	✓	✓	✓											
6	-	-	✓	-	-										
7	x	-	✓	-	✓	✓									
8	x	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓								
9	x	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓							
10	x	-	✓	-	-	-	✓	✓	✓						
11	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	-	✓					
12	-	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	✓				
13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	✓	-	✓			
14	-	-	-	-	-	-	x	x	x	✓	-	✓	✓		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	

Key

✓ Compatible

x Incompatible

- No link / insignificant

? Uncertain / unknown

As the above table indicates, most of the SAOs are internally compatible or have no significant impact on each other. However, a small number of objectives, mostly associated with environmental protection, prudent use of resources and energy use have clear conflict with objectives that need to provide more housing and economic

development. Indeed, simply increasing the amount of housing, business premises and other forms of development places greater pressure on existing resources within Bassetlaw, with increased energy requirements, and more waste being generated. Expansion of existing settlements will involve building on some greenfield sites, thus encroaching into the countryside, potentially threatening and wildlife habitats.

However, it should be emphasised that the emerging LDF policies seek to address these incompatibilities by ensuring the impacts of individual policies and the secondary, cumulative and synergistic impacts all within the DPD, offset each other's ability to conflict with the aims of the SAOs.

4. PREVIOUS STAGES OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

4.1 Development of the Publication Core Strategy

The Publication Core Strategy has been developed through extensive consultation with key stakeholders and the public and the SA process. The Core Strategy also sets out housing growth targets and a monitoring framework for assessing the future performance of the document's policies. This framework is based on the data used in the Annual Monitoring Report and incorporates elements of the SA Framework to ensure consistency in achieving the SAOs. However, the monitoring proposals included in the Core Strategy are not assessed as part of the SA process.

4.2 Previous Assessment Stages

To demonstrate that the SA process has been integral to plan preparation and is an iterative process that is carried out over the duration of the DPD's development, the following section summaries of the previous stages of the SA process.

4.3 Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

The Scoping Report was undertaken using the Nottinghamshire Joint Sustainability Appraisal Framework, developed by the Nottinghamshire Planning Authorities. This set out baseline data and links with other relevant plans, programmes and policies, identifying sustainability issues to be addressed in the SA Framework with appraisal objectives and indicators. The report was subject to consultation with the statutory environmental consultation bodies (Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency), Government Office for the East Midlands and neighbouring authorities in August 2009, with consultation responses received into October 2009. The Scoping Report helped inform the development of the Core Strategy Issues and Options paper.

For full details please see the *Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report*, available at: http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/services/planning_amp_building/planning_policy/local_development_framework/sustainability_appraisal.aspx

Following consultation, four responses were received from the statutory consultation bodies (listed in Appendix 5 of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Preferred Options). All comments were given careful consideration, amending the SA Framework as necessary and taking the principles forward in the development of the Preferred Options document, as appropriate.

4.4 Issues and Options

The future development options for Bassetlaw were developed internally, through examination of national, regional and county planning policy and analysis of baseline data derived from background studies and the Bassetlaw Sustainable Communities Strategy. These options were established in way that specifically addresses the key sustainability issues that were highlighted in the SA Scoping Report. The key issues that required addressing with regard to the future development of Bassetlaw and the options considered as a means of delivering them, were sent out for consultation in September 2009.

Almost 1600 consultation responses were received on the Issues and Options document and a number of consultation events held throughout the autumn of 2009 also gathered views and input from members of the public and other interested

parties on the proposed options. In all cases, consultees to the Issues and Options paper were asked if they felt that another course of action was preferable to those proposed by the Council, or were given open-ended questions to allow for specific suggestions to be made.

For full details please see the *Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation*, available at:

http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/services/planning_building/planning_policy/local_development_framework/core_strategy.aspx

4.5 Preferred Options

Following the Issues and Options consultation, an assessment of the likely social, economic and environmental impacts of potential Core Strategy options (set out below) was undertaken to assist the Council in further decisions over the most favourable course of future action.

Figure 3: Comparison of the sustainability effects of the strategic options

Strategic Option	Summary of Proposals
Option 1	This option proposes the distribution of development across Bassetlaw using a tiered hierarchy of grouped settlements and builds on the recommendations of the Bassetlaw Services and Facilities Study to try and ensure that everyone has the best possible access to services, facilities, homes and jobs, while endeavouring to provide a spread of development across the District to address both rural and urban needs. It is possible that Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes would need urban extensions in order to achieve the regional housing targets set for Bassetlaw up to 2026.
Option 2	<p>This option would focus all new development in Bassetlaw's existing two large centres of Worksop and Retford. This option reflects the respective roles and status given to both Worksop and Retford in the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) as a Principle Urban Area (Worksop) and Retail & Service Centre (Retford) respectively.</p> <p>This option would see both towns grow significantly while restricting development in other settlements to minor infill development, where this was deemed to be appropriate to meet locally identified needs. This option would mean that Worksop and Retford would need significant urban extensions in order to achieve the regional housing targets set for Bassetlaw up to 2026.</p>
Option 3	<p>This option would focus all new development in the settlements in west Bassetlaw that have suffered from the decline of the coal mining industries, namely Worksop, Harworth/Bircotes, Carlton in Lindrick and Langold. This would have the aim of delivering effective regeneration through employment and residential growth. This option would also build on the obvious linkages (in terms of access to employment and large scale retail and leisure opportunities) between the western side of the District and the nearby urban centres of Sheffield, Rotherham and Doncaster. Economic development in the north west of the Bassetlaw would also prove attractive to companies wanting to be closer to urban centres and, potentially, the Robin Hood Airport (Doncaster Sheffield).</p> <p>This option would restrict development in all other settlements in Bassetlaw to minor infill developments, where deemed to be appropriate to meet locally identified needs. This option would mean that Worksop, Harworth/Bircotes, Carlton in Lindrick and Langold would need urban extensions in order to achieve the regional and sub-regional development targets set for Bassetlaw up to 2026.</p>

The results of the SA, including a matrix based appraisal for each option, is presented in Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options SA. The assessment considers the options against the full SA Framework objectives in summary form, with commentary focused on those SA objectives where significant adverse or

favourable affects are noted. Figure 4 below, summarises the detailed appraisal of the strategic development options put forward in the Issues and Options paper.

Figure 4: Strategic Options Appraisal Matrix

SAO	Option 1 Potential Impact	Option 2 Potential Impact	Option 3 Potential Impact
1. Housing	✓✓	×	?
2. Health	?	?	✓
3. Recreation	✓	?	?
4. Crime and Community Safety	–	–	?
5. Social Capital	✓	×	✓
6. Biodiversity	–	–	–
7. Historic Environment	✓	×	–
8. Natural Resources	✓	?	✓
9. Waste	–	–	–
10. Energy	✓	✓	?
11. Transport	✓✓	✓✓	✓
12. Employment	✓	✓	✓✓
13. Enterprise and Education	?	?	?
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	?	✓

The following issues arose from this assessment:

Figure 5: Issues emerging following assessment of Strategic Options

SA Objective	Issues arising from Strategic Options
1. Housing	<p>Of the three proposed development options, Option 1 offers the greatest potential to meet the District's housing needs by seeking to locate the bulk of the proposed development in the most sustainable locations, while still meeting identified local needs in smaller rural settlements. Although Option 2 seeks to position all housing growth in the District's current most sustainable locations it does not address the importance of maintaining the viability of rural settlements, while imposing heavily on the land capacity of Worksop and Retford. Providing so much housing in just two settlements may have long-term impacts on their ability to accommodate a proportionate level of employment land.</p> <p>While under Option 3 the range of housing provision will have a strong positive impact on the settlements it affects to the west of the District, it fails to</p>

	address the identified needs of both Retford and other settlements in the rural east.
2. Health	It is quite difficult to draw a direct correlation between the strategic distribution of growth and reduced health inequalities and the improved accessibility of healthcare services. It is considered, under Options 1 and 2, that the impacts of the proposed spatial strategies will potentially enhance existing services in Worksop and Retford, and to a lesser extent in other areas (proportionately with the level of growth) if the identified roles are to be maintained or enhanced. However, it may be regarded that the regeneration of former coalmining communities, under Option 3, would have a more direct short to medium-term impact through delivery of better quality housing and proportionate provision of healthcare services as these areas are generally recognised as suffering from poorer levels of health
3. Recreation	Based on the premise that provision of new and enhancement of existing open space will most likely be delivered in conjunction with new housing development, Option 1 would appear to offer the widest distribution which would be to the benefit of more people. Although Option 2 would significantly enhance the recreational offer in Worksop and Retford, it would not meet wider needs across the District. Until the housing and employment development splits are defined for the large areas of previously developed land prioritised for development under Option 3 it is not possible to say whether open space improvements can be secured.
4. Community Safety and Crime	It is difficult to determine whether a policy at this scale, which largely focuses on the distribution of growth, will have significant impacts on community safety and help reduce crime/fear of crime. While new development and regeneration schemes will contribute to a general enhancement of the public realm, it is not considered that any clearly measurable impact will be seen in the long or short-term under Options 1 and 2. The same can largely be said for Option 3, although regeneration of areas with derelict buildings may improve community safety and remove areas that are conducive to anti-social behaviour.
5. Social Capital	Wherever growth occurs in the District it is likely that there will be consequential improvements to social capital to help sustain and meet the needs that arise there. However, in strict sustainability terms, Options 1 and 3 present the most favourable options by ensuring reasonable access to services on an appropriate scale to the settlement. Limiting growth solely to the existing towns is likely to have a detrimental impact on the long-term sustainability of rural areas as places to live and work.
6. Natural Environment	It is considered that the overall impact of the three development options on this SAO will be neutral, as permitting development in one place instead of another will often incur a degree of loss set against the preservation of another site. While Option 1 may require some mitigation measures across a wider area, Option 2 would threaten more sensitive assets on the edges of Worksop and Retford but prevent losses occurring elsewhere. Although redevelopment of brownfield sites in Option 3 would generally be most favourable, in terms of biodiversity protection, careful consideration must be given to sites that have naturally regenerated as these can often harbour species that do not occur on other greenfield sites.
7. Historic Environment	Conservation of the historic environment may be more difficult to achieve under Option 2, as the intensity of development required in Worksop and Retford is such that negative impacts on historic assets in and around the towns are likely. No likely significant effects should occur under Option 1 as the distribution of development under the settlement hierarchy is based on the known capacity and sensitivity of each settlement. Option 3 would protect historic assets in the east of the District, while the requirement for urban extensions to settlements in the west may incur negative impacts on features of identified importance.
8. Natural Resources	Option 3's emphasis on redevelopment of brownfield sites has the most obvious positive impact on this objective, although Option 1 also seeks to maximise opportunities to build on previously developed sites and avoid

	development in areas at risk of flooding. While the latter principle is applied for all development options, across the board, Option 2 is most likely to have a significant impact on loss of greenfield sites due the need for significant urban extensions. However, a subsequent benefit of this option would be the possibility of increased housing densities as this would be more compatible with the existing urban and suburban character.
9. Waste	In the long-term, any growth scenario will incur an increase in waste generation, regardless of the location or distribution of development. As such, although the three development options would see significant levels of growth, none would lead to more excessive levels of waste being generated than any other; therefore each option is considered to have a neutral impact on the SAO.
10. Energy	In line with the Council's Energy Opportunities Plan, a wider spread of development, under Option 1, indicates greater opportunity to utilise the various renewable and low carbon energy sources available across the District, while higher density development under Option 2 will increase the feasibility of introducing district heating systems in Worksop and Retford. Given that the focus of Option 3 is on a relatively confined area, some renewable and low carbon energy options will remain, although these will be significantly less extensive than in options with a broader scope.
11. Transport and Accessibility	Given that Worksop and Retford are positioned favourably within the District's existing transport network, all the proposed development options derive some benefits and score positively against this SAO. Options 1 and 2 both ensure new development is positioned to fully utilise road and rail assets, while Option 3 only utilises the infrastructure in the west of the District.
12. Employment	All of the three proposed development options make a positive contribution to the enhancement of employment opportunities in the area. While a wider distribution of employment opportunities may be to the benefit of the greatest number of people, focusing provision in existing towns positions new development to make better use of the existing infrastructure. Option 3, however, stands out as having the strongest positive impact on this objective, due to the contribution it would make to reducing unemployment in areas that have suffered significant structural decline in recent years.
13. Enterprise and Education	The effects of the development options on this objective are difficult to determine in relation strategic level policies, as the type of jobs that will be brought to the area cannot be foreseen, while increases in qualifications depend on the level of growth and subsequent effects and investment in educational resources. Impacts are most likely to occur through cumulative effects of other developments, rather than directly as a result of the respective spatial strategy.
14. Economic Infrastructure	Under Option 1, development dispersed across the District will help provide infrastructure to meet economic needs and utilise new technologies on a wider scale. Focusing development in Worksop and Retford, under Option 2, will make best use of existing infrastructure and support economic growth in the short to medium-term, although it is possible in the capacity of these towns may limit larger development opportunities in the long-term. Option 3 makes effective use of the transport infrastructure of the west of the District and builds on the traditionally more industrial base of this part of the District, however, this fails to acknowledge the extent of the contribution that is made by business opportunities in rural areas. Neglecting the rural areas would be detrimental to the sustainability of many of the settlements, particularly in the east of Bassetlaw.

4.6 Conclusions on Sustainability of Strategic Options

The appraisal indicates that Options 1 and 3 are the most sustainable options for the future development of Bassetlaw, with the greatest potential for long-term positive impacts on the SAOs, while Option 2 has emerged as the least sustainable. This

generally accords with the feedback gained through the consultation process, where Options 1 and 3 stood out as the favoured approaches by some margin.

While the towns of Worksop and Retford are currently regarded as being the most sustainable settlements in the District, the aim of Option 2, to locate future development almost entirely here, will impose a long-term impact that is to the detriment of the wider area. Although, in the short to medium-term, this option ensures future development is well positioned to take full advantage of the District's existing transport infrastructure, it is important to maintain the continued viability and sustainability of Bassetlaw's rural population; therefore appropriate levels of growth must be permitted in more out-lying areas to secure this. The demise of smaller settlements as rural service centres will contribute to an increase in unsustainable travel patterns, while the large-scale growth of the two towns may come at significant cost to the environmental capacity with failure to fully utilise the brownfield land resources that exist in other parts of District.

Options 1 and 3, however, have potentially positive long-term impacts for the towns and other settlements, in which development will occur, by encouraging more efficient use of land and other natural resources, promoting social inclusion and targeting regeneration of areas of identified need.

However, in terms of taking these options forward to the Preferred Options stage, having taken the comments from the Issues & Options consultation into account, it was clear that none of the three proposed options were sufficient on their own. As such, a revised Spatial Strategy, drawing upon elements of all of those proposed initially, has been developed. This is set out below and, we believe, reflects the consultation feedback, respects the strategic framework set out by the Regional Spatial Strategy and will serve to ensure that urban growth, regeneration opportunities and rural communities all receive support. The full details of this are explained in the Preferred Options document which this SA accompanies.

4.7 Progressing the Issues and Options

The Preferred Options (POs) carried forward the options considered through the Issues and Options consultation and presented a series of POs that included: a Spatial Strategy for the distribution of development; Core Policies that are designed to guide the nature and type of development in each of the key settlements (highlighted in Spatial Strategy); and a set of Development Management Policies that cover broader issues. In addition, the POs document sets out a Vision and a series of Strategic Objectives, against which progress in achieving the Vision can be measured.

These objectives were initially developed to reflect the Regional Spatial Strategy's (RSS) objectives for the East Midlands Northern Sub-Region, in which Bassetlaw sits. Although the RSS has now been revoked the Council considers that the work undertaken to establish the RSS and the targets it has set for housing in Bassetlaw, based on an assessment of household projections and the consideration of population growth and migration factors, remains a sound basis for decisions about local housing growth. See <http://www.emregionalstrategy.co.uk/RSS-Evidence>

4.8 SA of Core Strategy Preferred Options

The SA of the Core Strategy Preferred Options was carried out in house by members of the Planning Policy Team and was made available for public consultation

alongside the Preferred Options document. For more information on this assessment visit the Council's website at:

http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/services/planning_amp_building/planning_policy/local_development_framework/sustainability_appraisal.aspx

The SA of the POs was an effective means of identifying changes to policies to help them score more favourably against the SAOs. A summary of the effects of the SA of the POs can be seen in Figure 6, below.

Figure 6: Effects of the SA of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Vision	
Summary	The Vision portrays the District in a fair light, given its relative weaknesses and opportunities. It sets out reasonable short and long-term aspirations for addressing these issues in-line with the core principles set out in national policy.
Changes made	Amendments were made to the vision to incorporate references to learning, reducing health inequalities and developing safer communities. Assessment of the Vision also drew out the need to promote energy efficient building methods.
Strategic Objectives	
Summary	The Strategic Objectives have a largely positive relationship and ensure effective delivery of the Vision. However, issues are raised in relation to potentially conflicting objectives such as the impact of minimising carbon emissions on the viability of new development and the visual effect on historic buildings; insufficient brownfield land in the District to meet all development needs will result in impacts on biodiversity; and increased development resulting in increased waste generation.
Changes made	<u>Objective 3:</u> The need for wider community regeneration was emphasised in order to achieve the social objectives within the SA Framework. <u>Objective 5:</u> Specified the need to enhance service provision in rural areas. <u>Objective 6:</u> Included reference to taking opportunities to achieve sustainable transport solutions and that measures to respond to the effect of climate change should apply to all new development, not just housing.
Spatial Strategy and Core Strategy Policies	
Summary	Largely beneficial sustainability effects, aimed at addressing identified needs in each settlement whilst making the most of existing assets, the availability of previously developed land and the relative capacity of each settlement. The greatest levels of development will occur in the most sustainable locations, supporting growth of urban areas and sustaining the function of rural centres.
Changes made	None – in most circumstances the proposed Development Management policies will provide mitigation or enhancement measures that balance-out the policies and limit the need text alterations, even where potential negative impacts may occur.
Development Management Policies	
Summary	The combined effect of the Development Management policies is to provide robust criteria for the assessment of planning applications. There is a significant degree of overlap and interaction between the policies as specific types of development incur particular impacts in different parts of the District. These policies should therefore not be considered in isolation.
Changes made	<u>DM1:</u> None – issues arising from this policy are effectively addressed through the influence of other Development Management policies relating to protection of the countryside and green infrastructure/biodiversity protection. <u>DM2:</u> None. <u>DM3:</u> None – issues arising from this policy are effectively addressed through the influence of other Development Management policies relating to green infrastructure/biodiversity protection and conservation and built heritage. <u>DM4:</u> None. <u>DM5:</u> None. <u>DM6:</u> In addition to waste management facilities being provided on sites for Gypsies,

	<p>Travellers and Travelling Show People the SA highlighted the need for inclusion of recycling facilities, as this is just as important for travelling communities as it is for residents of a fixed abode, within the District.</p> <p><u>DM7:</u> None.</p> <p><u>DM8:</u> None – some of the issues arising from this policy are deemed unavoidable, where conservation objectives outweigh those for energy efficiency of building fabric.</p> <p><u>DM9:</u> Addition of text to include other environmental features of importance such as Ancient Woodland, Protected Trees and Protected Hedgerows.</p> <p><u>DM10:</u> Inclusion of text regarding improvements to the energy efficiency of building fabric, in addition to renewable and low carbon energy technology.</p> <p><u>DM11:</u> None – the effect of this policy will be largely to mitigate the impacts of new development that cannot be achieved through other DM policies.</p> <p><u>DM12:</u> Include reference to green infrastructure and biodiversity within SUDS.</p> <p><u>DM13:</u> None</p>
--	---

5. SA OF PUBLICATION CORE STRATEGY

Following consultation on the POs and the SA, no significant changes were required. Most of the minor changes that have been made to the DPD have come as the result of comments received in consultation on the document itself. An additional policy has been included to address comments from The Coal Authority with regard to ground conditions and land stability, while Nottinghamshire County Council highlighted the need to more explicitly address sustainable transport issues. As such, Policy DM13 'Parking Standards' has now been expanded and renamed as 'Sustainable Transport'.

The most significant comment made directly on the SA came from CABI, who directed us towards their publications on the influence of design in relation to measurable social, environmental and economic outcomes. Whereas the SA of the POs intimated that it is difficult to quantify the effects of good design, CABI were keen for us to draw out the many positive benefits that can be derived from higher standards of design in all new developments.

Many of the other issues that had arisen in consultation came not as a result of policies themselves, but due to a lack of detailed explanation. It is hoped that these concerns expressed by consultees have been effectively remedied by giving more detailed background text in support of each policy, setting out the broader context, a justification for the policy and, in some cases, explaining how the policy will operate.

5.1 SA of Spatial Vision

This section of the SA sets out the Core Strategy vision, objectives, core policies and development management policies. More detail on the policies and their reasoned justifications can be found in the DPD itself.

A Vision for Bassetlaw

Over the next 15 years, Bassetlaw will progress through a period of economic transition, as it successfully positions itself as a well-connected, attractive and good value area in which to live, work and learn. Through the provision of a wider range of jobs and services in its larger centres, the conservation and enhancement of its environmental and heritage assets, the continued regeneration of key opportunity sites and the delivery of necessary infrastructure, Bassetlaw will establish its reputation as an area that can offer a high quality of life for all of its residents, including a reduction in health inequalities across the District and the development of safer communities.

As the largest settlement in Bassetlaw, Worksop will build on its role as the District's principal urban centre. Its older employment sites will be regenerated, encouraging opportunities for indigenous growth, and new business locations will be established, taking advantage of the town's good connections to the strategic road network. High-quality housing developments, supported by an appropriate range of community facilities, will benefit from town centre retail and leisure investment. Opportunities will be taken to enhance the Chesterfield Canal 'corridor' and Bridge Street, through redevelopment of opportunity sites, and to enhance key assets including Worksop Priory and the Cane town park.

Retford will continue to provide an attractive range of homes and a good concentration of services and facilities, allowing it to maintain its role in supporting surrounding rural communities without compromising its market town character. Development in Retford will, therefore, protect the town's retail and service role, delivering growth of a scale that respects the town's heritage assets and, where appropriate, supporting the increased use of the Chesterfield Canal.

Harworth Bircotes, the District's third largest settlement, will grow further as a key focus for local employment, with the regeneration of the Harworth Colliery site resulting in a well-integrated development that contributes to a

significantly improved range of housing in the town, along with an enhanced town centre. Further employment opportunities will be established around the town, taking advantage of the A1 corridor.

Beyond these three key settlements, opportunities will be taken to strengthen the service role of the larger villages across the District. Development opportunities in Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold will see support for the regeneration of the former coal mining areas of western Bassetlaw. Growth in Tuxford will seek to realise its potential as a key local centre, building on its existing employment provision, excellent range of facilities and good access to larger towns nearby. Improvements to its village centre environment will increase its attractiveness to local residents and those of surrounding villages, as a place for leisure and shopping. Misterton will maintain its role as the key rural community centre in eastern Bassetlaw, attracting and maintaining a range of services and facilities to support both its own residents and those of surrounding villages.

The character of Bassetlaw's many attractive villages and hamlets, as well as its pleasant and varied landscapes, will be conserved, with small-scale development aimed at supporting affordable housing and the enhancement or maintenance of local service provision. Support for rural businesses, and appropriate farm diversification schemes, will ensure that the economy of these rural areas continues to evolve. Future development will deliver strong improvements in all aspects of design quality, as well as ensuring that opportunities are taken to regenerate the District's historic environment, particularly in the centre of Worksop, Retford and Tuxford. We will also ensure that opportunities for the greater use of renewable and low carbon energy sources, and the use of energy efficient building methods, are realised, along with opportunities for mitigating or adapting to climate change.

By 2026, Bassetlaw will have become an increasingly popular place in which to live and invest, with ongoing improvements to the quality of life for Bassetlaw's citizens and environment.

A detailed SA of the Council's Vision and Strategic Objectives is contained within Appendix 3, although the key outcomes and findings are contained within the following paragraphs.

This Vision draws on the specific aspirations of the Bassetlaw Sustainable Community Strategy and views expressed in the Issues and Options consultation; drawing on the strengths and weaknesses that residents and stakeholders believe exist within Bassetlaw. The Vision makes aspirational, yet realistic assertions about what can be achieved in Bassetlaw through the LDF, in light of the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities in the area.

The results of the SA of the Vision indicate a high level of compatibility with the SA Framework, which will facilitate long-term progress on the indicators identified for each of the SAOs. Uncertainty has only arisen in relation to impacts on community safety and crime, as the extent of factors that influence this issue are so wide-ranging that they are beyond what is achievable in spatial planning alone. In addition, as Bassetlaw is only a 'collection authority', the extent of the influence the Core Strategy can have on waste is somewhat limited. While it is felt that the Vision could be enhanced by making firm links to initiatives outside of the District or the planning system that explicitly address these sustainable development issues, there is uncertainty has been generated with the removal of the regional tier of planning policy and the Government's spending review.

5.2 Strategic Objectives

The Core Strategy's Strategic Objectives have been developed to support the delivery of the Council's vision.

Strategic Objectives for Bassetlaw's Core Strategy

S01 To provide a range of high-quality market and affordable houses in Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes, Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold, Tuxford, Misterton and sustainable rural settlements (as identified in the Settlement Hierarchy) to meet the diverse needs of Bassetlaw's growing population.

S02 To provide a range and choice of employment sites in Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes (including the A1 corridor), Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold and Tuxford.

S03 To prioritise the community regeneration opportunities available in Harworth Bircotes, Misterton and Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold by developing brownfield sites in these settlements in advance of greenfield allocations.

S04 To enhance and protect the vitality and viability of the centres of Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes and Tuxford, through environmental improvements and provision of increased town centre retail, employment and leisure development.

S05 To ensure the continued viability of Bassetlaw's rural settlements through the protection, and enhancement in the levels, of local services and facilities and support for enterprises requiring a rural location.

S06 To ensure that all new development addresses the effects of climate change by, as appropriate, reducing or mitigating flood risk; realising opportunities to utilise renewable and low carbon energy sources and/or infrastructure, alongside sustainable design and construction; taking opportunities to achieve sustainable transport solutions; and making use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.

S07 To ensure that all new development enhances the attractiveness and local distinctiveness of the area and, where appropriate, achieves its full potential against national and local design standards.

S08 To protect Bassetlaw's natural environment by maintaining, conserving and enhancing its characteristic landscapes, biodiversity, habitats and species and seeking quantitative and qualitative growth in the green infrastructure network across and beyond the District.

S09 To protect and enhance Bassetlaw's heritage assets, identify those of local significance, advance characterisation and understanding of heritage asset significance, reduce the number of heritage assets at risk and ensure that development is managed in a way that sustains or enhances the significance of heritage assets and their setting.

Overall, it is considered that the Strategic Objectives are compatible with and contribute positively towards the SAOs. As a whole, they cover all the necessary elements of sustainability and although there are some conflicts and uncertainties arising, the DPD objectives largely compatible subject to rewording of some sections and by identifying suitable mitigation measures within the objectives themselves or in other parts of the DPD.

The key issues arising from the analysis of the Strategic Objectives against the SAOs are summarized below.

Figure 7: Summary of issues arising from SA Core Strategy Strategic Objectives

SA Objective	Issues arising from Core Strategy Strategic Objectives
1. Housing	Although measures to mitigate the impacts of climate change, minimise flood risk and utilise renewable and low carbon energy sources seek to ensure the long-term sustainability of the future housing stock, the associated costs can potentially effect the affordability of new homes if developers are forced to pass on the costs to buyers.
	None identified.

2. Health	
3. Recreation	None identified.
4. Community Safety and Crime	None identified.
5. Social Capital	The following wording was added to Objective 3 to improve its score against this SAO: <i>'Providing regeneration opportunities for communities ... thus seeking to improve the quality of life in former coalmining areas with identified needs'</i>
6. Natural Environment	Clear conflicts exist between the provision of land for housing and the aspiration to protect biodiversity and the wider natural environment, particularly in light of insufficient brownfield land to meet the 60% target set by the Government. Provision of land for employment-creating uses is likely to incur conflict where greenfield development is required, while redevelopment of naturally regenerated brownfield sites can result in loss of species that do not occur in other locations. Pollution resulting from operational use is also a potential concern. Provision of community facilities outside settlement boundaries may require measures to mitigate loss of greenfield sites.
7. Historic Environment	Although policies will have regard for settlements' capacity and identified features of interest, uncertainty arises in relation to the objectives ability to contribute to this SAO. Given the level of new development that is required, there is potential for negative impacts on historic assets, particularly in terms of appearance, particularly in town centres. Conflict can arise where the visual impact of renewable energy technologies can result in negative impacts on character and settings of historic buildings and other assets.
8. Natural Resources	Given that not all of the District's housing requirements can be met on previously developed land there may be a need to provide land for employment-creating uses on greenfield sites, while the types of employment development makes it difficult to determine the likely effects on air quality and conservation of water resources. Circumstances may arise where the need to protect the historic environment takes precedence over the protection of natural resources, therefore restricting use of more sustainable building materials or reduced density of development.
9. Waste	The logical correlation between increasing the number of households in an area and the volume of waste produced assumes that there will be an increase in waste. While it may not be possible for the arising conflict to be fully resolved in itself, other areas of the LDF may be able to contribute to mitigation – for instance, through utilising waste to generate energy. Although maintaining a supply of employment land does not have a direct impact on levels of waste generated, the secondary or cumulative effect can be that waste-intensive uses occupy employment sites.
10. Energy	It is not possible to judge the impact vitality and viability enhancements of Bassetlaw's town centres will have on energy use without knowing the specific details of development types that will help achieve this objective – much depends on market forces. Principles relating to conservation of the historic environment may restrict progress against this SAO in some parts of the District.
11. Transport and Accessibility	None identified.
12. Employment	None identified.
13. Enterprise and Education	Ensuring an appropriately located supply of employment land cannot alone stimulate the high knowledge sector job creation or increased level of qualifications to which this SAO strives.

14. Economic Infrastructure	Possible conflicts may arise, depending on where development is located. Sustainable transport and energy generation options may not be feasible in some locations, while flood risk may prohibit development in areas where other locational benefits exist. The nature conservation agenda presents conflicts of interest with regard to ensuring provision of employment land and associated infrastructure in sustainable locations, particularly on the edges of existing towns. The presence of sensitive historic assets can restrict land supply but also support economic development through re-use of historic buildings, for economic development.
-----------------------------	--

5.3 SA of the Spatial Strategy/Settlement Hierarchy

Alternative Approaches Considered

The preferred approach to a Spatial Strategy is set out in policies CS1 to CS9. The preferred approach to the Spatial Strategy maintains a settlement hierarchy, as per Option 1 from the Issues & Options paper, but has been modified and takes account of consultation feedback. It addresses the importance of delivering sufficient new growth in larger settlements, in line with the principles of national planning policy, the District's housing targets and the recommendations of the Council's Employment Land Capacity Study; takes account of regeneration opportunities in the west of the District (as identified in Option 3 from the Issues and Options paper); and acknowledges the needs of the rural communities throughout the District.

Policy CS1: Settlement Hierarchy

Figure 8: Bassetlaw Settlement Hierarchy

PRINCIPLE URBAN AREA The primary town within Bassetlaw. The focus for major housing, employment and town centre retail growth (Policy CS2)	Worksop¹
CORE SERVICE CENTRE The focus for levels of housing, employment and town centre development to maintain and enhance its service role and market town character (Policy CS3).	Retford
MAIN REGENERATION SETTLEMENT A regeneration opportunity town (Policy CS4).	Harworth Bircotes
LOCAL SERVICE CENTRES Settlements with smaller regeneration opportunities and the services, facilities and development opportunities available to support moderate levels of growth (Policies CS5; CS6; CS7).	Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold
	Tuxford
	Misterton

¹ Worksop includes the settlements of Rhodesia and Shireoaks.

<p>RURAL SERVICE CENTRES Rural settlements that offer a range of services and facilities, and the access to public transport, that makes them suitable locations for limited rural growth (Policy CS8).</p>	<p>Beckingham Blyth Clarborough and Hayton Cuckney Dunham East Markham Elkesley Everton Gamston Gringley-on-the-Hill</p>	<p>Lound Mattersey Misson Nether Langwith North Leverton North and South Wheatley Rampton Ranskill Sturton-le-Steeple Sutton Walkeringham</p>
<p>ALL OTHER SETTLEMENTS Rural settlements that have limited or no services and facilities or access to public transport and which are unsuitable for growth (Policy CS9).</p>	<p>Any settlements within Bassetlaw not listed above are considered to be small villages or hamlets forming part of the countryside</p>	

Sustainability Effects and Mitigation Proposals

Policy CS1 should prove to have significant beneficial sustainability effects with the settlement hierarchy encapsulating the entirety of the Core Strategy and determines how the overall Vision will be delivered spatially. The key issues arising from the analysis of Policy CS1 against the SAOs are summarised below.

The settlement hierarchy represents a considered approach to addressing identified needs in Bassetlaw, as determined by the baseline data and the LDF evidence base². The majority of housing growth proposed under Policy CS1 will occur in the current most sustainable locations in the District, having regard to the relative capacity of each settlement and making best use of existing service provision and the area's transport infrastructure. Priority is given to redevelopment of brownfield sites where it is available, in order to minimise use of natural resources.

A wide spread of employment land provision ensures that a range of job opportunities will be secured across the District, including rural areas, while the wide distribution of development enables different areas to make use of the varying renewable and low carbon energy opportunities that exist across the District, in accordance with the Energy Opportunities Diagram³. The settlement hierarchy seeks to meet identified needs of and protect the intrinsic character of the rural villages, helping sustain their existing functions by allowing housing, employment and community facility development of an appropriate scale.

While some uncertainties exist (largely in the short-term) in relation to the deliverability of reductions in health inequalities and development of social capital, most development is focused in settlements already regarded as being able to cater for existing needs and future growth scenarios. Also, it is difficult to determine whether the types of development that emerge in the area will directly influence trends relating to community safety/fear of crime, or stimulate high-knowledge sector jobs or improve levels of qualification in the area.

Under the settlement hierarchy, development is promoted in locations that can sustain the existing population and future growth, although specific needs that may arise are considered in the Council's Infrastructure Capacity Study. Any identified

²

http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/services/planning__building/planning_policy/local_development_framework/background_studies.aspx

³ Bassetlaw Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study (Aecom, 2010)

needs will therefore be acknowledged in the Site Allocations DPD with phased delivery plans. Where urban extensions are required strong landscaping and green infrastructure enhancement schemes will be required to prevent harmful impacts on specific biodiversity assets and the overall character of the countryside. In addition, however, there may be scope for extension of public transport routes in these extended areas and creation of new routes to connect residential development with employment areas and local services.

The distribution of development in itself will not necessarily increase the overall volume of waste that is generated by households and businesses, although waste inevitably will increase at a rate relative to the increase in population that is anticipated over the lifespan of the DPD. Although Bassetlaw is only a collection authority, recycling is one of the key aims of the Community Strategy, therefore facilitating greater capacity for recycling has been factored in to the Development Management policies.

It is felt that the realistic and viable alternative approaches to the overall distribution of development in Bassetlaw were fully explored in the Issues and Options paper, and the subsequent SA and consultation responses indicate the identified settlement hierarchy as the preferred option and the most sustainable approach.

5.4 SA of Core Strategy Policies (Policies CS2 – CS9)

Core Strategy Policies:

- CS1: Settlement Hierarchy
- CS2: Worksop
- CS3: Retford
- CS4: Harworth Bircotes
- CS5: Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold
- CS6: Tuxford
- CS7: Misterton
- CS8: Rural Service Centres
- CS9: Other Settlements

Alternative Approaches Considered

The Core Strategy policies have been developed by considering the requirements of national and regional (prior to its being revoked) policy, the relative needs of each settlement in the various tiers of the settlement hierarchy and their capacity to accommodate the levels of housing and employment growth across the District. Setting these requirements against the evidence provided through background studies and the opinions expressed on each of the 'issues' from the Issues and Options paper has shaped the strands of each policy and provides what, subject to the outcome of the SA process, is considered to be the most sustainable and flexible way of delivering the Vision and Spatial Strategy.

Principle Urban Area – Policy CS2: Worksop

As the largest and most sustainable settlement in the District, Worksop is largely capable of meeting the immediate needs of new development in the short-term while, as the Principle Urban Area (formerly regarded as a Sub-Regional Centre, under the RSS) in Bassetlaw, has the capacity to accommodate significant long-term future growth and progresses the SAOs well, particularly in relation to housing, transport and employment.

Although some uncertainties exist in the short-term, the combined impacts of the various strands of the proposed policy will result in positive impacts in the longer-term. Until specific development sites are identified for large-scale housing development and employment uses it is difficult to determine the extent of impacts on natural resources, whilst the implications for enterprise and education remain unclear without knowing what kind of businesses will occupy these sites and the training/start-up opportunities that may arise as a result.

The overall impacts of this policy may be more prominent than in other parts of the District, given the level of growth proposed in a relatively small geographic area. However, the baseline data derived from background studies has provided a comprehensive picture of the capacity of Worksop to accommodate growth and as the appraisal of the policy indicates, the proposals for the town and its immediate environs should be deliverable in a sustainable manner.

Core Service Centre – Policy CS3: Retford

The policy for Retford makes positive progress on the SAOs on housing, employment, transport and the historic environment. The policy emphasises the need to sustain Retford in its role a Core Service Centre by maintaining the level of service provision in the town in proportion to the level of growth, although having regard for the numerous environmental assets that serve to constraint and subsequently limit the town's capacity. In light of this it is inevitable that some greenfield development will be required to meet the housing targets.

Transport and accessibility remain amongst Retford's key strengths as, despite the fact that the town is not as directly connected to the major road network as other settlements in the District, it is well-positioned to utilise the existing rail network, whilst much of the District's bus network converges on Retford bus station. This facilitates Retford's role as a service hub for the out-lying rural areas. The main uncertainties that have arisen through the SA process broadly relate to a lack of clarity on future uses.

Given the ratio of growth to the size of the town, as with Worksop, the impacts of the proposed policy appear to affect a more concentrated area. However, in preparing the Issues and Options, the PO and subsequent policy that has been derived from these, the likely sustainability effects of the proposed levels of growth were given full consideration – drawing on the key sustainability issues identified in the Scoping Report.

Main Regeneration Settlement – Policy CS4: Harworth Bircotes

The likely scale of growth and subsequent change the policy for Harworth Bircotes proposes is quite significant, however, this takes full account of the social, economic and environmental needs that exist and the regeneration opportunities that are available, given the close proximity of the A1, M18 and Robin Hood Airport Doncaster/Sheffield. The town's colliery also has a significant role to play in the future development of the area. Whether the colliery remains open or not, it is a significant opportunity site. The proposed levels of growth seek to maximise use of previously developed land to facilitate economic restructuring through large-scale investment and small business growth opportunities, in conjunction with improvements to the range and quality of housing in the area.

The SAOs are generally progressed significantly in the short and long-term, when set against the existing baseline for Harworth Bircotes. The cumulative effects of housing and employment growth are likely to have significant impacts on other issues such as service and retail provision, reduction of health inequalities, educational opportunities/ attainment and improvements to the natural environment, while prioritising use of brownfield land prior to development being permitted in other locations.

Given that the Harworth Bircotes area currently lacks green infrastructure assets of strategic importance to contribute to environmental quality, a more explicit commitment to improvements to the open space with sustainable management and connection to the wider green infrastructure network ensures the policy makes a positive contribution to SAO6.

Local Service Centres – Policies CS5/CS6/CS7: Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold, Tuxford and Misterton

The proposed policies for each of these settlements make positive contributions across the range of SAOs, recognising their limitations, but acknowledging their role and function as Local Service Centres in the wider context of the settlement hierarchy. In the long-term the policies for each settlement purport enhancement of services and facilities to sustain their role in proportion to the levels of growth.

Particular progress will be made in terms of housing and employment objectives, improving the range of accommodation and jobs in these areas and utilising the transport linkages to the larger centres. Positive progress is also made in terms of protecting and enhancing the historic environment, which is regarded as a key component of each settlement.

Uncertainties are generated with regard to the long-term impacts on natural resources when brownfield land supplies have been used up and also as to how energy efficiency measures will be implemented and alternative sources utilised. Loss of greenfield land will ultimately be limited by Development Management policies pertaining to development in the countryside and protection of green infrastructure, biodiversity and landscape character. Policy DM10 will provide enhancement measures for energy-related issues by directing development towards and supporting appropriate opportunities that facilitate compliance with Part-L of the Building Regulations.

Rural Service Centres – Policy CS8

The policy for these villages progresses the SAOs relating to the key needs of housing and community infrastructure, seeking to sustain them through development of key services and employment opportunities. Although these are generally small settlements, the number and spread of the villages is such that the geographic scale of the likely impacts will be more widespread than in other tiers of the settlement hierarchy.

The main enhancement opportunities lie in the need to limit losses of greenfield land to new development and to address drainage and water and energy supply for villages, particularly as large areas are currently off the gas grid. Harnessing developer contributions (DM11) will be critical in providing solutions in villages. Given the rural nature of the area transportation is a key issue, although it is acknowledged that it is difficult to reduce car dependency where growth and demand will be limited.

All Other Settlements – Policy CS9

This policy's emphasis is on protecting small settlements from inappropriate levels of development that would harm their specific character.

Housing growth is strictly limited, although positive progress is made on the SAOs for recreation, the natural and historic environment, natural resources, employment, and education and enterprise, insofar as the policy seeks to protect existing provision and enhance provision on a needs oriented basis. Although the policy would progress these objectives, uncertainties exist in relation to actual provision of social capital given the limited levels of growth proposed.

Although most development in will be restricted to more accessible areas, development that is permitted will largely be dependent on private car use. In more isolated rural areas it will be difficult to promote more sustainable forms of transport, although prioritising employment development that creates employment opportunities for local people could enhance this policy.

5.4 Development Management Policies

Development Management Policies:

- DM1: Rural Economic Development
- DM2: Conversion of Rural Buildings
- DM3: Development in the Countryside
- DM4: Design and Character
- DM5: Housing Mix and Density
- DM6: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
- DM7: Securing Economic Development
- DM8: The Historic Environment
- DM9: Green Infrastructure; Biodiversity and Geodiversity; Landscape; Open Space and Sports Facilities
- DM10: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy
- DM11: Developer Contributions
- DM12: Flood Risk, Sewerage and Drainage
- DM13: Sustainable Transport
- DM14: Ground Conditions and Land Stability

Policy DM1: Rural Economic Development

This policy broadly supports the development of the rural economy and businesses, acknowledging the need for existing enterprises to expand to maintain rural areas as viable places to live and work. A number of uncertainties do exist, however, with regard to the implementation of the policy. This is primarily due to the varied nature of rural economic development opportunities and the potential loss of greenfield sites to accommodate expanding enterprises, although these are generally subject to the unpredictable nature of the open market and it is impossible to predict what may come forward.

Policy DM2: Conversion of Rural Buildings

Given the very specific nature of this policy, a significant number of the SAOs incur a neutral score. However, with the exceptions of affordable housing schemes or in providing accommodation linked to economic development, prioritising re-use of existing buildings for economic purposes ensures this policy makes a long-term

positive contribution to furthering the SAO for employment uses, which in-turn can help protect buildings of historic and architectural merit. In the long-term, provision of affordable housing in rural areas can make a valuable contribution to meeting the needs of rural settlements. Where the criteria can be adequately met, the policy makes provision for permitting conversion of buildings for developing community services and facilities.

Conversion of existing buildings also has a positive impact on efforts to reduce consumption of raw materials, although the ability of converted buildings to accommodate energy efficiency and low carbon energy measures is questionable, while the visual impact of certain technologies may be incompatible with the historic character of some buildings.

Policy DM3: Development in the Countryside

This policy facilitates sustainable forms of development that can demonstrate the need to be located in a rural area, while restricting unsustainable expansion into the countryside. Where appropriate, provision is made for delivery of limited economic development and community services and facilities. The key area of uncertainty that has emerged in relation to the proposed policy is on transport and accessibility, as individual uses incur different levels of trip generation.

Policy DM4: Design and Character

While enhanced design quality potentially incurs long-term benefits for housing, recreation, accessibility of services and facilities and the historic environment, while helping design-out crime and anti-social behaviour, it is not strictly a policy that has measurable outcomes. Although no negative impacts on the SAOs have been identified when assessing the criteria of this policy, it is difficult to predict which features from the Building for Life standard developers will use on particular projects in order to achieve the overall standard. In addition, while appropriately located, good quality buildings can contribute to the attractiveness of specific locations to investors, it is only one of many factors involved in decision-making, therefore not possible to determine in this SA process.

Policy DM5: Housing Mix and Density

The policy sets strong criteria for housing development across the District and responds fully to the SAO. Housing mix and density that shows consideration for the surrounding environment can make positive contributions to the historic character of a locality, while higher densities, where appropriate, make more efficient use of land and resources, and facilitate better connectivity and accessibility.

Despite commitments to delivering a greater mix of housing types and tenures it is difficult to gauge the impact this will have on community cohesion and help reduce crime/fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. Any impacts that do occur will be likely to be as a result of employing measures from the 'Secured by Design' guidance and the cumulative influence of other policies and factors outside of the planning process. Uncertainty also exists in relation to the impact of the policy on renewable and low carbon energy as the density of development can determine the feasibility of different technologies.

Policy DM6: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People

A valuable contribution is made, by this policy, to meeting the housing needs of Bassetlaw's population. Locating transit and residential pitches in the right places can improve their long-term sustainability by giving good access to the road network and making public transport use feasible and improve access to services and facilities.

The policy initially stated that provision must be made for waste collection from sites, but did not specify measures to reduce waste or promote recycling. Given the unique circumstances associated with Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People sites, the policy has been amended to include this as an issue for more detailed consideration. While the nature of transit sites means that it is difficult for the policy to have much influence over use of renewable and low carbon energy, this could be emphasised as a matter for consideration for residential pitches.

Distinct conflict arises in relation to the location of pitches and the historic environment, as the visual impact of caravans is incompatible with sensitive historic assets. Policy DM8 will, however, generally limit development that may be harmful to the historic environment.

Policy DM7: Protecting Economic Development Land

The proposed policy for protection of employment-creating uses provides strong support for the SAOs for employment, enterprise and education, and provision of economic infrastructure. It supports the economic transition purported in the overall Vision, enhancing the range and diversity of jobs in the area, utilising the existing transport network and protects existing employment sites.

Numerous uncertainties exist in relation to this policy and the SAOs, largely due to the unpredictability of the type of employment uses that will come forward, particularly during the recession recovery. SAOs may be progressed if mixed-use schemes are permitted where economic uses can be demonstrated to be unviable on their own.

Policy DM8: The Historic Environment

Bassetlaw has a rich diversity of heritage assets that will be protected through implementation of the PO for Conservation and Built Heritage. The proposed policy acknowledges the inter-twined nature of the historic and natural environment and the supports appropriate enhancements to historic assets, which being inclusive of Conservation Areas, Scheduled Monuments and Parks and Gardens, can positively contribute to the range of recreational opportunities and encourage participation in cultural activities.

While the policy supports re-use of historic buildings for economic purposes, therefore contributing to reducing loss of greenfield sites, this largely depends on the open market's willingness to pursue this as an option which leaves a significant degree of uncertainty and is difficult to mitigate, at least through the planning system.

Negative impacts have arisen in relation to the energy SAO, as renewable and low carbon energy technologies such as solar, photovoltaics and wind turbines are all quite intrusive to the fabric of historic buildings and can therefore conflict with conservation objectives. These impacts appear to be largely unavoidable with present technologies, although this may change in the long-term.

Policy DM9: Green Infrastructure; Biodiversity; Landscape; Open Space and Sports Facilities

As a predominantly rural area, the impact of this PO on the natural environment is generally positive. It directly and indirectly enhances the SAOs by promoting healthy lifestyles, recreation, improvement of sports facilities, sustainable use of natural resources and protection of biodiversity and landscape character.

Some uncertainties are generated through green infrastructure policies having little impact on energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources, although sustainable woodland management can contribute to enhancing biomass resources in the area. Potential opportunities for green infrastructure/energy generation opportunities might be explored in conjunction with Site Allocations or Area Action Plans to enhance this policy.

The policy's impact on employment opportunities is uncertain as environmental improvements have no direct impact, although the secondary long-term effect may stimulate job opportunities in land management and tourism.

Policy DM10: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

Given the specific focus of this policy it has little impact on many of the SAOs. However, the policy makes a positive contribution to reducing energy demand and reliance on fossil fuels will help ensure protection and more prudent use of natural resources, while the policy also promoting sustainable building techniques and materials. Although fuel sources such as biomass may increase wood use, most operations seek to do so through use of short rotation coppice or sustainable woodland management.

Some uncertainties that are identified in relation to house prices and job creation, although there is significant potential to help diversify the economy of the area in the long-term, especially given introduction of statutory measures imposed through tightening Building Regulations. Conflict is apparent where the visual impact of renewable energy technologies may be incompatible with conservation principles and result in negative impacts on historic assets. While this may be unavoidable to a certain extent, DM8 will seek to mitigate negative impacts.

DM11: Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Provision

Securing developer contributions and infrastructure provision will help to progress a wide variety of SAO aims by delivering affordable housing; healthcare and recreation facilities; community services; enhancements to the natural and historic environment; natural resources loss and flood risk mitigation; improvements to the transport network; and enhanced educational facilities. The only real uncertainties that arise as a result of the proposed policy are the short-term impacts on crime and community safety, which are generally only affected through the cumulative positive impact of other policies, while the impact on energy efficiency and alternative sources depends on the level of priority it is attributed when compared to other areas of need.

Policy DM12: Flood Risk, Sewerage and Drainage

The main focus of this policy is to ensure prudent use of water resources and minimising flood risk to development occurring in the District, therefore makes a

strong positive impact on the SAO to preserve natural resources. The policy also seeks to improve the efficiency with which wastewater is dealt, thus achieving progress against the SAO for waste. Beyond these factors the proposed policy has little impact on other SAOs, given the specific nature of the issues it addresses. The main uncertainties that have arisen are in relation to use of SUDS, as clarity is still required on their adoption and long-term management. When these issues are resolved there will also be greater clarity over their use as multifunctional spaces.

Policy DM13: Sustainable Transport

It should be noted at the outset that sustainable transport measures are inherently more difficult to achieve in rural areas, however, in-line with the settlement hierarchy this policy will seek to ensure areas receiving greater levels of growth maximise opportunities for non-car based modes of transport. Enhancing connectivity within and between urban areas will promote walking and cycling as alternative modes and indirectly facilitate recreational opportunities. The proposed policy fully supports the aims of the SAO for transport and accessibility. While there are potential benefits for the natural environment associated with promoting a modal shift, with the likely levels of population growth within the District and surrounding area there will be an inevitable increase in traffic and congestion.

Policy DM14: Ground Conditions and Land Stability

Given the specific nature of this policy and its relatively limited application across the District, it is difficult to determine the extent its impact on the SAOs. No foreseeable impacts have been identified for many of the SAOs, although some uncertainties arise due to the unknown nature of conditions on individual sites. The uncertainties that have been identified with regard to housing, the natural environment and economic infrastructure can only really be assessed on a case-by-case basis, at the application stage.

5.5 Summary of Impacts

Following the SA the policies in the Core Strategy the potential long-term impacts have been summarised in visual form in order to give an indication of the overall sustainability of the DPD.

5.6 Mitigation Measures

In most instances where uncertainties and conflicts have arisen in the appraisal of the Core Strategy policies and Development Management policies, synergistic effects of individual policies have proved sufficient as means of mitigating direct and secondary impacts. The most prominent conflicts to have arisen and require direct mitigation occur in Core Strategy Policies CS2, CS3 and CS9, and also under Development Management Policies DM1, DM8, DM10 and DM13.

Figure 9: Long-term sustainability effects of the Core Strategy

Policy	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
CS2	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	✓	✗	—	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
CS3	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✗	—	?	✓✓	✓	?	✓
CS4	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	—	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
CS5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	?	—	?	✓	✓	?	✓
CS6	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	?	—	?	✓	✓	?	✓
CS7	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	?	—	?	✓	✓	?	✓
CS8	✓✓	?	✓	—	✓	✓	—	?	—	✓	—	✓	?	?
CS9	—	?	✓	—	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	✗	✓	✓	—
DM1	—	—	—	—	?	?	✓	✗	—	?	?	✓	✓	✓✓
DM2	✓	—	—	—	—	—	✓✓	✓	—	?	?	✓	—	✓
DM3	—	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	✓	—	?	?	✓	—	✓
DM4	—	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	—	✓	—	—	✓✓	✓✓	—	—	✓
DM5	✓✓	✓	—	✓	—	?	✓	?	—	?	✓	—	—	—
DM6	✓	✓	—	—	—	—	✗	✓	?	—	✓	—	—	—
DM7	?	—	—	—	?	?	—	—	?	?	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
DM8	—	—	✓	—	—	✓✓	✓✓	?	—	✗	—	✓	—	?
DM9	—	✓	✓✓	—	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	—	?	✓	?	—	?
DM10	?	—	—	—	—	—	✗	✓✓	?	✓✓	—	?	?	✓
DM11	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	?	?	✓✓	—	✓	?
DM12	—	—	?	—	—	✓	—	✓✓	✓	—	—	—	—	—
DM13	—	✓	✓	—	✓	✗	—	—	—	—	✓✓	—	—	✓
DM14	?	—	?	—	—	?	—	—	—	—	—	?	—	?

While most forms of development in ‘Other Settlements’ (CS9) in rural areas will generally be limited, transport and accessibility will be a significant issue for uses which do require a rural location and incur a high level of trip generation. Broadly speaking, such uses create a significant level of car dependency unless used predominantly by local residents. It should therefore be a requirement for all such permitted uses to develop Green Travel Plans and identify alternative transport solutions, using Developer Contributions where appropriate. Opportunities should be explored to enhancing green infrastructure connectivity between recreation sites.

There is a significant likelihood that new development in Worksop and Retford (CS2/3), along with rural economic development schemes, including farm diversification and agricultural/forestry-based development (DM1) will impact upon or result in loss of natural resources and particularly greenfield sites, given the specific locational requirements of such uses. While these policies makes provision to protect features of identified importance, it is inevitable that some greenfield sites will be lost as there is just not enough previously developed land in sustainable locations throughout Bassetlaw to accommodate the level of growth that is anticipated over the life of the development plan. Employing methods such as sustainable drainage and sustainable construction techniques on all sites is an aspiration of the DPD, although this stands out as being of paramount importance on greenfield sites to minimise

waste generation and surface runoff. Developers should be encouraged to engage with bodies such as Natural England to explore the feasibility of introducing Higher Level Stewardship schemes on rural-urban fringe sites to minimise impacts on wildlife. As in most cases, developers will be encouraged to engage in pre-application discussions with the Council to identify any arising issues that may require addressing under this policy.

Conflict is generated through proposals to introduce renewable and low carbon energy technologies (DM10) to new development and the need to protect the historic environment. To a certain extent these conflict may be regarded as unavoidable, although mitigation might be achieved through considering use of alternative technologies/methods of carbon reduction or seeking contributions towards other climate change mitigation measures. In the long-term likely impacts may be reduced as technology uptake leads to innovative ways of overcoming such obstacles, while clarification from the Government on measures such as 'allowable solutions'⁴ may also present viable ways of contributing to the carbon reduction measures in constrained area or on specific sites.

One of the key challenges in implementation of the policies will be to balance new housing and population growth with provision of employment. There is potential for cumulative benefits through the regeneration of smaller rural settlements, particularly former coalmining communities, where the population balance and out commuting level are leading to marginal economic viability for key services. Facilitating the 'economic transition', set out in the Vision, can help to prevent the District becoming a 'dormitory' for larger urban conurbations, to the west in particular. Synergies with policies seeking to deliver improved accessibility and improved services have the potential to enhance the wider health and well-being benefits of these communities.

Notably, the policies within the Core Strategy have insignificant or uncertain impacts on the SAO for waste. Given that Bassetlaw District Council is only a collection authority and not a waste management authority, the Nottinghamshire Waste and Minerals LDF will be the primary steer for addressing issues arising. However, in response to these SAOs and in the Council's responsibility to minimise waste by promoting recycling, it is important to consider ways of enhancing capacity in this area. In order to address this it will be important to ensure that new developments are designed with capacity to accommodate recycling banks that give sufficient turning space for collection wagons and limit operational noise intrusion through appropriate design features.

5.7 Assessing Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects

Secondary (or indirect) effects are effects that are not a direct result of a policy, but occur away from the original effect or as a result of a complex pathway. Cumulative effects occur where two or more insignificant impacts combine to form a significant impact. Synergistic effects occur as the result of interactions between individual effects producing a total effect greater than the sum of each of the individual effects. Secondary, cumulative or synergistic effects may be either positive or negative.

The secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects of the policies in the Core Strategy on the SAOs are summarized in Figure 10, below.

⁴ Definition of Zero Carbon Homes, Impact Assessment, DCLG (2009)

Figure 10: Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects of the Core Strategy

SA Objective	Potential Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Impacts
1. Housing	Beneficial, cumulative impacts of housing policies arise through focusing development primarily in areas where people have access to a range of services, facilities and employment opportunities. While these policies may restrict more extensive housing growth in smaller rural villages, the synergy of provision of affordable housing to meet local needs, as well as development in urban areas generating critical mass can help provide a greater range of social capital.
2. Health	The cumulative effect of policies that improve the range and accessibility of services and facilities, as part of new developments, will support the PPS1 aim for sustainable development based on a critical mass of centralised services. In addition, community regeneration policies and an improved housing stock in some of the District's more deprived areas will incur secondary benefits for the health residents.
3. Recreation	A positive cumulative effect should occur through provision of open spaces within each settlement, with the synergistic effect of enhanced connectivity of the green infrastructure resulting in recreational opportunity benefits for people and habitat growth for wildlife that is greater than the sum of the individual parts.
4. Community Safety and Crime	No cumulative impacts have been identified although, on the evidence of CABE's research on the effects of design, the secondary effects of design in new developments and improvements to housing and public realm in areas that currently suffer from high crime will help enhance community safety.
5. Social Capital	The collective impact of provision of community infrastructure through the Core Strategy policies will improve the overall accessibility of essential services and facilities, particularly in rural areas.
6. Natural Environment	The cumulative and synergistic effects of the Core Strategy policies and a number of the Development Management policies will protect and enhance existing natural assets and promote development of new features. This will incur positive benefits for both people and wildlife. Benefits for the District's biodiversity may include reversing the trend of habitat fragmentation that has been so prevalent in recent years. The Spatial Strategy's approach of prioritising development in and around existing settlements will ensure improved connectivity of green infrastructure features on the rural-urban fringe.
7. Historic Environment	The historic environment is broadly recognised as one of the District's most significant assets, therefore policies have been shaped so as to protect and enhance it. No cumulative or synergistic effects have been identified.
8. Natural Resources	It is likely that synergistic benefits will arise from distribution of development under the Core Strategy policies. The main benefits are likely to be gained in the District's towns and larger villages where the economics of improving public transport services and initiatives for non car-based movement to encourage a modal shift are likely to be most favourable, in terms of air quality impact. Conversely, however, this aspect of the DPD will also have a significant effect on loss of greenfield land, as there is insufficient brownfield land in Bassetlaw to accommodate the level of housing, employment and infrastructure needed to support the District's development needs. There is potential for both increased and reduced flood risk as a result of these policies. While development pressure in the District's town centers may result in indirect effects that increase flood risk to people, places and property,

	<p>guiding development into areas of low flood risk and the incorporation of flood management infrastructure, including green infrastructure will have positive impact on the objective.</p> <p>Negative secondary impacts potentially arise from increased volumes of traffic resulting in the need to expand the road network, to the detriment of greenfield land.</p>
9. Waste	<p>The proposed levels of growth in the District and cumulative effects of policies in the Core Strategy will be likely to result in a net increase in waste generation, particularly household waste. However, this DPD does not specifically address this issue as Bassetlaw is only a waste collection authority. Nottinghamshire County Council's Waste LDF will therefore address pertinent issues in more detail.</p>
10. Energy	<p>The cumulative effects of policies to protect the built and natural environment may restrict development of renewable energy technologies in certain locations around the District which has a secondary impacts in terms of the economies of scale that are achievable through larger schemes. However, the effect of objectives and policies that seek to promote energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources will have a beneficial, long-term cumulative effect.</p>
11. Transport and Accessibility	<p>Overall positive synergistic impact from policies that prioritise housing and employment growth in existing urban areas and larger villages, providing a range of services. Focusing development in these areas will help generate new public transport services by securing a critical mass. Secondary benefits may arise for more outlying areas as a result of this.</p>
12. Employment	<p>Long-term synergistic benefits will occur as a result of the Core Strategy policies, provided that suitable land becomes available to attract employment-creating opportunities. The cumulative effect of policies delivering a wide range of housing will contribute to generating a more diverse and potentially skilled workforce. In addition, secondary benefits of policies relating to renewable and low carbon energy generation and green infrastructure may generate job opportunities in these sectors, in the long-term.</p>
13. Enterprise and Education	<p>The synergistic effects of growth across the District will generate demand for provision of further educational facilities, particularly to the benefit of areas where community regeneration is needed. The cumulative effect of investing in schools and further education in the District will be to ensure the District has a better skilled workforce.</p>
14. Economic Infrastructure	<p>Long-term synergistic benefits will depend on the availability of suitable sites in appropriate locations to attract developers and employers in due course. While economic growth can occur from the protection of employment land and from diversification in rural areas, allowing mixed use schemes or release of employment land and suitable replacement can facilitate provision of more viable sites and/or stimulate conditions for growth.</p> <p>Secondary benefits may be derived from environmental and design policies creating a higher quality environment that is more attractive to investors.</p>

5.8 Changes to the Core Strategy

Following the assessment of the Publication Core Strategy, a number of changes have been made to the Strategic Objectives and Development Management policies that demonstrate the process of refinement of the DPD and the overall effectiveness of the SA process. These changes are summarised in the table below.

Figure 11: Significant Changes to the Core Strategy

Section of the DPD	Significant Changes	Reason for Changes
SO6	Incorporated the text: ' <i>... alongside sustainable design and construction;</i> '	Included in order that the Strategic Objective better reflects the criteria of SAO 10. Although there is adequate coverage of renewable and low carbon energy within the DPD, increased energy efficiency and energy demand reduction is a critical first step towards achieving a greater impact on the causes of climate change.
Policy DM1	The whole emphasis of this policy has been changed and reworded. In rewording the policy it became apparent that whilst the scale of such proposals should be appropriate to the location, proposals for farm diversification need not remain subsidiary to the farm itself as it is not the place of planning policy to restrict the size or potential of an enterprise.	Changed in order to ensure that it incorporates the wider facets of sustainable rural economic development, in-line with PPS4 and in recognition that the previous approach of 'farm diversification' was somewhat limited.
Policy DM4	Included the section from DM10, relating to CO2 reduction through design, within this policy. Included the text: ' <i>... allows adequate space for waste and recycling storage and collection;</i> '	Because this aspect of the policy is more closely related to the design of buildings it was felt that it would be better positioned within DM4, rather than DM10 whose emphasis is more on provision of renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure. Given the need to seek to reduce waste, provision of recycling facilities are essential. However, this incurs the need to provide sufficient space for collection and operation that does not impose on the amenity of other nearby uses.
Policy DM5	Removed housing density guidelines from section B of this policy.	Removed in order to comply with revised PPS3.
Policy DM9	Included reference to ongoing strategic green infrastructure projects within the locality/sub-region/region, stating that proposals will be considered favourably where they contribute to the further development of these projects. These projects include The Idle Valley Project, The Trent Vale Partnership and Sherwood Forest Regional Park.	This was included to ensure that green infrastructure is considered in its broader context and not limited to the Bassetlaw area.

5.9 Likely future state of the environment in the absence of the Core Strategy

Bassetlaw District Council has never had an adopted development plan with which to determine planning applications or co-ordinate growth. The ‘do nothing’ scenario has not been assessed as part of the SA as it is not considered a reasonable alternative, although consideration has been given to the likely effects of future growth on the SAOs in the absence of a development plan. These potential impacts are summarised in the table below.

Figure 12: Likely effects of the ‘do nothing’ scenario.

SA Objective	Potential implications of not having the Core Strategy
1. Housing	Without the Core Strategy it is likely that housing growth would occur on a sporadic, ad-hoc basis, in unsustainable locations. Housing provision would be market-led rather than plan-led therefore only delivering what will sell instead of what is actually needed. The current situation reflects this, where the type and tenure of housing available within the area does not meet the needs of existing or future residents.
2. Health	Although the extent to which the Core Strategy can directly contribute to healthcare provision and accessibility is limited, without an overarching steer for infrastructure development it will be difficult to co-ordinate provision of new facilities to meet the needs of new communities across the District.
3. Recreation	Without a co-ordinated approach to new development and supporting infrastructure (including open space), new communities will not have access to recreational facilities which has implications for health and well-being.
4. Community Safety and Crime	As with issues relating to health, the Core Strategy does not have direct control over people’s behaviour patterns and the subsequent outcomes. However, if better design policies are not implemented through the Core Strategy it will not be possible to ensure that measures such as ‘Secured by Design’ take effect in new housing developments or a broader mix of housing types contributes to greater community cohesion.
5. Social Capital	In the absence of a strategy for provision of services and community facilities, new housing developments and their residents will not have services needed to support their long-term needs.
6. Natural Environment	Protection and enhancement of the natural environment is a key feature of the Core Strategy. Without the policies that will be implemented through the Core Strategy there will be little in terms of policy weight for protection and enhancement of the natural environment in conjunction with new development, particularly for locally important wildlife sites and other environmental assets such as Ancient Woodland and Biodiversity Action Plan habitats that do not carry any statutory protection. Without the policies in the Core Strategy there would be continued fragmentation of key habitats within the District.
7. Historic Environment	Although protection and enhancement of the historic environment is not entirely dependent on policies within the Core Strategy it is given a significant level of local context and weight to local issues. Core Strategy policies flesh-out the guidance given at national level.
8. Natural Resources	While the Core Strategy offers clear support for reducing development on greenfield land there is insufficient previously developed land within Bassetlaw to meet the needs of housing and economic development. Where greenfield sites must be used to accommodate future growth, the Core Strategy seeks to locate it in the most sustainable locations in order to minimise the wider effects. Without the Core Strategy more greenfield development in less sustainable locations is likely to occur, while development may also have adverse impacts on water resources within the District.

9. Waste	Given that the Core Strategy does not directly address waste issues the likely impact of not having the DPD is difficult to discern. However, without the Core Strategy there would not be a framework to co-ordinate provision of infrastructure to meet the needs of waste management and collection from future developments.
10. Energy	Given that the policy in the Core Strategy does not set any additional requirements for energy production or carbon reduction, not having the Core Strategy would not incur any significant differences to provision of renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure. This policy simply adds local context to national guidance and Building Regulations by identifying the location and extent of local resources.
11. Transport and Accessibility	Without the proposed policy for transport and accessibility within the Core Strategy it would be more difficult to ensure that new developments are effectively integrated into the existing road network, while there would be no local emphasis on reducing the need to travel by car. Promoting a modal shift to public transport, walking and cycling, where appropriate, will contribute to enhancing the overall sustainable movement network in the longer term.
12. Employment	The likely outcome of future development without the Core Strategy would be for more market-led employment-creating development that would not necessarily secure the more value-added employment opportunities that are needed to progress the economic base of the District or generate higher income jobs. Without policies for economic development and provision of employment land, future development of business and industry would occur on a more ad-hoc basis.
13. Enterprise and Education	The Core Strategy will provide a framework for enhancing the appeal of Bassetlaw as an area for economic development and securing improvements to the educational and training opportunities within the area itself. The absence of policies to secure such gains for the District could result in continued lack of opportunity for residents of the area to increase their knowledge and skills, which incurs a knock-on effect for the type of businesses/employers/investors that are attracted to the area.
14. Economic Infrastructure	Economic development is key to securing a sustainable future for Bassetlaw. The Core Strategy seeks to provide a positive framework for the provision of land and infrastructure required to support modern economic development. Without such policies there is a danger that the west of the District, in particular, can develop as a dormitory settlement for the likes of Sheffield and Doncaster, where the towns and villages would not necessarily reap the benefits of increasing prosperity of its residents.

6. IMPLEMENTATION

6.1 Links to other tiers of plans and programmes

The Core Strategy must, like all of the Council's DPDs, be in general conformity with national planning policy and guidance.

The Core Strategy should also be read in conjunction with the Council's forthcoming DPDs and SPDs (please refer to the Council's Local Development Scheme available at:

http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/services/environment_and_planning/planning/planning_policy/local_development_framework/local_development_scheme.aspx

These will be fundamental to the implementation of the spatial policies it sets out.

Effort has also been made to link the Strategic Objectives of the Core Strategy with the aims of the Council's Community Strategy.

6.2 Proposals for monitoring

Guidance notes that the significant effects of the implementation of the policies in the LDF Core Strategy DPD must be monitored to identify any unforeseen adverse impacts and enable appropriate remedial action to be taken. This reporting process will be implemented (as far as possible) beginning with the AMR for 2010, although it should be noted that there may be some indicators that cannot be measured until the policy to which it relates is formally adopted.

In addition to the DPD indicators, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to produce an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), which will aid evaluation of progress being made towards delivering the spatial vision and objectives through the implementation of policies. The AMR includes 'Contextual, Core' and 'Local Output Indicators' that, along with the DPD indicators, provide the basis for any contingencies to be implemented or the need for a review to be undertaken. In order to enable effective reporting, a range of indicators have been identified to complement the objectives in the SA Framework and these will be monitored annually alongside those used for the AMR. Monitoring will be constantly reviewed in light of good practice guidance.

Section 6 of the Core Strategy 'Performance Indicators and Targets in Monitoring Framework' contains the monitoring proposals for the Publication Core Strategy. The monitoring proposals have been informed by the indicators set out in the SA Framework.

SA guidance indicates that whilst significant effects of Core Strategy policies must be monitored to identify any unforeseen adverse effects, so as to enable appropriate mitigation measures to be implemented, it is not necessary to monitor everything, or monitor any effects indefinitely. Monitoring will therefore be focused on significant sustainability effects that are deemed to indicate a likely breach of international, national or local legislation, recognised guidelines or standards, and/or result in irreversible damage (with a view to identifying trends before such damage is caused). Where uncertainties have been identified in the SA, monitoring would facilitate preventative or mitigation measures for issues of concern.

APPENDIX 1: COMPLIANCE WITH SEA DIRECTIVE

SEA Directive & Regulation Requirements	Report Section	Details
(a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.	Section 5	Sets out the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Bassetlaw District Council Core Strategy
	Section 3	Summarises the relationship with other plans and references the detailed review provided in Appendix 1 of the SA Scoping Report (Nov 2009)
(b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without the implementation of the plan or programme.	Section 3	Summarises the relevant baseline conditions for sustainability (including the state of relevant environmental aspects) in the Bassetlaw area. The information is set out in more detail in the SA Scoping Report (Nov 2009).
(c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.	Section 3	Where relevant and available this information is provided in the SA Scoping Report.
(d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directive 79/409/EEC ('Wild Birds' Directive) and 92/43/EEC ('Habitats' Directive).	Section 3	Summarises existing sustainability (including environmental problems) for the Bassetlaw area and references the SA Scoping Report (Nov 2009), where greater detail is given.
	Section 2	References the screening assessment for Natura 2000 sites in line with Habitats Regulations Assessment requirements.
(e) The environmental protection objectives established at International, Community or Member State level which are relevant to the plan or programmes and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation.	Section 3	Refers to the SA Scoping Report (Nov 2009) which provides the summary of objectives for sustainability in Bassetlaw (including environmental objectives) and are taken into account through the SA Framework used in this document.
(f) The likely significant effects on the environment,	Section 1 & 5	The likely effects are assessed in the matrices in the Appendices and summarised

SEA Directive & Regulation Requirements	Report Section	Details
including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors.	Appendix 2 & 3	in Section 5. The likely significant effects of the Core Strategy as it currently stands are set out Sections 1 and 5. These issues are also incorporated into the main Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Assessment Questions used as part of the Appraisal process.
(g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme.	Section 5 Appendix 3	Where potential significant adverse effects are predicted the SA has sought to provide suggestions for potential mitigations. These are provided in the appraisal matrices and summarised in Section 5.
(h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties encountered in compiling the required information.	Section 4 Appendix 2	Alternatives were considered as part of the POs by gauging opinion through consultation on the Issues and Options paper and assessing the impacts against the SA Framework.
	Section 2	Section 2 outlines the difficulties and uncertainties that relate to compiling information for the SA.
(i) A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10.	Sections 3 & 6	Monitoring information is set out in Section 6, while the SA Framework sets out indicators that will be used in the Annual Monitoring Report to monitor the progress of the policies against the SAOs.
(j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings.	Section 1	Provides a non-technical summary.

APPENDIX 2: SA MATRICES OF SPATIAL VISION AND COMPATIBILITY ANALYSIS OF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

KEY

Compatible	✓
Neutral/No Impact	—
Incompatible	✗
Uncertain Impact	?

A Vision for Bassetlaw

Over the next 15 years, Bassetlaw will progress through a period of economic transition, as it successfully positions itself as a well-connected, attractive and good value area in which to live, work and learn. Through the provision of a wider range of jobs and services in its larger centres, the conservation and enhancement of its environmental and heritage assets, the continued regeneration of key opportunity sites and the delivery of necessary infrastructure, Bassetlaw will establish its reputation as an area that can offer a high quality of life for all of its residents, including a reduction in health inequalities across the District and the development of safer communities.

As the largest settlement in Bassetlaw, Worksop will build on its role as the District's principal urban centre. Its older employment sites will be regenerated, encouraging opportunities for indigenous growth, and new business locations will be established, taking advantage of the town's good connections to the strategic road network. High-quality housing developments, supported by an appropriate range of community facilities, will benefit from town centre retail and leisure investment. Opportunities will be taken to enhance the Chesterfield Canal 'corridor' and Bridge Street, through redevelopment of opportunity sites, and to enhance key assets including Worksop Priory and the Canch town park.

Retford will continue to provide an attractive range of homes and a good concentration of services and facilities, allowing it to maintain its role in supporting surrounding rural communities without compromising its market town character. Development in Retford will, therefore, protect the town's retail and service role, delivering growth of a scale that respects the town's heritage assets and, where appropriate, supporting the increased use of the Chesterfield Canal.

Harworth Bircotes, the District's third largest settlement, will grow further as a key focus for local employment, with the regeneration of the Harworth Colliery site resulting in a well-integrated development that contributes to a significantly improved range of housing in the town, along with an enhanced town centre. Further employment opportunities will be established around the town, taking advantage of the A1 corridor.

Beyond these three key settlements, opportunities will be taken to strengthen the service role of the larger villages across the District. Development opportunities in Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold will see support for the regeneration of the former coal mining areas of western Bassetlaw. Growth in Tuxford will seek to realise its potential as a key local centre, building on its existing employment provision, excellent range of facilities and good access to larger towns nearby. Improvements to its village centre environment will increase its attractiveness to local residents and those of surrounding villages, as a place for leisure and shopping. Misterton will maintain its role as the key rural community centre in eastern Bassetlaw, attracting and maintaining a range of services and facilities to support both its own residents and those of surrounding villages.

The character of Bassetlaw's many attractive villages and hamlets, as well as its pleasant and varied landscapes, will be conserved, with small-scale development aimed at supporting affordable housing and the enhancement or maintenance of local service provision. Support for rural businesses, and appropriate farm diversification schemes, will ensure that the economy of these rural areas continues to evolve. Future development will deliver strong improvements in all aspects of design quality, as well as ensuring that opportunities are taken to regenerate the District's historic environment, particularly in the centre of Worksop, Retford and Tuxford. We will also ensure that opportunities for the greater use of renewable and low carbon energy sources, and the use of energy efficient building methods, are realised, along with opportunities for mitigating or adapting to climate change.

By 2026, Bassetlaw will have become an increasingly popular place in which to live and invest, with ongoing improvements to the quality of life for Bassetlaw's citizens and environment.

SA Objective	Potential Impact	Comments
1. Housing	✓	The Vision specifically aims to ensure that Bassetlaw remains a 'good value' area in which to live, in the long-term providing a range of housing to meet the needs of new and existing residents in urban and rural areas.
2. Health	✓	This objective is supported by the overall sustainable development principle of focusing higher levels of growth in existing service centres and the aspiration to provide and maintain a range of services and facilities (including healthcare, where appropriate) that support the wider local area. In addition, the Vision specifically targets enhanced connection of new development to the District's green infrastructure network, thus increasing opportunities for physical activity.
3. Recreation	✓	The Vision incorporates the aspiration of a well-connected area with accessible services and facilities (inclusive of recreation and leisure), protecting areas and features of recognised importance and regenerating former coalmining areas.
4. Community Safety and Crime	?	Safe and crime-free communities are considered to be integral aspects of achieving a high quality of life for all residents in Bassetlaw and while the Vision commits to delivering improvements in design quality, this alone cannot secure positive progress on this objective and its indicators.
5. Social Capital	✓	Accessibility of services and increased engagement in community activity is implicit in the Vision's aim to achieve a high quality of life and ensure Bassetlaw remains a sustainable and desirable place for people to live and work. The Vision and subsequent spatial policies support proportionate development of social capital for each tier of the settlement hierarchy.
6. Biodiversity	✓	Protection and enhancement of the District's landscape and environmental assets are key features of the Vision – acknowledging the contribution they make to the character and setting of individual settlements.
7. Historic Environment	✓	The Vision specifically references cultural and historic assets, and landscape character as making a strong contribution to the District as a whole and to individual settlements, purporting sympathetic design and recognising the contribution of green infrastructure as means of protecting and enhancing townscape character.
8. Natural Resources	✓	The Vision itself supports this objective through the overall distribution of development; by seeking to deliver improvements to the quality of the natural environment, avoiding development in areas that are at risk from flooding, while guiding a range of policies within the Core Strategy that will conserve natural resources. Take-up of opportunities to utilise renewable and low carbon energy sources represent more efficient use of energy.

		and minimising associated waste.
9. Waste	—	Although the proposed Vision seeks to maximise resource efficiency through the overall distribution of development, this, in itself, will not necessarily minimise waste.
10. Energy	✓	The Vision aspires to progress this objective through integration of renewable and low carbon energy technologies in new development and to utilise the opportunities available within the District through the appropriate distribution of development.
11. Transport	✓	The Vision makes specific reference to the influence of the existing transport infrastructure and sets the spatial strategy to maximise locational benefits for sustainable future growth of settlements. The Vision incorporates these connections to establish the district as a favoured area for inward investment in the wider Sheffield City Region.
12. Employment	✓	From the outset, the Vision states its intention of making Bassetlaw a well-connected, attractive and good value area in which to work; prioritising regeneration of opportunity sites, utilising the area's transport linkages, targeting provision of employment opportunities with housing growth in existing towns and other sustainable locations, and supporting sustainable employment opportunities in rural areas.
13. Enterprise and Education	✓	The Vision incorporates the desire for Bassetlaw to benefit from inward investment in the wider Sheffield City Region, particularly in western Bassetlaw with its proximity to the Sheffield-Doncaster-Rotherham conurbations, thus drawing more knowledge intensive jobs to the area.
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	A clear emphasis on the need to provide the necessary infrastructure to support the District's growth and targets provision of land for economic development in the most sustainable settlements and other strategic locations.

Strategic Objectives

Core Strategy Objective		Sustainability Appraisal Objective													
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	To provide a range of high-quality market and affordable houses in Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes, Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold, Tuxford, Misterton and sustainable rural settlements (as identified in the Settlement Hierarchy) to meet the diverse needs of Bassetlaw's growing population.	✓	✓	✓	—	✓	×	—	—	×	—	✓	—	—	—
2	To provide a range and choice of employment sites in Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes (including the A1 corridor), Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold and Tuxford.	—	—	—	—	—	×	—	?	?	—	✓	✓	?	✓
3	To prioritise the community regeneration opportunities available in Harworth Bircotes, Misterton and Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold by developing brownfield sites in these settlements in advance of greenfield allocations.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	✓
4	To enhance and protect the vitality and viability of the centres of Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes and Tuxford, through environmental improvements and provision of increased town centre retail, employment and leisure development.	—	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	?	—	—	?	✓	✓	—	✓
5	To ensure the continued viability of Bassetlaw's rural settlements through the protection, and enhancement in the levels,	—	—	—	—	✓	×	?	—	—	—	✓	✓	✓	✓

Core Strategy Objective		Sustainability Appraisal Objective													
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	of local services and facilities and support for enterprises requiring a rural location.														
6	To ensure that all new development addresses the effects of climate change by, as appropriate, reducing or mitigating flood risk; realising opportunities to utilise renewable and low carbon energy sources and/or infrastructure, alongside sustainable design and construction; taking opportunities to achieve sustainable transport solutions; and making use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.	?	—	✓	—	—	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	—	?
7	To ensure that all new development enhances the attractiveness and local distinctiveness of the area and, where appropriate, achieves its full potential against national and local design standards.	✓	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	—
8	To protect Bassetlaw's natural environment by maintaining, conserving and enhancing its characteristic landscapes, biodiversity, habitats and species and seeking quantitative and qualitative growth in the green infrastructure network across and beyond the District.	—	✓	✓	—	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	—	—	—	—	×
9	To protect and enhance Bassetlaw's heritage assets, identify those of local significance, advance characterisation and understanding of heritage asset significance, reduce the number of heritage	—	—	✓	—	?	✓	✓	×	—	×	—	—	—	?

Core Strategy Objective	Sustainability Appraisal Objective													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
assets at risk and ensure that development is managed in a way that sustains or enhances the significance of heritage assets and their setting.														

Summary of Key Incompatibilities and Uncertainties:

SAO 1: To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Bassetlaw

- Impact of climate change mitigation and utilising renewable and low carbon energy sources on cost/ affordability of new homes.

SAO 5: To promote and support the development and growth of social capital across the District

- The following wording was added to Objective 3 to improve its score against this SAO: *‘Providing regeneration opportunities for communities ... thus seeking to improve the quality of life in former coalmining areas with identified needs’*

SAO 6: To protect the natural environment and increase biodiversity levels across the District

- Insufficient brownfield land to meet the 60% target creates conflict between housing land provision biodiversity protection.
- Employment land provision on greenfield sites.
- Redevelopment of naturally regenerated brownfield sites can result in loss of species that do not occur in other locations.
- Pollution (i.e. surface runoff/poor air quality) from operational use.
- Provision of community facilities outside settlement boundaries resulting in loss of greenfield sites.

SAO 7: To protect and enhance the historic built environment and cultural heritage assets in Bassetlaw

- Given the level of new development that is required, there is potential for negative impacts on historic assets, particularly in terms of appearance, particularly in town centres.
- Visual impact of renewable energy technologies can result in negative impacts on character and settings of historic buildings and other assets.

SAO 8: To protect and manage prudently the natural resources of the District including water, air quality, soils and minerals

- Not all housing requirements can be met on previously developed land, requiring employment-creating development on greenfield sites.
- Difficulty in determining the likely effects on air quality and conservation of water resources without knowing what types of development will come forward.

- Protection of the historic environment may take precedence over the protection of natural resources – restricting use of more sustainable building materials or reduced density of development.

SAO 9: To minimise waste and increase the re-use and re-cycling of waste materials

- Increasing overall development assumes that there will be an increase in waste.
- Potential to utilise waste to generate energy.
- Potential for waste-intensive uses occupy employment sites.

SAO 10: To minimise energy usage and to develop Bassetlaw's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources

- It is not possible to judge the impact vitality and viability enhancements of Bassetlaw's town centres will have on energy use without knowing the specific details of development types that will help achieve this objective. Much depends on market forces.
- Principles relating to conservation of the historic environment may restrict progress against this SAO in some parts of the District.

SAO 13: To develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation

- Employment land provision alone cannot stimulate high knowledge sector job creation or increased level of qualifications.

SAO 14: To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure, including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies

- Sustainable transport and energy generation options may not be feasible in some locations, while flood risk may prohibit development in areas where other locational benefits exist.
- Conflicts of interest with regard to nature conservation agenda and provision of employment land and associated infrastructure in sustainable locations, particularly on the edges of existing towns.
- Sensitive historic assets can restrict land supply but also support economic development through re-use of historic buildings, for economic development.

APPENDIX 3: SA MATRICES OF SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY, CORE STRATEGY POLICIES AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

KEY

Strong positive impact	✓✓
Positive impact	✓
Neutral/No Impact	—
Negative impact	×
Strong negative impact	××
Uncertain impact	?
Short-term potential impact	S
Long-term potential impact	L

Spatial Strategy – CS1: Settlement Hierarchy

Summary

This option has been developed as a combination of Options 1 – 3 and incorporates the comments received during consultation on the Issues and Options Paper (2009). It proposes the distribution of development across Bassetlaw using a tiered hierarchy of grouped settlements, endeavouring to provide a spread of development across the District to address both rural and urban needs. It proposes Worksop, as the District's Principle Urban Area, to be the focus for major housing and employment development and town centre growth, with Retford as a Core Service Centre and Harworth/Bircotes as a major regeneration priority. Both these settlements would be a focus for large-scale housing, employment and town centre developments to maintain and enhance their current roles. Appropriate levels of growth will be apportioned to help to the Local Service Centres of Carlton-in-Lindrick, Langold, Tuxford and Misterton maintain their roles, with an emphasis on Brownfield regeneration for the two settlements in the west of the District.

SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Mitigation/Enhancement
	S	L		
1. Housing	✓✓	✓✓	Although the main focus for housing will primarily occur in existing centres, this option makes provision for needs-based housing to be provided in a wider range of settlements than previously proposed. Such distribution of housing will have a strong positive impact in terms of meeting housing needs. This option still ensures that housing can be delivered at higher densities where appropriate and seeks to maximise the brownfield land available in the west of the District.	In former coalmining settlements to the west of the District, release and development of brownfield sites will be prioritised above development of other sites and other locations. Site Allocations DPD, informed by SHLAA, will ensure a range of sites in appropriate locations. SO1, SO7, DM5
2. Health	?	✓	Policy does not explicitly reference health inequality reduction, although the emphasis of the PO is on locating development in sustainable locations and sustaining and enhancing their functions. Regeneration of areas of recognised need can have a positive indirect impact in terms of health of residents through provision of better housing and improving leisure facilities and opportunities in these centres.	DM11 Infrastructure provision to be set out in Site Allocations DPD, as identified through needs assessment.
3. Recreation	✓	✓	Maintaining and enhancing the role of existing service centres along with requirements for open space will facilitate better recreational opportunities on a broader scale, in accordance with the settlement hierarchy	SO4, DM9, DM11

			proposal.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	?	✓	The proposed spatial strategy is unlikely to have a direct impact on community safety, although, in the longer term, development and regeneration of existing settlements across the District may contribute to a safer built environment through removal of unsightly derelict sites, particularly in former industrial areas.	DM11 The cumulative impact of individual developments will help increase a greater sense of place and foster community cohesion.
5. Social Capital	?	✓	Although there is some uncertainty about this policy's influence on the accessibility of community services in the shorter-term, this approach offers potential for improvement by meeting needs in rural areas and regenerating other areas of identified need and deprivation.	In the long-term, improved accessibility and provision of community services and facilities should occur on a scale proportionate to the levels of growth in individual settlements or between clusters of smaller rural settlements.
6. Biodiversity	✓	✓	The policy proposes growth in areas with greater brownfield land availability and subsequently seeks to avoid extensive development in rural areas. However, the policy also acknowledges the need for some urban extensions which will result in loss of some greenfield sites.	Impact generally depends on location/proximity of development to features of identified importance. Guided by Policy <i>DM9</i> and the Bassetlaw Green Infrastructure Study, areas identified for urban extensions will avoid sites of recognised biodiversity importance and seek enhancement of the natural environment in the immediate environs of new development sites.
7. Historic Environment	—	✓	No significant impact is likely as the location of development will be in accordance with the capacity of each settlement and have regard for features of recognised importance. Well-designed developments may contribute positively to the townscape of existing settlements.	SO7, SO9, DM3, DM7
8. Natural Resources	?	?	Although development will not be permitted in areas at high risk of flooding, the impact of this policy on other natural resources is uncertain.	SO3, SO6, DM Flood Risk, Sewerage and Drainage Understanding of the area and issues affecting future development, derived from the evidence base, will seek to ensure minimal impact on natural resources, although the Spatial Strategy could make more explicit reference to this.
9. Waste	—	—	While it is accepted that any growth will involve increased waste generation, the spatial distribution of future growth is unlikely to have significant effects on the overall volume.	Waste Management will be addressed in the Nottinghamshire County Council Waste and Minerals LDF. All new development must make provision for recycling facilities (DM4) and developer contributions may be sought

				to increase the Council's collection capacity. Enhancing the quality of the public realm and built environment (SO3, SO4, SO7, DM4) can influence residents' perception and sense of pride, which may indirectly help reduce the amount litter dropped.
10. Energy	?	✓	No significant direct impact is likely to occur as a result of this policy, although the density of new development and specific locations may lend themselves to use of particular renewable technologies and low carbon fuel sources. The response of development in relation to this objective relies largely on the long-term responses to changing building regulation requirements. New development will ultimately be forced to utilise the renewable energy sources of the locality in the future.	Incremental changes to Building Regulations will require all new development to integrate renewable and low carbon energy sources. Bassetlaw Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study informs Policy DM10 and SO6. The Energy Opportunities Map sets out the distribution of energy sources in the area. Consider opportunities for co-locating developments to utilise waste heat.
11. Transport	✓	✓✓	The proposed settlement hierarchy seeks to ensure new development is located in areas that are accessible by means other than private car, concentrating housing and employment growth largely in the same areas, which are those with an already well-established transport infrastructure.	Potential for more definitive commitments to sustainable transport infrastructure that prioritise sustainable approaches. Locating most development in areas with the greatest range of services will contribute reducing car dependency.
12. Employment	✓	✓✓	The proposed settlement hierarchy supports this objective by providing a range of employment opportunities in settlements across the District to both maintain and enhance their current position and to make the most of individual settlement's locational benefits.	SO2, SO3, SO4, SO5, DM7, Site Allocations DPD
13. Enterprise and Education	?	✓	There is uncertainty over the extent to which the proposed settlement hierarchy supports this objective, as the provision of employment land in various locations across the District cannot necessarily guarantee attracting high knowledge sector industry, despite the locational benefits of some parts of the District. However, enhancement of educational facilities will be a key part of the long-term regeneration of the District's key settlements.	DM11
14. Economic	✓	✓	The settlement hierarchy will deliver a range of land and	SO2, SO3, SO5

Infrastructure			building types across the District that will support a greater diversity of jobs in Bassetlaw.	Make use of previously developed land, particularly former employment/industrial sites with existing infrastructure provision.
----------------	--	--	--	--

Principle Urban Area: Policy CS2 – Worksop

SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	✓✓	✓✓	The policy supports the objective of ensuring the housing stock meets the housing needs of Bassetlaw by providing 32% (approximately 1400 homes) of the Council's residual housing target within Worksop. Such a figure represents a substantial opportunity to deliver a range of types and tenures, also the need to provide a significant amount of affordable housing to meet needs within the town and surrounding area.	
2. Health	✓	✓	Ensuring Worksop's growth as a Sub-Regional Centre requires improvements in both quality and quantity of housing, leisure and community facilities and the built/natural environment; all of which, in combination, make a positive contribution to improving the health of the town's residents. Continued growth of the town will act as a driver to increase the range of healthcare facilities.	SO4, DM4 Worksop is already regarded as having a good level of service provision and services should continue to develop in proportion to growth.
3. Recreation	✓	✓	The Policy progresses the SAO by seeking enhancement of the natural environment and public realm through pursuing regeneration of key environmental and cultural heritage assets in the town.	SO8, SO9, DM3, DM8
4. Community Safety and Crime	?	✓	Regeneration and enhancement of public spaces and the town centre can contribute to a more secure environment in the long-term. While evidence exists to suggest that in the long-term good design has a positive impact on creating a safer built environment however, it is difficult to quantify the extent of the impact on variables such as behaviour, particularly in the short-term.	SO4, DM3
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	The policy commits to focusing a large proportion of the District's overall growth in relatively close proximity to the greatest concentration of services and facilities which contribute to	SO4, DM4

			Worksop's status as a Sub-Regional Centre. The policy is supportive of proposals that would help sustaining a growing population, including in the identified 'Local Centres' that serve the more peripheral parts of the town.	
6. Biodiversity	—	—	The policy has a neutral impact on biodiversity due to the fact that it supports enhancement of the natural environment through emphasis on improvements to existing parks and the canal corridor, however, some development on Greenfield sites is inevitable, given the level of proposed for the town.	SO4, SO6, SO8, SO9, DM9 Although this policy itself does not actively protect biodiversity, the above objectives and policy prioritise protection of green infrastructure for its intrinsic value.
7. Historic Environment	—	✓	Worksop has numerous heritage assets in and around the town – some of which may be affected by large-scale growth, despite aspirations to protect the built environment. However, specific focus is placed upon enhancement of the main thoroughfares in the town centre and to the Worksop Priory.	SO4, SO9, DM2, DM3, DM8
8. Natural Resources	✗	✗	Until the locations of specific types of development are identified, the impact of development on natural resources is uncertain. To a certain extent, the impact of development alongside the River Ryton and the Chesterfield Canal can only be determined on a case-by-case basis. While this policy has must be regarded alongside the flood risk and drainage policy, there is potential for the cumulative effect of new development river catchment areas to contribute to increased surface runoff, thus affecting water quality. Similarly, a growing population will result in greater volumes of traffic and greenfield housing development contributing to loss of soils.	SO6, DM2, DM4, DM8, DM10 All types of development specific in this policy will be subject to the criteria of relevant Development Management policies. Specific mitigation briefs for Greenfield sites in Site Allocations DPD. More specific reference to the role of new infrastructure in meeting this objective. In town centre, specific issues to be addressed with the Environment Agency.
9. Waste	—	—	Although increased growth will result in a net increase in waste generation (particularly household waste) in the short and long-term, the policy has no significant influence on the ability of individual households to reduce the amounts of waste generated or to increase recycling.	Waste management will be addressed in the Nottinghamshire County Council Waste and Minerals LDF. All new development must make provision for recycling facilities (DM4) and developer contributions may be sought to increase the Council's collection capacity.
10. Energy	?	✓	While this policy does not directly support the SAO, concentrating high levels of growth in Worksop can, in the long-term, generate a wider range of opportunities to introduce renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure such as increasing the feasibility for	SO6, DM4, DM10 Tightening Building Regulations will be the catalyst for progressing this SAO in the long-term.

			introducing district heating systems to new and existing developments (densities permitting).	
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓✓	✓✓	Locating the greatest proportion of the District's housing and employment needs in Worksop increases opportunities to utilise the existing transport infrastructure and potentially reduces the need for private car use due to the close proximity of such a range of services and facilities.	DM13
12. Employment	?	✓✓	This policy furthers the objective to create a range of high quality employment opportunities by seeking to enhance both the quality and quantity of land available for such uses in the town, as well as making provision for leisure and retail needs. Meeting these needs will make a strong contribution towards sustaining the town in its role as a Sub-Regional Centre, although short-term uncertainty exists while the market re-establishes itself.	SO2, SO4, DM5 Flexibility of employment uses. Allocating sites that make best use of the transport infrastructure and raising the skills of workers in the area are key to attracting more value-added employment.
13. Enterprise and Education	✓	✓	The policy supports the development of educational and research facilities at the North Nottinghamshire College, which is a key stakeholder and means of providing residents and employees with the skills needed for enterprise and innovation. In addition, provision of suitable employment land in the town will be a catalyst for attracting high-knowledge industry.	SO2, SO4, SO7, DM4, DM5 Suitable site allocations will help attract more specific types of investment facilitate more business start-up.
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	✓✓	The combined impact of the various elements of this policy reflect that which is stated in the Vision for the District as a whole and strives to position Worksop as a competitive, viable centre for employment, providing sufficient land and infrastructure to support economic growth.	

Core Service Centre: Policy CS3 – Retford

SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	✓✓	✓✓	The policy for Retford proposes 26% of the District's residual housing target, with a sizeable proportion of family-sized affordable housing units to meet local needs – thus making a significant contribution towards meeting this objective.	

2. Health	✓	✓	The policy aims to sustain Retford as a Core Service Centre and maintain a level of services and facilities proportionate to the scale of development occurring in the town.	SO8, DM4, DM8
3. Recreation	✓	✓	The regeneration aspirations of the policy for Retford include provision of a Marina along the Chesterfield Canal and enhancement of the town's historic market square – both of which support this objective's emphasis on recreation and cultural heritage improvements. Open space and play facility provision are also highlighted as particular needs in the town.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	?	✓	The contribution of housing and employment development and enhancement of public spaces and the town centre can contribute to a more secure environment in the long-term. While evidence exists to suggest that in the long-term good design has a positive impact on creating a safer built environment however, it is difficult to quantify the extent of the impact on variables such as behaviour in the short-term.	SO4, SO7, DM2, DM3
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	Given that the policy looks to sustain the town's role as a Core Service Centre it does not directly progress this objective, although in the long-term and in conjunction with wider housing and employment growth, levels of service provision should occur at a proportionate rate.	DM4, DM11 Developer contributions to provide identified community needs.
6. Biodiversity	✓	✓	Retford is relatively constrained with a number of sensitive environmental assets in close proximity to the town. The policy specifically acknowledges the need to protect and enhance the town's natural environment.	SO7, SO8, DM7, DM9 Targeted green infrastructure provision in association with housing development will enhance existing assets.
7. Historic Environment	✓	✓✓	Protection and enhancement of the historic character of Retford is one of the key requirements of the policy, given that it is such a strong feature of the town. The policy identifies the Market Square and its wider environs as being of notable significance in achieving this.	SO9, DM5, DM8 The level of housing growth in different locations around Retford will be required to be consistent with local character.
8. Natural Resources	✗	✗	While this policy acknowledges the sensitivity of the natural environment around Retford, it is likely that the growth proposed for the town will incur negative impacts for this SAO. Potential negative impacts largely depend on the specific location of development. Growth/development in wider river catchment areas	Although this policy has a negative impact on the SAO when considered in isolation the criteria in the DM policies will limit or mitigate as necessary on a case-by-case basis.

			can contribute to increased surface runoff which affects water quality; a growing population will result in greater volumes of traffic; and urban extensions will result in greenfield housing development contributing to loss of soils.	
9. Waste	—	—	Although increased growth will result in a net increase in waste generation, the policy has no significant influence on the ability of individual households to reduce the amounts of waste generated or to increase recycling.	Waste management will be addressed in the Nottinghamshire County Council Waste and Minerals LDF. All new development must make provision for recycling facilities (DM4) and developer contributions may be sought to increase the Council's collection capacity.
10. Energy	?	?	The level of development this policy proposes for Retford may make certain renewable and low carbon energy technologies feasible, depending on the location, density and impact on the historic character of the area.	SO6, DM4, DM10 Tightening Buildings Regulations will prompt greater uptake of low carbon energy.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓✓	✓✓	The services provided in Retford that contribute to the town's role as a Core Service Centre include the existing transport infrastructure, with the town acting as a hub for many of the out-lying villages in the rural-east of the District. Locating further housing and employment growth in Retford will help reduce the number of journeys undertaken by car and facilitate residents' use of alternative modes of transport. The town has good external accessibility beyond the District boundaries, due to the close proximity to the A1 and being located on the East Coast Mainline.	
12. Employment	✓	✓	While the policy for Retford largely seeks sustain the town in its current role, emphasis is placed on increasing the range of employment opportunities in the town.	SO2, SO4, DM5
13. Enterprise and Education	✓	?	Although the policy makes no explicit reference to this SAO criteria, sustaining Retford's role as a Core Service Centre requires proportionate growth of facilities.	SO7, DM4, DM5 Success of the new Enterprise Park will serve as an indicator of ability to stimulate high-knowledge industry in the area.
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	✓	The policy's commitment to providing 20% of the District's employment land growth target in Retford significantly contributes to this objective, as well as making retail provision of an appropriate scale, to support the diversity of jobs available.	

Main Regeneration Settlement: Policy CS4 – Harworth Bircotes				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	✓✓	✓✓	The proposed scale of housing development for Harworth Bircotes, relative to the current size of the settlement is significant. Improvements to overall quality of the housing stock and diversification of the range of housing will help ensure a more mixed community.	
2. Health	✓	✓✓	Connectivity of new development to the existing centre and associated services is a key target. Although new health facilities have recently been provided in the settlement, policy specifies provision of facilities necessary to support a new community, including open space. Given the scale of proposals enhancement will be more evident in the long-term.	SO3 Accessibility of open space and recreational opportunities must be prioritised to contribute to improved health of community residents – acknowledge the influence of green infrastructure.
3. Recreation	✓✓	✓✓	Although Harworth Bircotes may be regarded as a relatively green settlement it currently has a strategic green infrastructure and open space deficit, therefore the policy makes a commitment to providing new open space, leisure and play facilities.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	✓	Targeted improvements of the public realm within new and existing communities, and in the town centre will contribute to a greater sense of community cohesion, with the built form of new developments seeking to design-out anti-social behaviour. Given the current position of Harworth Bircotes it is expected that the benefits derived from new development will have a positive long-term impact.	SO3, SO4, SO7, SO8, DM4 New development being built to higher standards of design will help create safer communities.
5. Social Capital	✓	✓✓	Makes a positive contribution to the SAO by promoting provision of facilities both necessary to support and proportionate to new development. Phased delivery of development will see growth of facilities over the long-term. Mixed housing development will broaden the demographic of the area and contribute a more diverse community.	Site Allocations DPD, SO3, Ensure new developments are connected to and integrated with the existing community to avoid 'us & them' scenarios. Design schemes must overcome physical barriers to access.
6. Biodiversity	?	✓	Current strategic green infrastructure and subsequent biodiversity deficit will take time to overcome and establish features of	DM9 Long-term site management and species introduction

			interest.	may be required. Regeneration of spoil tips (as seen elsewhere in the County) can be a significant opportunity for improving the quality of the natural environment and overall landscape character. Landscape Character Assessment indicates need to 'create', therefore sensitively deal with legacy of coalmining.
7. Historic Environment	?	✓	Short-term uncertainty may exist in transitional stage from coal mining heritage to redevelopment of the colliery site, although long-term benefits can be derived from strong design policies.	SO9 Efforts must be made to retain reference to cultural heritage and appropriate redevelopment of industrial sites to generate a positive legacy.
8. Natural Resources	✓✓	✓	Short-term impacts perceived to be more positive as redevelopment of brownfield land is prioritised above redevelopment of other sites in the area. Remediation of the colliery site will contribute to reduction of contaminated land.	
9. Waste	✓	—	Short-term positive impact derived if resource intensive coal mining activity ends.	Waste management will be addressed in the Nottinghamshire County Council Waste and Minerals LDF. All new development must make provision for recycling facilities (DM4) and developer contributions may be sought to increase the Council's collection capacity.
10. Energy	?	✓	Decentralised and renewable energy opportunities may become feasible in Harworth Bircotes in the long-term. Influence of tightening Building Regulations to impact long-term need to implement carbon-reduction measures and utilise sources identified through Energy Opportunities Diagram.	SO6 Coalmine methane supply and opportunities should be explored for use in Harworth and co-location of buildings on mixed-use sites.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓	✓	Harworth is well positioned in terms of access to the road network and with close access to RHADS. The policy targets connectivity of new development with the existing town and transport improvements, where necessary.	DM13
12. Employment	✓	✓	The policy proposes 35% of the District's employment land requirements to be located in Harworth Bircotes and targets a greater range of jobs to be provided in the area, making provision for large-scale investment and for smaller businesses to grow.	SO2, SO3, DM7
13. Enterprise and Education	✓	✓✓	Education is highlighted as one of the main needs and a regeneration opportunity in the town. This will be integral to	.

			securing the long-term sustainability of the area. Specific emphasis is given to the support of smaller businesses, enabling them to establish themselves and grow. This is key to the restructuring of the local economy.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	✓✓	Redevelopment of the colliery site aims to attract investment and provide a range of opportunities for businesses that should make a positive contribution to the SAO and restructuring of the local economy. Benefits derived from the town's position on the transport network will support development of other economic infrastructure.	SO2, SO3, DM11

Local Service Centres: Policy CS5, CS6, CS7 – Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold, Tuxford and Misterton				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	✓	✓	The policies recognise the need to deliver a range of housing that proportionate to the function and capacity of each settlement to meet the needs of the various communities that exist in these areas and sustain their existing roles in the future.	SO1, SO3, DM2 Housing delivery should be phased to ensure affordable housing needs are met across the plan period and not delivered after market housing.
2. Health	✓	✓	Each settlement has some form of healthcare facility or is in close proximity. Policies support provision of community facilities, subject to demonstrable need and relative to the scale of growth.	SO3, SO8, DM4, DM8
3. Recreation	✓	✓	Green infrastructure, open space and play facility provision are highlighted as key areas for supporting community growth.	Green infrastructure provision and enhancements will be integral to delivery of sustainable housing developments.
4. Community Safety and Crime	✓	✓	Although the direct impact of these policies on this objective may be difficult to define, regeneration of previously developed sites will remove derelict buildings that are of risk to the community and redundant sites that attract antisocial behaviour. The long-term effects of sustained redevelopment of redundant land will enhance community cohesion and improve the quality of the public realm.	SO3, SO7, DM4
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	Policies commit to providing community infrastructure to meet identified needs, thereby sustaining settlement roles. Improving the range of services, facilities and open space in and around the	DM11 Developer contributions to assist in provision of community infrastructure.

			local centres in these settlements will help nurture greater involvement in community activity.	
6. Biodiversity	✓✓	✓	Prioritises redevelopment of brownfield sites before Greenfield developments are permitted.	<i>SO3, SO7, SO8, DM9</i> Enhance green infrastructure in line with Green Infrastructure study findings. Seek developer contributions for enhancement around Tuxford as this is an area of environmental quality deficit.
7. Historic Environment	✓✓	✓✓	Development required to comply with guidance given in Conservation Area appraisals, while specific enhancement of Tuxford is targeted in the policy, making strong positive contributions to the objective.	
8. Natural Resources	✓	?	Commitment to brownfield development priority will minimise greenfield site losses in short to medium-term, although types of development and subsequent impacts are uncertain in the long-term.	
9. Waste	—	—	No significant effect on this objective.	Waste management will be addressed in the Nottinghamshire County Council Waste and Minerals LDF. All new development must make provision for recycling facilities (DM4) and developer contributions may be sought to increase the Council's collection capacity.
10. Energy	—	?	No significant effects are likely as a result of these policies. Housing densities and heat demand are most likely to be insufficient to utilise district heating. However Tuxford is off the gas grid, therefore renewable and low carbon energy options may be pursued to meet Building Regulation requirements.	<i>SO6, DM10</i> Explore feasibility of alternative energy sources for meeting future energy demand in these settlements.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓	✓	Local Service Centres already provide a certain level of accessibility by public transport and road linkages. Enhancements will be made proportionately to levels of growth, to sustain the settlements' roles, although due to their predominantly rural nature, the trend of out-commuting and car dependency is unlikely to be reversed.	<i>SO1, SO2, SO6, DM4</i>
12. Employment	✓	✓	Allocating some employment development in these areas will support a wider variety of local jobs and support restructuring of the local economy.	<i>Site Allocations DPD, SO2, SO3, DM5</i>

13. Enterprise and Education	?	?	It is difficult to determine the extent to which these policies will further this SAO, although generally supportive of enterprise proposals insofar as the objectives identified in PPS4, for sustainable rural development.	SO2, SO3, DM5 Provision of starter-units on Employment Land Allocations
14. Economic Infrastructure	—	✓	Allocating land and supporting local employment development in these locations will contribute positively to the objective, in the long-term.	Such areas need to offer something different to what is available in larger towns.

Rural Service Centres: Policy CS8				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	✓	✓✓	Settlements share a proportion of the overall housing target for the District, while the policy supports provision of specific levels of affordable housing in particular villages, based on identified need. Other residential development is intended to ensure the continued viability of local employment and community facilities.	<i>Site Allocations DPD, SO5, DM5</i> Ensure appropriate mix of housing in villages to maintain rural areas' viability for local workers
2. Health	—	?	Although the policy supports this objective by promoting access to services, provision of healthcare services is not specified, whilst there is uncertainty about the provision of such services in these areas above more accessible parts of the District.	<i>SO5, SO8, DM9, DM11</i>
3. Recreation	✓	✓	Supportive of provision of rural services and facilities and seeks to protect against loss. Where loss occurs, policy stipulates that provision of equal of better quality will be made.	<i>SO8, DM9</i>
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	Although the cumulative effect of the policy will contribute to enhanced community cohesion and quality of rural settlements it is not anticipated that the PO will directly influence this objective.	
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	Provision of rural community services and facilities will be supported where they are of a scale appropriate to, and accord with the role of, the village. Existing services will be protected.	
6. Biodiversity	?	✓	Although there is potential for some developments to result in loss of biodiversity through development in rural areas, development is generally restricted to land within settlement boundaries unless no alternative sites exist. Green infrastructure enhancements may be	Developments to have regard for green infrastructure network constraints, needs and opportunities.

			delivered in conjunction with development schemes.	
7. Historic Environment	—	—	No direct impact on the historic environment.	Where development proposals will result in impacts on identified heritage assets they will be required to be assessed against design-related policies, which should ensure a positive impact, protecting the rural character of settlements.
8. Natural Resources	?	?	Development in villages should generally be guided by constraints set out in SFRA and Water Cycle Strategy. Development in the countryside, outside settlement boundaries, resulting in loss of soils and greenfield sites will be restricted, with priority being given to sites that lie within settlement boundaries.	No development should occur in areas at risk of flooding when reasonable alternatives exist elsewhere.
9. Waste	—	—	No significant direct impact on this objective can be derived from the proposed policy.	Waste management will be addressed in the Nottinghamshire County Council Waste and Minerals LDF. All new development must make provision for recycling facilities (DM4) and developer contributions may be sought to increase the Council's collection capacity.
10. Energy	?	✓	The level of development this policy proposes for Rural Service Centres may make certain renewable and low carbon energy technologies feasible, depending on the location, density and impact on the character of the area. Building Regulations requirements will influence long-term progress on the SAO.	<i>DM10</i> External influence of tightening Building Regulations will force uptake of alternative energy technologies. Options should be explored for villages, particularly those off the gas grid.
11. Transport and Accessibility	—	—	Rural Service Centres are identified as settlements with public transport provision and a range of other services, although the nature of such areas and the suggested levels of growth are such that improved services will only be proportionate to the growth and limited opportunities exist for reducing car dependency.	<i>SO6, DM13</i>
12. Employment	✓	✓	In line with national policy, developments which deliver rural employment opportunities, of a scale and type appropriate to the settlement and neighbouring land uses, will be permitted.	
13. Enterprise and Education	—	?	The policy supports developments that will help sustain continued local employment and services and facilities. While enterprise and innovation in rural areas will be supported in line with national policy, no specific provision is made under this policy that specifically advances this SAO.	

14. Economic Infrastructure	—	?	While employment uses of an appropriate scale will be permitted in Rural Service Centres, no further allocations are to be made. As such, the policy's ability to deliver this objective is uncertain.	<i>DM7</i> Under the above policy all existing or former vacant employment sites will be protected for uses within the B use class.
-----------------------------	---	---	--	--

Other Settlements: Policy CS9				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	The restrictions imposed on residential development mean that residential development must be located in more sustainable and accessible areas.	
2. Health	—	?	Uncertain impact in the long-term. These settlements are generally dependent upon services provided in other settlements, although existing community services will be protected from development that would result in loss. Healthcare facilities will generally be located in more sustainable locations in order to make them more accessible to a greater number of people.	<i>SO5, DM11</i>
3. Recreation	✓	✓	Open space will be both protected and provided, being regarded as having an important role as a community facility in smaller villages around the District.	<i>SO5, SO8, DM9, DM11</i>
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No likely significant impact on this objective given the nature of rural settlements and development proposals.	
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	Despite the restrictions on residential developments in these areas, provision of rural community services and facilities will be supported where they are of a scale appropriate to, and accord with the role of, the settlement, while loss of sites will be restricted.	<i>SO5, DM11</i>
6. Biodiversity	✓	✓	Limited development will secure the long-term protection of biodiversity and landscape character.	
7. Historic Environment	✓	✓	Restrictions on new development in these settlements will make a positive contribution to this objective.	<i>DM4, DM8</i> The combined effect of this along with other policies

				relating to design and protection of the historic environment.
8. Natural Resources	✓	✓	The restrictive nature of this policy makes a strong positive contribution to the protection of natural resources.	SO6 Given the locational criteria to be applied to such settlements no development should be permitted in flood risk areas.
9. Waste	—	✓	While no significant direct impact on this objective can be derived from the proposed policy, reduced levels of development in more isolated rural settlements will limit the amount of additional waste that is generated.	
10. Energy	—	—	The policy has no direct influence on energy efficiency or use of renewable or low carbon energy and level of development is such that energy schemes selected to meet Building Regulations requirements will be unlikely to go beyond the scale of individual units.	SO6, DM10 Explore sustainable energy options for more isolated settlements, particularly those off the gas grid.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✗	✗	Although most development in such areas will be restricted to more accessible areas that which is permitted will largely be dependent on private car use.	SO5, SO6 Support uses which provide employment opportunities for local residents. Promote community transport schemes such as those identified in the Local Strategic Partnership's transport and accessibility action plan (car sharing, dial-a-ride).
12. Employment	✓	✓	Developments which deliver rural employment opportunities, of a scale and type appropriate to the settlement and neighbouring land uses will help meet local employment needs.	
13. Enterprise and Education	✓	✓	The policy supports development that will help ensure the continued viability of local employment. In line with national policy, enterprise and innovation in rural areas will be supported.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	—	—	No specific provision or allocation of land is made for employment-creating development in these settlements.	

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

Policy DM1: Rural Economic Development				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	Policy is of no relevance to this objective.	
2. Health	—	—	Policy is of no relevance to this objective.	
3. Recreation	—	—	Although rural economic development may provide recreational facilities these will not necessarily be publicly accessible, therefore this policy is not considered to be directly relevant to this objective.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No significant impact.	
5. Social Capital	?	?	Policy has the potential to have a positive impact on the SAO where rural economic development delivers services that could contribute to the vitality and viability of rural centres. The level of impact is uncertain as it is dependent on market and individual enterprises to bring proposals forward.	
6. Natural Environment	?	?	Although the policy restricts uses that would exacerbate environmental problems, potential conflicts may arise between agricultural uses and wildlife conservation.	Promote uptake of Natural England's Higher Level Stewardship schemes amongst landowners. This would indirectly make a positive contribution to green infrastructure.
7. Historic Environment	✓	✓	Where new development occurs the policy promotes scale, form and designs that are compatible with the existing character of the surrounding area.	SO9, DM4, DM8
8. Natural Resources	✗	✗	As former agricultural land is classified as greenfield, any agricultural related development, rural economic development or diversification of farms will result in loss of greenfield sites may be unavoidable.	SO8 Promote HLS schemes, sustainable drainage and use of sustainable materials in construction of agricultural buildings

9. Waste	—	—	No direct impact.	
10. Energy	?	?	The impact of this policy on this SAO depends on the number of proposals that come forward. However, where new buildings are required to fulfil rural economic development roles or for agricultural/forestry purposes, renewable and low carbon energy sources may be required for compliance with Building Regulations.	<i>DM10</i>
11. Transport and Accessibility	—	?	The predominantly rural nature of most developments likely to be affected by this policy means that it is unlikely that they will enhance existing transport infrastructure. Conversely, however, agricultural/forestry development or forms of rural economic development may result in reducing the overall need for travel by car in rural areas and seeks to avoid exacerbation of highway safety problems.	Other policies, primarily under the Spatial Strategy, seek to ensure uses that attract higher visitor numbers are located in more sustainable locations and/or linked to existing uses.
12. Employment	✓	✓	Policy is supportive of enhancement of existing agricultural enterprises and development of the rural economy through farm diversification, provided that development does not result adverse impacts on vitality and viability of existing rural services and centres.	<i>SO5, CS7, CS8, DM2, DM3</i>
13. Enterprise and Education	?	✓	Long-term impact of a favourable approach to rural economic development will provide a framework for ensuring flexibility and adaptability of traditional rural enterprise, whilst also allowing for more innovative uses of land in rural areas.	<i>SO5, DM11</i>
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	✓✓	Allowing for farm diversification and provision of new agricultural infrastructure makes a positive contribution to provision of land and buildings for rural economic development. This is to the benefit of local people and will help sustain rural areas as viable places to live and work.	<i>SO5, DM7</i>

Policy DM2: Conversion of Rural Buildings

SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		

1. Housing	—	✓	The number of conversions and overall scale of housing provision made through conversions is such that the contribution to housing needs is negligible, however, the emphasis on support for affordable housing will make a contribution in the longer term towards provision of affordable housing in rural areas.	
2. Health	—	—	Policy is of no relevance to this SAO.	
3. Recreation	—	—	Policy is of no relevance to this SAO.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	Policy is of no relevance to this SAO.	
5. Social Capital	—	—	The impact of this policy is unlikely to be significant on this SAO because although it supports conversion of rural buildings for appropriate economic uses and in doing so seeks to restrict negative impacts it does not enhance or improve access to/satisfaction with existing community services.	
6. Natural Environment	—	—	Although this policy generally would not result in loss of biodiversity	Protected species (i.e. bats) surveys must be undertaken.
7. Historic Environment	✓✓	✓✓	Makes a strong commitment to retention of features of architectural and historic interest in order to avoid compromising historic value. Includes use of complementary materials.	
8. Natural Resources	✓	✓	Minimises use of raw materials by minimising construction and reduces loss of greenfield development sites.	
9. Waste	—	—	No impact on the SAO.	
10. Energy	?	?	The ability of converted buildings to accommodate energy efficiency and low carbon energy measures is questionable, while the visual impact of certain technologies may be incompatible with the historic character of many buildings.	Provide guidance on appropriate technologies for use in converted buildings.
11. Transport and Accessibility	—	?	Impact on this SAO is largely dependent on the type of development and the level of trip generation associated with it.	DM11

12. Employment	✓	✓	Supports conversion of existing buildings for economic uses above conversion for residential use as it is widely regarded that in the case of agricultural buildings, maintaining use as close to that which is as close to the original use as possible involves less intrusion into the fabric of the building.	SO5
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	No impact on the SAO.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	?	✓	There is a degree of short-term uncertainty over the impact of this policy, although once established will provide a framework for supporting rural business development.	

Policy DM3: Development in the Countryside				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	This policy is broadly an exceptions policy. The impact of housing delivery in rural areas will be negligible given that residential development will only be on a small scale and only permitted where economic uses can be demonstrated to be unviable.	
2. Health	—	—	Development in the countryside will generally have poorer accessibility of healthcare facilities than in more sustainable locations, hence it will be minimised through the suite of Core policies.	
3. Recreation	—	—	No direct impact on this objective. Although the policy supports green infrastructure enhancement or recreational uses requiring a rural location, it is not possible to determine the level of accessibility and subsequent benefit to rural communities at this stage.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No direct relevance to this SAO.	

5. Social Capital	✓	✓	This policy has potential to have a positive, albeit limited impact on provision of community facilities where need can be demonstrated.	
6. Natural Environment	✓	✓	Restricts expansion onto greenfield sites and promotes restoration and natural regeneration of brownfield sites. Green infrastructure enhancement is promoted along with positive landscaping is promoted that supports the landscape character of the area.	<i>SO8, DM9</i> Under the above policy proposals should demonstrate how they avoid or mitigate any impacts on features of interest. Promote pre-application discussion with relevant parties will be key.
7. Historic Environment	—	—	No direct impact.	<i>DM8</i> Assessment against this policy will ensure development in the countryside does not harm the setting of identified heritage assets.
8. Natural Resources	✓	✓	Policy restricts development on greenfield sites only to that which can be demonstrated to be necessary in a rural location.	<i>DM9, DM12</i>
9. Waste	—	—	No direct impact.	
10. Energy	?	?	The uncertainty of the impact of this policy on the SAO relates to the potential for rural areas being the most appropriate locations for some types of renewable energy infrastructure. Where it can be demonstrated, subject to the criteria of other policies in this DPD, that such developments will not have an adverse effect on the character of the area and any features of identified importance, rural areas may the greatest opportunity for renewable and low carbon energy generation schemes.	
11. Transport and Accessibility	?	?	The impact of the policy on this objective is dependent on the types of development and the level of associated road use. The subsequent impacts can only be assessed on a case-by-case basis.	<i>DM11, DM13</i>
12. Employment	✓	✓	Policy supports replacement and development of buildings for business, equine and other rural economy uses where it can be demonstrated that such locations are the most appropriate for the operational needs.	
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	No impact on this objective.	

14. Economic Infrastructure	?	✓	While there is a degree of short-term uncertainty over the impact of this policy, once established it will provide a framework for supporting rural business development.	S05, DM1, DM3
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---------------

Policy DM4: Design and Character				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	Although the policy may have positive effects on the overall quality of new housing development it does not directly relate to the SAO criteria in terms of housing provision.	
2. Health	—	✓	The implications of this policy for health and reductions of health inequalities are largely indirect, insofar as improvements to accessibility.	S07, S08
3. Recreation	✓	✓	The policy's emphasis on consideration of design features such as layout, form, connectivity and accessibility can all contribute positively to resident's ability to participate in recreation, while Building for Life purports integration of locally distinctive culture which can promote wider engagement in cultural activity.	DM9
4. Community Safety and Crime	✓	✓	Design cannot eradicate crime alone and the benefits difficult to quantify, there is an increasing body of evidence to support the notion that the effect of linking well-designed places together can be to improve community safety by removing features that give rise to anti-social behaviour.	DM11 Development proposals should have regard to 'Secured by Design' guidance.
5. Social Capital	✓	✓✓	Enhanced accessibility of services and facilities through location, layout, connectivity and public realm improvements can, in the long-term, foster greater engagement in community activity.	
6. Natural Environment	—	—	Given that design issues are only considered if the principle of a development is compatible with locational criteria for protecting sites of recognised biodiversity significance, the policy cannot be regarded as having a direct impact on the quality of the natural environment or biodiversity.	

7. Historic Environment	✓	✓	Although new development is likely to have some impact on the setting of historic assets, this policy makes a strong commitment respecting and complementing features of recognised importance and seeks to enhance overall townscape character.	DM8
8. Natural Resources	—	—	Although over the long-term the general principle of this policy seeks to make more efficient use of land, it is considered that the policy does not have a significant impact on the criteria of this objective.	
9. Waste	—	—	This policy has no direct impact on this objective.	
10. Energy	✓	✓✓	This policy promotes increased efficiency of new development, which in-line with tightening Building Regulations, will increase over time.	Enhanced by DM10 – policy cites direct reference to this. Tightening Building Regulations pushes carbon reduction agenda forward.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓✓	✓✓	The policy emphasises the significance of accessibility, while the Building for Life criteria, for major developments, makes specific reference to integrating new development into existing transport networks. In combination with the distribution of development set out in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, this policy will have positive long-term impact on the objective.	
12. Employment	—	—	Design issues have no direct impact on this objective.	
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	Design issues have no direct impact on this objective.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	✓	Providing high quality buildings that are well connected to the surrounding area is a significant aspect of providing the physical conditions for growth of the modern economy. This policy goes some way to meeting this objective.	

Policy DM5: Housing Mix and Density

SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		

1. Housing	✓✓	✓✓	Sets strong criteria for housing development across the District and responds fully to the SAO.	
2. Health	?	✓	Limited contribution to the SAO – although supports provision of specialist accommodation and accommodation for the elderly.	
3. Recreation	—	—	No direct impact.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	?	✓	Creating communities that comprise a greater mix of housing types and tenure will help foster a greater level of community cohesion. A greater mix of housing could promote increasing engagement and interaction between different groups and reduce the potential for crime.	SO7 Development proposals should have regard to ‘Secured by Design’ guidance.
5. Social Capital	—	—	As this policy only affects the mix and density of houses available and does not impact on community accessibility issues it has limited impact on this SAO.	In-line with the Spatial Strategy, delivering housing in the most sustainable locations will ensure people have access to and opportunity to engage in community activity and facilities.
6. Natural Environment	?	?	Pursuing higher densities in appropriate locations, such as brownfield sites, may help avoid the need to develop on greenfield sites. However, the scale on which this will occur cannot be determined at this stage.	<i>Site Allocations DPD</i>
7. Historic Environment	✓	✓	Policy responds to local character and sensitivity by delivering densities appropriate to the locality.	<i>SO9, DM8</i>
8. Natural Resources	?	?	The impact of this policy is uncertain. While support for higher densities, where appropriate, makes more efficient use of land, greater levels of development will generally increase impacts on natural resources.	
9. Waste	—	—	No significant effect on SAO.	
10. Energy	?	?	Higher density development of specific sites can make alternative energy options feasible, although such opportunities cannot be determined at this stage.	<i>Site Allocations DPD, SO6, DM10</i> Use Energy Opportunities Map to explore feasibility of energy options and potential targets for strategic sites.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓	✓	Policy supports higher density development in areas with good access to public transport, while housing schemes within higher density mixed developments, in accordance with the settlement	

			hierarchy, can reduce car dependency.	
12. Employment	—	—	Policy bears no relation to this SAO.	
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	Policy bears no relation to this SAO.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	—	—	Policy bears no relation to this SAO.	

Policy DM6: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	✓	✓	Meeting the needs of these communities is a vital part of meeting the housing needs of Bassetlaw's population.	
2. Health	✓	✓	The policy seeks to locate residential pitches in sustainable locations, in accordance with the spatial strategy, in order that residents have ready access to healthcare facilities and therefore reduce health inequalities amongst the Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Show People communities.	
3. Recreation	—	—	Although the policy and development of sites/pitches will not necessarily contribute to open space provision, locating Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People in locations where services already exist will increase their ability to access them.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	The policy has no direct impact on this objective.	
5. Social Capital	—	—	Although the policy and development of sites/pitches will not necessarily promote the growth of social capital, locating Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People in locations where services already exist will increase their ability to access them.	

6. Natural Environment	—	—	Given that site selection is generally required to conform to the settlement hierarchy and criteria for provision of land for housing, including appropriate screening, this policy should have no direct impact on the natural environment or landscape character.	
7. Historic Environment	×	×	While the policy does specify that boundary treatment measures will be imposed to mitigate any visual impacts, the appearance and character of caravans cannot be regarded as being congruent with the historic built environment.	<i>DM8</i> minimises impacts.
8. Natural Resources	✓	✓	This policy specifically states the need for sites to be located in areas that are not at risk of flooding and restricts business uses that would give rise to air/noise pollution or harm features of biodiversity interest.	
9. Waste	?	?	The policy states that provision must be made for waste collection from sites, but does not specify measures to reduce waste or promote recycling.	Wording could be amended to make provision for the unique circumstances of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People sites.
10. Energy	—	—	Given the nature and use of such sites and accommodation it is not possible to influence the SAO criteria.	Potential to consider the provision/incorporation of small-scale renewable energy sources at permanent sites to reduce environmental impacts.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓	✓	Locating accommodation in or adjacent to identified service centres aims to ensure travelling communities have access to and make use of the existing transport infrastructure and suitable parking and turning areas while minimising car dependency in accessing services and facilities.	
12. Employment	—	—	No direct impact.	
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	No direct impact.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	—	—	No direct impact.	

Policy DM7: Securing Economic Development				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	?	?	This policy has little impact on housing provision, although does make provision for release of employment land for other uses, potentially including housing development, where it can be demonstrated that no employment uses are viable.	<i>DM4, DM5</i>
2. Health	—	—	Policy has no direct impact on health or the reduction of health inequalities.	
3. Recreation	—	—	No direct impact.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No direct impact.	
5. Social Capital	?	?	The impact of this policy on provision of social capital is uncertain, given that provision of community facilities is only made where other employment-creating uses can be demonstrated to be unviable.	
6. Natural Environment	?	?	Protecting existing employment land can reduce the need for employment land elsewhere, thus limiting impact on biodiversity, although a secondary negative impact may arise where release of allocated sites for other uses leads to redevelopment of greenfield sites for employment land.	
7. Historic Environment	—	—	No direct impact.	
8. Natural Resources	—	—	No direct impact.	<i>Site Allocations DPD</i> Employment land developed to accord with environmental capacity and constraints.
9. Waste	—	?	Long-term impact is uncertain given that policy is land-based and future uses are not known.	
10. Energy	?	?	Utilisation of alternative energy sources depends on location of each site.	Enhanced by <i>DM10</i> . Promote co-location of uses to utilise waste heat

				sources.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓	✓	Sites that are identified as being worthy of retention as employment land are generally those that are located in sustainable locations and therefore make good use of the existing transport network.	<i>Site Allocations DPD</i>
12. Employment	✓✓	✓✓	The policy seeks to retain existing land accommodating employment uses that offer the greatest level of long-term sustainability and marketability for a range of high value-added employment-creating opportunities. However, the policy also incorporates sufficient flexibility to respond to the needs and demands of the market and a growing population.	
13. Enterprise and Education	✓	✓	It is stated in the policy that support will be given to proposals that seek to harness the educational and research facilities of the North Nottinghamshire College. In addition, aspirations are set out to help provide opportunities for workforce training and development, and providing employment allocations that offer business starter units or opportunities for small/medium-sized enterprises.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	✓✓	The policy meets this objective by protecting employment land in the most sustainable locations across the District that is capable of providing for and sustaining modern business/industry.	

Policy DM8: The Historic Environment

SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	Although this policy would require a higher standard of design in housing developments that may affect the setting of historic assets, the overall impact on the range and affordability of housing in the District is likely to be negligible.	
2. Health	—	—	No direct impact.	
3. Recreation	✓	✓	The proposed policy supports appropriate enhancements to historic assets, which being inclusive of Conservation Areas,	

			Scheduled Monuments and Parks and Gardens, can positively contribute to the range of recreational opportunities and encourage participation in cultural activities.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	Protection of the District's built heritage is unlikely to have any significant effect on crime levels and community safety.	
5. Social Capital	—	—	No direct impact.	
6. Natural Environment	✓	✓✓	Protection and enhancement of assets such as Parks and Gardens and Scheduled Monuments can both directly and indirectly contribute positively to this objective, as these often contain prominent landscape character features and significant biodiversity assets. Protection of trees in Conservation Areas make a positive contribution to the urban environment.	
7. Historic Environment	✓✓	✓✓	The proposed policy makes a strong positive contribution to this SAO by seeking to secure the long-term future of Bassetlaw's historic assets.	
8. Natural Resources	?	?	The policy has some potential for negative and positive impacts on this objective. Re-use of existing buildings limits use of raw materials, however, the overall level of re-use cannot be determined, while conservation principles can restrict building densities in some sensitive areas. In some instances, use of more sustainable building materials may be restricted (such as double/triple glazing and prefabricated, high insulation materials) where it would affect the setting of listed buildings.	Potential conflicts may be unavoidable.
9. Waste	—	—	Conservation of built heritage does not have any significant impact on waste generation.	
10. Energy	✗	✗	Protecting the fabric of historic buildings can override and prohibit measures that Building Regulations seek to impose to improve energy efficiency, while sensitive building settings can place restrictions on the introduction of certain renewable energy technologies.	Unavoidable.
11. Transport and Accessibility	—	—	No direct impact.	

12. Employment	✓	✓	The policy makes allowances for re-use of historic buildings for appropriate business uses, where it is the optimum viable use.	
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	No direct impact.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	?	?	Allowing conversion or re-use of historic buildings for business use supports this objective by offering variety in the range of buildings available to support economic growth. However, the extent of the impact is difficult to determine.	Consideration might be given to ways of incentivising re-use of historic buildings.

Policy DM9: Green Infrastructure; Biodiversity; Landscape; Open Space and Sports Facilities				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	Green infrastructure and wildlife/biodiversity protection and enhancement and open space provision have no direct impact on this objective.	
2. Health	✓	✓	This policy makes a positive contribution towards achieving this objective as the principle aims of enhancing green infrastructure include access to open space, to the benefit of residents having healthier lifestyles.	
3. Recreation	✓✓	✓✓	The proposed policy has a strong positive impact on this SAO in seeking to provide new open space, enhance the quality of the natural environment and increase the number of places (and subsequently opportunities) to engage in cultural activity.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	This policy is unlikely to have any significant impact upon community safety.	
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	Recreation and leisure facilities are key components of green infrastructure, whilst enhanced connectivity is one of the key facets behind the principles of green infrastructure planning. Provision and enhancement of green infrastructure should therefore result in residents' improved access to and satisfaction with community facilities.	

6. Natural Environment	✓✓	✓✓	The policy meets all the criteria of this objective – protecting the natural environment and seeking to enhance landscape character.	
7. Historic Environment	✓	✓	Green infrastructure acknowledges and includes the historic environment as a key feature therefore its protection and enhancement is broadly supportive of this objective.	Highlighting the natural environment's contribution to/ interaction with the historic environment in Conservation Area Appraisals will facilitate better awareness of the significance of open spaces within the built form.
8. Natural Resources	✓	✓	Use of SUDS can provide more multifunctional greenspaces which will make a positive contribution to sustainable management of water resources. Also, protection of the countryside for its intrinsic value will help reduce loss of greenfield sites.	
9. Waste	—	—	Policy of no relevance to this objective.	
10. Energy	—	?	Green infrastructure policies have little impact on energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources, although sustainable woodland management can contribute to enhancing biomass resources in the area.	<i>Site Allocations DPD, Area Action Plans</i> Explore green infrastructure/energy opportunities.
11. Transport and Accessibility	—	✓	Although the policy does not explicitly make reference to supporting sustainable forms of movement, this is an integral feature of the definition and objectives of green infrastructure.	
12. Employment	—	?	The policy's impact on employment opportunities is uncertain as environmental improvements have no direct impact, although the long-term effect may stimulate job opportunities in land management and tourism.	<i>DM7, Site Allocations DPD</i> Identify sites for housing allocations in accordance with environmental capacity and constraints.
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	No direct impact.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	—	?	The policy does not directly provide land for economic development, although in the long-term environmental enhancements can create a more attractive environment for investors.	

Policy DM10: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	?	Although the policy will not directly influence the type of homes that are built in Bassetlaw, incorporating renewable and low carbon energy technologies in new developments may have a negative impact on the affordability of homes in the long-term, as these costs are passed on from the developer to the buyer.	Although the initial outlay on buying properties may increase it is likely that the running and maintenance costs may reduce as a result of integrating such technologies.
2. Health	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
3. Recreation	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
5. Social Capital	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
6. Natural Environment	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
7. Historic Environment	×	×	The visual impact of renewable and low carbon energy technologies may be incompatible with conservation principles and result in negative impacts on historic assets.	<i>DM8</i> Where conservation concerns override carbon reduction measures the introduction of ‘allowable solutions’ may provide alternative means of making contributions. However, these are yet to be finalised by the government.
8. Natural Resources	✓	✓✓	Reduced energy demand and reliance on fossil fuels will help ensure protection and more prudent use of natural resources, while the policy also promotes sustainable building techniques and materials. Although fuel sources such as biomass may increase wood use, most operations seek to do so through use of short rotation coppice or sustainable woodland management. The	The effect of tightening Building Regulations will act as the stimulus for this policy to take effect.

			effectiveness of this policy is likely to increase in the long-term.	
9. Waste	—	?	Introduction of CHP plants utilising waste as fuel may contribute to an overall reduction of waste in the long-term.	This is only likely to occur where it can be demonstrated to be both a feasible and viable solution for meeting CO2 reduction requirements.
10. Energy	✓✓	✓✓	The policy promotes more efficient building construction and integration of renewable and low carbon energy sources.	
11. Transport and Accessibility	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
12. Employment	—	?	The long-term, indirect effect of the policy may help generate jobs to in conjunction with energy scheme supply and maintenance.	
13. Enterprise and Education	?	?	As this is a growing sector and the Energy Opportunities Diagram shows a discernable level of potential within Bassetlaw for renewable and low carbon energy sources, this may indirectly stimulate innovation and encourage higher knowledge job provision.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	✓	Use of decentralised energy opportunities incorporates use of new technologies can contribute to the infrastructure needs of the modern economy.	

Policy DM11: Developer Contributions & Infrastructure Provision				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	✓✓	✓✓	This policy will ensure an appropriate range of housing (including affordable housing) to meet Bassetlaw's identified needs.	
2. Health	✓✓	✓✓	The policy will further this objective with Developer Contributions towards healthcare services and facilities being sought where it is determined that there are existing inequalities, under-provision or that current provision is at capacity.	
3. Recreation	✓✓	✓✓	Developer Contributions will be sought in all developments where it is determined that enhancement of existing or provision of new	

			open space/green infrastructure/cultural heritage activities are required (to meet identified needs) on-site or in close proximity, to improve the quality of life for residents.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	?	✓	Enhancement of the public realm through Developer Contributions will, in the long-term, have a positive impact on creating a safer and more secure built environment. Provision of CCTV may also help reduce crime and fear of crime.	
5. Social Capital	✓✓	✓✓	Developer Contributions help further this objective in both the long and short-term, through actual improvements of the services themselves and the in-combination effect of delivering wider improvements to the community.	
6. Natural Environment	—	✓	While contributions to green infrastructure enhancements and flood mitigation measures will have a significant impact on this objective and the overall quality of the environment, in some cases Developer Contributions may be required to compensate the loss of an existing site.	
7. Historic Environment	✓	✓	The policy makes direct reference to supporting development of natural and cultural heritage assets, although in some cases Developer Contributions may be required to compensate the loss of an existing site.	
8. Natural Resources	✓✓	✓✓	This policy's commitment to securing funds to mitigate potential negative impacts on natural resources, including minimising flood risk and loss of habitat makes a strong positive contribution towards achieving this SAO.	
9. Waste	—	?	While it is unlikely that the effects of this policy will have an impact on the amounts of waste generated in Bassetlaw, contributions may be sought to enhance waste collection services.	
10. Energy	?	?	At present the proposed policy is unlikely to have a direct impact on energy efficiency and uses, however, should a CIL approach become feasible, a proportion of the funds gained through the process may contribute to progressing this objective.	
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓✓	✓✓	The policy will seek to meet identified transport needs, enhancing and integrating existing services with new developments, and promoting more sustainable forms of movement around and between homes and places of work.	

12. Employment	—	—	The policy has a neutral impact as it makes provision for replacing employment land that is lost to other uses. The policy cannot be regarded as enhancing the level of employment land, but seeks to maintain provision.	
13. Enterprise and Education	✓	✓	The proposed policy makes a direct commitment to enhancing education and training facilities and opportunities, proportionate to the levels of growth in Bassetlaw. Developer Contributions can also support provision of alternative employment land and infrastructure to foster enterprise and innovation	
14. Economic Infrastructure	?	?	Impact of the policy largely depends on the circumstances relating to each application.	Where alternative employment land provision is required Developers should engage with the Council to ensure provision meets an identified need.

Policy DM12: Flood Risk, Sewerage and Drainage

SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	No foreseeable impact on the criteria associated with this objective, with regard to the type and delivery of housing in the District.	
2. Health	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
3. Recreation	—	?	Introduction of SUDS that have multifunctional green infrastructure components may result in an increase in water-compatible recreation opportunities.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
5. Social Capital	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
6. Natural Environment	?	✓	The policy gives preference to SUDS that contribute to enhancement of biodiversity and wider green infrastructure as a means mitigating flood risk, although uncertainty exists over short-term delivery and management.	<i>DM11</i> Developer contributions can facilitate provision of SUDS

7. Historic Environment	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
8. Natural Resources	✓✓	✓✓	The main focus of this policy is to ensure prudent use of water resources and minimising flood risk to development occurring in the District.	
9. Waste	✓	✓	This policy seeks to improve the efficiency with which wastewater is dealt.	
10. Energy	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
11. Transport and Accessibility	—	—	Making contributions to enhancement of green infrastructure can indirectly promote sustainable movement opportunities, including rights of way alongside watercourses.	
12. Employment	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	

Policy DM13: Sustainable Transport				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
2. Health	✓	✓	This policy will ensure that residents have access to services and facilities across the District via a range of different modes and ensure sufficient parking is available where new developments must be accessed by private car.	

3. Recreation	✓	✓	Introduction of new footways, cycle paths and bridleways will help promote walking and cycling as alternative means of transport	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No significant impact on this objective.	
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	Given the rural nature of this District and subsequent car dependency improvements to alternative modes of transport and to highways, wherever it is deemed necessary, will help improve residents' access to services and facilities, therefore enhancing quality of life.	
6. Natural Environment	—	✗	Although promoting more sustainable forms of transport will be likely to have a beneficial effect on the natural environment, it is acknowledged that the overall level of growth will result in increased traffic generation and expansion of the road network leading to loss of greenspace.	<i>SO8, DM9</i> Protection must be prioritised or consider mitigation where losses of environmental assets occur. Developments must comply with Local Transport Plan objectives.
7. Historic Environment	—	—	No significant impact on this objective.	
8. Natural Resources	—	—	Whilst the overall level of growth will result in increased traffic and subsequent impacts on air quality, promoting non-car-based forms of transport will contribute to reduction/minimising these emissions. As such, the impact of this policy on the SAO will be neutral.	
9. Waste	—	—	No impact on this objective.	
10. Energy	—	—	No impact on this objective.	
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓✓	✓✓	Policy directly supports SA objectives for making the most of the existing transport infrastructure and minimising the impact on the environment through the appropriately locating development, promotion of walking and cycling and minimising the need to travel by car.	
12. Employment	—	—	No impact on this objective.	
13. Enterprise	—	—	No direct impact on this objective, although improving internal	

and Education			accessibility within the larger settlements will help improve access to education and training facilities.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	—	✓	In the long-term, the impact of road and other transport improvements should work to the benefit of the District's economic infrastructure, facilitating a wider range of job opportunities.	

Policy DM14: Ground Conditions and Land Stability				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	?	?	Uncertain impact on this objective. Ground conditions may limit the amount of housing that can be provided on a site, however, this can only be assessed on a case-by-case basis.	
2. Health	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
3. Recreation	?	?	The impact of this policy is largely uncertain, although there is potential for re-use of former colliery sites for recreational use, as is already the case for a number of these.	<i>DM9</i> Where issues relating to stability cannot be overcome, rendering other uses unfeasible, opportunities should be sought to enhance these areas as green infrastructure assets.
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
5. Social Capital	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
6. Natural Environment	?	?	This policy's impact on the natural environment can only be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Where former coalmine sites are allowed to naturally regenerate, this can make a strong positive contribution to landscape character and the other criteria of this objective. However, where sites are redeveloped, this can result in a loss of sites of biodiversity interest.	Ecological surveys should be undertaken prior to site development. Where BAP species and habitats are identified, these should be relocated to mitigate against loss.
7. Historic Environment	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	

8. Natural Resources	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
9. Waste	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
10. Energy	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
11. Transport and Accessibility	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
12. Employment	?	?	Uncertain impact on this objective. Ground conditions may limit the amount of land that can be utilised for employment-creating uses on a site, however, this can only be assessed on a case-by-case basis.	
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	?	?	Uncertain impact on this objective. Ground conditions may limit the amount of land that can be utilised for employment-creating uses on a site, however, this can only be assessed on a case-by-case basis.	

