

# Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework

## SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF PREFERRED OPTIONS CORE STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES



SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF PREFERRED OPTIONS  
CORE STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES



**BASSETLAW**  
DISTRICT COUNCIL  
NORTH NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

May 2010







<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
1. Introduction	1
2. Methodology	4
3. Sustainability Objectives, Baseline and Context	9
4. Sustainability Appraisal of Issues and Options	15
5. Sustainability Appraisal of Core Strategy Preferred Options	21
6. Implementation	34

## **Appendices**

1. Compliance with SEA Directive	36
2. Sustainability Appraisal of Core Strategy Issues and Options	39
3. Sustainability Appraisal of Spatial Vision and Compatibility Analysis of Strategic Objectives	46
4. Sustainability Appraisal of Spatial Strategy, Core Policies and Development Management Policies	54
5. Comments Received on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report	91

# **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 so far 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 around June 2011.

### *Sustainability Context and Baseline Characteristics*

Throughout Summer 2009 a sustainability scoping assessment was carried out by Bassetlaw District Council 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.

### *Issues and Options*

Following the Scoping Report a range of high-level options were put forward as proposals for addressing the key planning issues facing the District up to 2026. These were set out in the Core Strategy Issues and Options paper, consulted on between September and October 2009. This is available at:

[http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/services/planning\\_building/planning\\_policy/local\\_development\\_framework/core\\_strategy.aspx](http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/services/planning_building/planning_policy/local_development_framework/core_strategy.aspx)

The main strategic options considered, and sent out for consultation, are set out in Section 5. The key issues and supporting themes were covered in Section 6 and include the following issues:

- Theme 1: Developing a balanced housing market – Affordable housing; Older people's needs; Gypsy and Traveller accommodation; and Housing mix and density
- Theme 2: Maintaining a Quality Local Environment – Design of new developments; Local services and facilities; Climate change and renewable energy; Historic environment; and Green Infrastructure
- Theme 3: Supporting a Prosperous District – Protecting employment land; Worksop and Retford town centres; General retail issues; and Planning obligations.

The Issues and Options were developed internally through examination of national, regional and county planning policy, as well as local initiatives such as the Bassetlaw Community Strategy. The options open to the Council were limited because of the demands placed upon it by, for example, guidance and policies set out by national and regional bodies.

### *Preferred Options*

The Core Strategy will provide the overarching framework for all other documents to be produced as part of the Local Development Framework. It will be a District-wide document that will set out a vision for change in Bassetlaw to 2026, along with the strategic policy approaches to be taken in order to achieve this vision. It may also identify strategic development locations for housing and employment (with smaller sites being identified, as necessary, in the Site Allocations document). The strategic policies will be underpinned by a small number of more detailed development management policies, designed to provide greater detail, and facilitate implementation of initiatives, in relation to specific policy areas.

Between February and May 2010, following the development of the Preferred Options, a detailed appraisal of the Preferred Options document was undertaken against the SA Framework objectives. Commentary was provided on how the Preferred Options would progress SA objectives, and where appropriate, recommendations for enhancement and mitigation were provided.

### *Summary of the likely significant effects of Preferred Options*

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 Preferred Options:

- 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;
- 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.

## **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](mailto:future.plans@bassetlaw.gov.uk) by 5pm on 18 June 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 and 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 SA has been carried out in-house, by the Planning Policy Team of Bassetlaw District Council.

### *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.

Following consultation four responses were received from the statutory consultation bodies. 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.

### *Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy*

This SA was prepared between February and May 2010. It is being published for public consultation along with the Core Strategy Preferred Options, in accordance with good practice and in line with Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations and SA Guidance. It will be published on the Bassetlaw District Council website. The report will be sent to statutory consultees and neighbouring authorities, also being made available to any other interested stakeholders.

### *Habitats Regulations Assessment*

Given the specific legal requirements for Habitats Regulations Assessment work, the Preferred Options have been screened to assess the likely effects of the proposed policies on Natura 2000 sites. The findings of this process are reported in the Bassetlaw Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening report. 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.

## **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 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 regional and national 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.

## 2.5 Appraising the Core Strategy Preferred Options

The method used for this Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Preferred Options 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.

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 SA objectives, making recommendations for enhancement and mitigation and where appropriate.

### *Core Strategy Contents and Objectives*

The Core Strategy is the overarching strategic document of the LDF. Having analysed the characteristics of the area, its constituent parts and the key issues and challenges facing it and following consultation on a series of issues and options for the spatial development of Bassetlaw in the autumn of 2009, a vision has been developed which sets out the aspirations of the District from the present time to 2026.

### *Appraisal Criteria*

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

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

To make a more thorough assessment of their potential impacts, specific 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](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.

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

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

Objective	Decision making criteria	Indicators
		up-to-date character appraisals
8. To protect and manage prudently the natural resources of the district including water, air quality, soils and minerals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it improve water quality?</li> <li>• Will it protect and conserve water resources?</li> <li>• Will it improve air quality?</li> <li>• Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?</li> <li>• Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques?</li> <li>• Will it minimise the loss of soils to development?</li> <li>• Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield land lost (ha)</li> <li>• Carbon dioxide emissions (tonnes per capita per annum)</li> <li>• Households in flood zones 2 &amp; 3</li> <li>• No. of employment developments and housing developed on PDL</li> <li>• Density of dwellings</li> <li>• Developments incorporating SUDS</li> <li>• Planning applications granted contrary to advice of EA</li> <li>• Biological/chemistry levels in rivers, canals and freshwater bodies</li> <li>• Production of primary and secondary/recycled aggregates</li> </ul>
9. To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it reduce household waste?</li> <li>• Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?</li> <li>• Will it assist or facilitate compliance with the waste hierarchy (i.e. reduce first, then re-use, recover, recycle, landfill)?</li> <li>• Will it assist in maximising the use of recycled and secondary materials (including aggregates)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total amount of waste produced (tonnes)</li> <li>• Amount of residual household waste produced</li> <li>• Capacity of new waste management facilities as alternatives to landfill</li> <li>• % household waste composted, land filled, recycled, used to recover energy</li> </ul>
10. To minimise energy usage and to develop the district's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it improve energy efficiency of new buildings?</li> <li>• Will it support the generation and use of renewable energy?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Energy consumed from renewable sources (MW)</li> <li>• Energy use (gas/electricity) by end user</li> <li>• Renewable energy capacity installed by type (MW)</li> </ul>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it utilise and enhance existing transport infrastructure?</li> <li>• Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment?</li> <li>• Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternative modes of transport?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility to education sites, employment sites, health care, leisure centres, open space, shopping centres</li> <li>• Development of transport infrastructure that assists car use reduction</li> <li>• New major non-residential development with travel plans</li> <li>• People using car and non-car modes of travel to work</li> </ul>
12. To create high quality employment opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs?</li> <li>• Will it reduce unemployment?</li> <li>• Will it increase average income levels?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefit claimants</li> <li>• VAT business registration rate, registrations, de-registrations</li> <li>• Businesses per 1000 population</li> <li>• Employment rate</li> <li>• Number of jobs</li> <li>• New floor space</li> <li>• Shops, vacant shops</li> <li>• Unemployment rate</li> </ul>
13. To develop a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase levels of qualification?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 year olds achieving 5 or more</li> </ul>

Objective	Decision making criteria	Indicators
strong culture of enterprise and innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors?</li> </ul>	GCSEs at Grade A* - C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>19 year olds qualified to NVQ level 2 or equivalent</li> <li>21 year olds qualified to NVQ level 3 or equivalent</li> <li>Working age population qualifications</li> </ul>
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"> <li>Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses?</li> <li>Will it improve the diversity of jobs available?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed business development floorspace</li> <li>Land developed for employment</li> <li>Employment land lost</li> <li>Employment land allocated</li> <li>Profile of employment by sector</li> </ul>

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

Figure 2

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 emphasises that the emerging LDF policies seek to address these incompatibilities by ensuring the cumulative impacts of individual policies offset each other's ability to conflict with the aims of the SAOs.

## 4. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF ISSUES & OPTIONS

### 4.1 Strategic Options

The key issues that required addressing with regard to the future development of Bassetlaw and the options considered through which to deliver them, were sent out for consultation in September 2009. These options (set out below) 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. In addition, these options were established in way that specifically addresses the key sustainability issues that were highlighted in the SA Scoping Report.

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

Figure 3

Strategic Option	Summary of Proposals
<b>Option 1</b>	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.
<b>Option 2</b>	<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 Sub-Regional Centre (Worksop) and Retail &amp; 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>
<b>Option 3</b>	<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>

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.

## 4.2 Comparison of the sustainability effects of the strategic options

The purpose of this exercise is to determine the likely social, economic and environmental impacts of potential Core Strategy options, to assist the Council in further decisions over the most favourable course of future action. 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.

The results of the SA, including a matrix based appraisal for each option is presented in Appendix 2. 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

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 Innovation	?	?	?
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	?	✓



The following issues arose from this assessment:

### *Housing*

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.

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 address the identified needs of both Retford and other settlements in the rural east.

### *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.

### *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.

### *Community Safety*

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.

### *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.

### *Biodiversity*

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.

### *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.

### *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.

### *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.

## *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.

## *Transport*

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.

## *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.

## *Innovation*

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.

## *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.

### **4.3 Conclusions**

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.



## **5. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS**

### **5.1 Progressing the Issues and Options**

The Preferred Options (POs) take forward the options considered through the Issues and Options consultation and present a series of POs that include: Spatial Strategy Policies of the Bassetlaw settlements that serve as Core Policies, designed to guide the nature and type of development in each settlement, along with a set of Development Management Policies. 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 link with the Regional Spatial Strategy's objectives for the East Midlands Northern Sub-Region, in which Bassetlaw sits.

### **5.2 SA of Spatial Vision and Objectives**

A detailed SA of the Vision and Strategic Objectives (set out above) is contained within Appendix 3, although the key outcomes and findings are contained within the following paragraphs.

#### *A Vision for Bassetlaw*

*Over the next 15 years, Bassetlaw will progress through a period of economic transition, successfully positioning 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 grow into its role as a sub-regional centre. Its older employment sites will be regenerated and new business locations established along the town's main approach roads. 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' through the town, to redevelop opportunity sites along Bridge Street 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 cultural and historic 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 have been 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 the regeneration of the former coalmining 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 most rural settlements untouched by all but minor development in support of affordable housing or 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 and will 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 in the historic environment.*

*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.*

This Vision is based on the RSS aims for the Northern Sub-Region, 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 appraisal 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. The Vision could however be enhanced by making firm links to initiatives outside of the District or the planning system that explicitly address these sustainable development issues.

### *Strategic Objectives*

The following objectives have been developed to support the delivery of the Council's vision.

- SO1 *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;*
- SO2 *To provide a range and choice of employment sites in Worksop, Retford, Harworth Bircotes (including the A1 corridor), Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold and Tuxford;*
- SO3 *To prioritise the community regeneration opportunities available in Harworth Bircotes and Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold by developing brownfield sites in these settlements in advance of greenfield development sites in Tuxford, Misterton and rural locations;*
- SO4 *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 responds to the effects of climate change by reducing or mitigating flood risk; realising opportunities to utilise low and zero carbon energy sources and/or infrastructure; 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 the Building for Life 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 conserve and enhance Bassetlaw's heritage assets, increase the quality and number of designated heritage assets, reduce the number of heritage assets at risk and advance characterisation and understanding of heritage asset significance.*

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.

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

**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.** 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.

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

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

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

**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.** 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.

**SAO 14: To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure, including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.** 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 Preferred Option: A Spatial Strategy based on a Settlement Hierarchy

#### *Alternative Approaches Considered*

The preferred approach to a Spatial Strategy is set out in policies CS1 to CS8. The PO 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 RSS 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); acknowledges the needs of rural communities; and accords fully with the aims of the Regional Plan's Northern Sub-Regional Strategy.

<b>SUB-REGIONAL CENTRE</b> The primary town within Bassetlaw. The focus for major housing, employment and town centre retail growth (see Policy CS1)	Worksop <sup>1</sup>	
<b>CORE SERVICE CENTRE</b> The second key town within Bassetlaw. The focus for levels of housing, employment and town centre development to maintain and enhance its service role and market town character (see Policy CS2).	Retford	
<b>MAIN REGENERATION SETTLEMENT</b> A regeneration opportunity town (see Policy CS3).	Harworth Bircotes	
<b>LOCAL SERVICE CENTRES</b> Settlements with smaller regeneration opportunities and the services, facilities and development opportunities available to support moderate levels of growth (see Policies CS4; CS5; CS6).	Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold	
	Tuxford	
	Misterton	
<b>RURAL SERVICE CENTRES</b> 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 (see Policy CS7).	Beckingham Blyth Clarborough and Hayton Cuckney Dunham East Markham Elkesley Everton Gamston Gringley-on-the-Hill	Lound Mattersey Misson Nether Langwith North Leverton North and South Wheatley Rampton Ranskill Sturton-le-Steeple Sutton Walkeringham
<b>ALL OTHER SETTLEMENTS</b> Rural settlements that have limited or no services and facilities or access to public transport and which are unsuitable for growth (see Policy CS8).	Any settlements within Bassetlaw not listed above are considered to be <b>small villages</b> or <b>hamlets</b> forming part of the countryside	

<sup>1</sup> Worksop includes the settlements of Rhodesia and Shireoaks, in line with the definition of Worksop as set out in the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy.

## *Sustainability Effects and Mitigation Proposals*

The PO should prove to have significant beneficial sustainability effects with the settlement hierarchy, set out above, 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 Spatial Strategy 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 base<sup>2</sup>. The majority of housing growth proposed under the Spatial Strategy 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 Map<sup>3</sup>. The PO 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 PO, 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 future infrastructure requirement assessment. Any identified 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.

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 PO as the most sustainable approach.

---

<sup>2</sup>

[http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/services/planning\\_\\_building/planning\\_policy/local\\_development\\_framework/background\\_studies.aspx](http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/services/planning__building/planning_policy/local_development_framework/background_studies.aspx)

<sup>3</sup> Bassetlaw Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study (Aecom, 2010)



## **5.4 Core Strategy Policies**

### *Alternative Approaches Considered*

The Core Strategy policies have been developed by considering the requirements of national and regional 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.

### *Sub Regional Centre – Policy CS1: 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 a Sub-Regional Centre, 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 cumulative 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 PO indicates, the proposals for the town and its immediate environs should be delivery in a sustainable manner.

### *Core Service Centre – Policy CS2: Retford*

The PO 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, in light of the town's constraints and subsequent capacity.

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 being 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 PO may appear more concentrated. However, in preparing the Issues and Options and the subsequent PO 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 CS3: Harworth Bircotes*

The likely scale of growth and subsequent change the PO proposes for Harworth Bircotes 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 RHADS. 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 environmental quality, a more explicit commitment to improvements to the natural environment/open space with sustainable long-term management and connection to the wider green infrastructure network could enhance the PO. Also, reference might be made to appropriate memorial or interpretation of the cultural heritage of the area as new employment sectors and uses emerge.

#### *Local Service Centres – Policies CS4/CS5/CS6: Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold, Tuxford and Misterton*

The POs 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 PO for each settlement purports 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 CS7*

The PO 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 CS8*

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.

## **5.5 Development Management Policies**

### *Policy DM1: Farm Diversification and Agricultural/Forestry Buildings*

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 farm diversification 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: 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 DM3: Conversion of Rural Buildings*

Given the very specific nature of this policy, a significant number of the SAOs incur a neutral score. However, 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. Similarly, conversion of existing buildings 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 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: Conservation and Built Heritage*

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: Parking Standards*

The proposed policy indicates provision of car parking facilities will be made in accordance with need and the likely impact said provision would have on the surrounding area. The overall impact on sustainability largely depends on the location of individual developments and the choice of modes of transport that are



available in the locality. Where there is a greater range of choices, provision may be reduced and alternative means promoted through the implementation of other policies. The impact of green infrastructure improvements and developer contributions/infrastructure improvements could have a significant bearing on the long-term impact of this policy and the overall levels of car use in certain parts of Bassetlaw.

## **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 policies CS8, DM1, DM8 and DM10.

While most forms of development in 'Other Settlements' (CS8) 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 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 the policy makes provision to protect features of identified importance, sustainable drainage and construction techniques should be employed to minimise waste generation and surface runoff, and encourage landowners to engage with bodies such as Natural England to explore the feasibility of introducing Higher Level Stewardship schemes to minimise impacts on wildlife.

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.

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.

## **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 the RSS for the East Midlands (March 2009).

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](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**

The 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. In addition, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to produce an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) on the implementation of the Local Development Scheme, demonstrating the progress made in implementing the new policies. 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. It is anticipated that 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 annually. Monitoring will be constantly reviewed in light of good practice guidance.



## 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.	<b>Section 2</b>	Sets out the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Bassetlaw District Council Core Strategy
	<b>Section 3</b>	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.	<b>Section 3</b>	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.	<b>Section 3</b>	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).	<b>Section 3</b>	Summarises existing sustainability (including environmental problems) for the Bassetlaw area and references the SA Scoping Report (Nov 2009), where greater detail is given.
	<b>Section 2</b>	References the screening assessment for Natura 2000 sites in line with Habitats Regulations Assessment requirements.
<b>(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.</b>	<b>Section 3</b>	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, including on issues such as biodiversity,	<b>Section 1 &amp; 5 Appendix 2, 3, 4</b>	The likely effects are assessed in the matrices in the Appendices and summarised in Section 5. The likely significant effects of the Core Strategy as it currently stands

<b>SEA Directive &amp; Regulation Requirements</b>	<b>Report Section</b>	<b>Details</b>
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.		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.	<b>Section 5 Appendix 4</b>	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.	<b>Section 4 Appendix 2</b>	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.
	<b>Section 2</b>	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.	<b>Sections 3 &amp; 6</b>	Monitoring information is set out in Section 6, while the SA Framework sets out indicators that will be used to monitor the progress of the policies against the SAOs.
(j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings.	<b>Section 1</b>	Provides a non-technical summary.





**APPENDIX 2: SA OF CORE STRATEGY ISSUES & OPTIONS**

<b><u>KEY</u></b>	
Strong positive impact	✓✓
Positive impact	✓
Neutral/No Impact	—
Negative impact	×
Strong negative impact	××
Uncertain impact	?

SA Objective	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments
1. Housing	✓✓	A broad distribution of housing will have a strong positive impact in helping to ensure the future housing stock will meet the housing needs of the District. Greater levels of housing in existing towns can be delivered at higher densities which are compatible with the existing character, while there is generally more brownfield land available – particularly in Harworth Bircotes.	×	Focusing housing development solely in Worksop and Retford fails to make an appropriate response to the housing needs of Bassetlaw's wider population – in rural parts of the District in particular. Some provision is needed in the wider area to increase/contribute to the vitality of rural settlements. Focusing all housing development here may have a harmful long-term impact on the ability of these settlements to accommodate employment growth.	?	Increasing the number, range and affordability of homes in the west of the District will make a significant contribution to the needs of the housing needs on this side of Bassetlaw, although will fail to address housing needs, particularly in the rural east.
2. Health	?	Although a wide distribution of housing and employment development, as set out in the settlement hierarchy, will not necessarily directly secure improvements in the health of residents, the indirect, long-term effects may contribute to a wider distribution of services and facilities, including healthcare and recreation	?	While the direct impacts of a more restricted distribution of housing and employment on the reduction of health inequalities in the District remains unclear, the long-term, indirect implications of reduced investment in wider rural areas may be negative.	✓	The indirect impacts of regenerating the west of the District will contribute to a reduction in health inequalities which are recognised most prominently in this part of Bassetlaw.
3. Recreation	✓	Provision of better recreational opportunities may coincide indirectly with new housing development. If this is to occur on a broader scale, in accordance with the settlement hierarchy proposal, then opportunities may	?	Provision of better recreational opportunities may coincide indirectly with new housing development, which, if occurring on a limited scale, in accordance with this policy option, may lead to	?	While the proposed regeneration of these former coal-mining areas may include facilitating and enhancing provision of recreational opportunities and celebrating the area's heritage, it is not

SA Objective	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments
		be enhanced.		enhancement of opportunities, albeit on a more limited scale.		possible to discern the impact until the type of development is known.
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	Although the proposed settlement hierarchy is unlikely to have a direct impact on community safety, new development/regeneration schemes can have wider positive impacts that may include community safety.	—	Although the proposed policy option is unlikely to have a direct impact on community safety, new development/regeneration schemes can have wider positive impacts that may include community safety.	?	Regeneration and investment in many of these areas may contribute to a safer built environment through removal of unsightly derelict sites, although the overall impact on the wider community remains uncertain.
5. Social Capital	✓	This policy would have a positive impact on this objective as it seeks to ensure residents across the district have good access to a range of services and facilities.	×	This spatial strategy would give only limited opportunities to create and enhance community services and facilities with the focus on just two towns failing to meet the needs of smaller settlements and the wider rural area	✓	Improvements to access and quality of community facilities are an integral part of the regeneration proposed for these communities under this policy option.
6. Natural Environment	—	This development option ensures a significant amount of growth will occur in settlements that contain large areas of previously developed land and acknowledges Bassetlaw's existing green infrastructure. Some mitigation of loss and/or fragmentation may be required for urban extensions.	—	Concentrating development in the two main existing urban areas, where there is a significant amount of previously developed land, ensures more sensitive areas of the District are protected, although the need for significant urban extensions to Worksop and Retford would involve loss of large areas of greenfield land, some of which has significant biodiversity value.	—	A commitment to locating development on this side of the District where there is a greater level of previously developed land will ensure some recognised biodiversity assets will be protected and indeed, regeneration of former colliery and industrial sites provides unique habitat creation opportunities. However, the significant urban extensions that will be required will inevitably include

SA Objective	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments
						loss of some greenfield sites.
7. Historic Environment	✓	No significant effect is likely as the settlement hierarchy distributes housing growth in accordance with the capacity of each settlement – having regard for features of recognised importance.	✗	Although well-designed developments may contribute to the overall townscape character of Worksop and Retford, given that concentration of development here will require significant urban extensions, these are likely to have significant negative impacts on a the numerous cultural and heritage assets and their settings on the edges of these towns.	—	While the policy would protect historical and cultural assets in the east of the District, the requirement for urban extensions in the west would be likely to result in encroachment on the setting of historical and cultural assets. However, appropriately designed developments in the regeneration of existing centres may contribute positively to the townscape and landscape of settlements in the west.
8. Natural Resources	✓	The overall effect of this policy on natural resources is positive as although there is some uncertainty about responding to the effects of climate change, it seeks to locate a large proportion of housing in Harworth and utilise the significant amounts of brownfield land available there. However, measures should be taken to ensure that new developments protect and make prudent use of natural resources. Future land allocations must be made in accordance with the SFRA.	?	While the overall effect of this policy on natural resources is uncertain, specific sites for growth will be influenced by the SFRA and Water Cycle Study in order to ensure new buildings are not at risk of flooding and issues relating to drainage are suitably mitigated. In addition, concentration of new development in existing centres will generally contribute to reduced journey distances and car use, with access to a better public transport network.	✓	The direct impacts of the proposed spatial strategy generally positive, with priority being given to re-use of previously developed land and locating development in accordance with the findings of the SFRA.

SA Objective	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments
9. Waste	—	No likely significant effect.	—	Although it is accepted that any new development will contribute to an increase overall household waste and concentration in existing towns will contribute to a greater volume of waste collected in these areas, improved building efficiency (through introduction of sustainable building methods and materials) will help reduce waste.	—	It is not anticipated that this policy option will have a significant direct impact on waste and recycling.
10. Energy	✓	The energy opportunities plan indicates that with a wider distribution of development across the District, feasibility of opportunities exist to utilise renewable and low carbon energy sources of energy will increase, while building regulations will ensure increasingly efficient design of new houses and commercial buildings. In addition higher density development may offer opportunities for district heating systems.	✓	Although this has no direct implications, higher density urban development is more energy efficient and the Council's energy opportunities plan indicates that development in higher concentrations can make low and zero carbon energy solutions such as district heating systems more feasible, while building regulations will ensure increasingly efficient design of new houses and commercial buildings.	?	This policy has no direct impact on this objective, although it is important to mindful of opportunities that may exist, particularly in the west of the District, to utilise coalmine methane as an alternative heat source.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓✓	This policy approach clearly seeks to locate new development in areas that accessible by means other than private car, with the greatest concentrations of both housing and employment growth occurring in the same areas,	✓✓	Locating the majority of new development in these towns means that it will be best positioned to utilise more of Bassetlaw's existing transport infrastructure than if located elsewhere in the District, whilst	✓	This policy generally seeks to locate development in existing settlements, thereby utilising the transport infrastructure that is already operational and minimise car dependency by enabling access to nearby

SA Objective	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments
		which are generally those with an already well-established transport infrastructure.		higher density development will also reduce the number of journeys undertaken by car and promote alternative forms of travel.		services and facilities. However, concentrating development solely in the west of the District fails to utilise the full extent of opportunities currently available in Bassetlaw.
12. Employment	✓	The proposed settlement hierarchy supports this objective by providing a range of employment opportunities across the District, with the greatest concentration in Worksop as the sub-regional centre, and the rest distributed across the most sustainable settlements.	✓	This option would ensure a concentration of employment land provision in Worksop and Retford that would therefore be best positioned to utilise the existing infrastructure and be accessible by the largest population concentrations. However, limiting opportunities in other parts of the District may hinder access to high quality employment opportunities for residents in rural areas and fail to make optimise locational benefits available to businesses elsewhere.	✓✓	Provision of employment opportunities that make distinct connections with the wider area, making the most of the locational benefits and providing jobs in areas that have seen the greatest decline in recent years.
13. Enterprise and Education	?	This impact of this policy on this objective is difficult to determine in isolation. Impacts are most likely to occur through cumulative effects of other developments, rather than directly as a result of this spatial strategy.	?	This impact of this policy on this objective is difficult to determine in isolation. Impacts are most likely to occur through cumulative effects of other developments, rather than directly as a result of this spatial strategy.	?	This impact of this policy on this objective is difficult to determine in isolation. Impacts are most likely to occur through cumulative effects of other developments, rather than directly as a result of this spatial strategy.
14. Economic	✓	The settlement hierarchy will deliver a range of land and	?	Under this policy option it may be more difficult to support the	✓	This policy specifically aims to provide land for employment

SA Objective	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments	Potential Impact	Comments
Infrastructure		building types across the District that will support a greater diversity of jobs in Bassetlaw.		physical conditions of modern economic structures on more traditional existing areas of employment land in these towns. Although some greenfield site opportunities exist on the urban fringe, Retford has a number of significant physical constraints.		opportunities, although the types of employment that will be developed here cannot be specified at this time.



**APPENDIX 3: SA OF SPATIAL VISION AND COMPATIBILITY ANALYSIS OF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES**

**KEY**

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

### **The Preferred Option - A Vision for Bassetlaw**

Over the next 15 years, Bassetlaw will progress through a period of economic transition, successfully positioning 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 grow into its role as a sub-regional centre. Its older employment sites will be regenerated and new business locations established along the town's main approach roads. 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' through the town, to redevelop opportunity sites along Bridge Street 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 cultural and historic 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 have been 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 the regeneration of the former coalmining 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 most rural settlements untouched by all but minor development in support of affordable housing or 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 and will 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 in the historic environment.*

*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.*

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>	<b>Comments</b>
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.

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 line with targets agreed by Bassetlaw District Council, in Worksop, Retford, Harworth, Carlton/Langold, Tuxford, Misterton and sustainable rural settlements locations (as identified in the Core Strategy) 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 and Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold by developing brownfield sites in these settlements in advance of greenfield development sites in Tuxford, Misterton and rural locations;	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	✓
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	—	—	—	—	✓	×	?	—	—	—	✓	✓	✓	✓

Core Strategy Objective		Sustainability Appraisal Objective													
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	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;														
6	To ensure that all new development responds to the effects of climate change by reducing or mitigating flood risk; realising opportunities to utilise low and zero carbon energy sources and/or infrastructure; 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 the Building for Life standard.	✓	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	—
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 conserve and enhance Bassetlaw's heritage assets, increase the quality and number of designated heritage assets, reduce the number of heritage assets at risk and advance characterisation and	—	—	✓	—	?	✓	✓	×	—	×	—	—	—	?

Core Strategy Objective		Sustainability Appraisal Objective													
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	understanding of heritage asset significance														

### 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 4: SA OF SPATIAL STRATEGY, CORE POLICIES AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

<b><u>KEY</u></b>	
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

## Preferred Option

### 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 a Sub-Regional Centre, 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 proposal.	SO4, DM9, DM11

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.	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	Incremental changes to Building Regulations will require all new development to integrate renewable and low carbon

			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.	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 Infrastructure	✓	✓	The settlement hierarchy will deliver a range of land and building types across the District that will support a greater diversity of jobs in Bassetlaw.	SO2, SO3, SO5 Make use of previously developed land, particularly former employment/industrial sites with existing infrastructure provision.

<b>Sub-Regional Centre: Policy CS1 – Workop</b>				
<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>		<b>Comments</b>	<b>Enhancement/Mitigation Measures</b>
	<b>S</b>	<b>L</b>		
1. Housing	✓✓	✓✓	The PO supports the objective of ensuring the housing stock meets the housing needs of Bassetlaw by providing 32.5% (approximately 1400 homes) of the residual housing target within Workop. Such a figure represents a substantial opportunity to deliver a range of types and tenures, also specifying the need for specialist older persons accommodation.	
2. Health	✓	✓	Ensuring Workop'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.	SO4, DM11 Workop 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 pursuing regeneration of key cultural heritage assets in the town.	SO8, SO9, DM8, DM11
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, however, it is difficult to determine the extent of the impact on variables such as behaviour.	SO4, DM11
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	The PO 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 Workop's status as a Sub-Regional Centre. The policy therefore supports proposals that would further contribute to sustaining a growing population.	SO4, DM11
6. Natural Environment	✓	✓	Enhancement of the natural environment and emphasis on improvements to existing parks and the canal corridor support this objective.	SO4, SO6, SO8, SO9, DM9 Further emphasis might be given to the Chesterfield Canal as a major green infrastructure corridor.
7. Historic Environment	—	✓	Workop has numerous heritage assets on its fringes – some of which may be affected by large-scale growth, despite aspirations	SO4, SO9, DM4, DM8, DM11

			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.	
8. Natural Resources	?	?	Until specific types of development and locations are identified, there are a number of uncertainties in terms of this policy's impact on use of natural resources. Despite policy measures seeking to avoid development in areas of known flood risk, growth/development in wider river catchment areas can contribute to increased surface runoff which affects water quality; a growing population will result in greater volumes of traffic; and greenfield housing development contributing to loss of soils.	SO6, DM5, DM9, DM11, DM12 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. Flood resilient design to be incorporated where proposals meet the exception test.
9. Waste	—	—	Although increased growth will result in a net increase in waste generation 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.	SO4, SO7, DM11, DM12
10. Energy	?	✓	The policy will not directly support the SAO, although concentrating high levels of growth in Worksop can, in the long-term, contribute to the feasibility of introducing district heating systems to new and existing developments (depending on densities).	DM10, DM11 and Energy Opportunities Map Tightening Building Regulations, potential influence of Community Infrastructure Levy.
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.	
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, DM7 Flexibility of employment uses. Raising the skills of workers in the area is key to attracting more value-added employment.
13. Enterprise and Education	?	?	The policy does not make explicit reference to the SAO criteria but does seek to ensure that all development contributes to the town's growth as a Sub-Regional Centre, therefore supporting	SO2, SO4, SO7, DM7, DM11 Suitable site allocations will help attract more specific types of investment facilitate more business start-up.

			educational needs and facilities to support high-knowledge industry.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	✓✓	The policy strives to position Worksop as a competitive, viable centre for employment, providing sufficient land and infrastructure to support economic growth.	SO2, SO4, SO7, DM7, DM11

<b>Core Service Centre: Policy CS2 – Retford</b>				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	✓✓	✓✓	The PO for Retford proposes 27.5% of the District's residual housing target, with a sizeable proportion of affordable housing (on sites of an appropriate size) – thus making a significant contribution towards meeting this objective. The policy also makes a clear commitment to providing specialist older persons' accommodation in the town, as needs determine.	
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, DM9, DM11 More explicit reference could be made to the role of green infrastructure.
3. Recreation	✓	✓	The regeneration aspirations of the PO 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.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	?	✓	The housing and employment proposals for Retford may contribute to a higher quality of design in the public realm and in wider new developments, in the long-term, although the level of impact these proposals have on this SAO is difficult to quantify and determine, in the short-term.	SO4, SO7, DM4, DM5
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 combination with wider growth,	DM11

			levels of service provision should occur at a proportionate rate to the overall development of Retford.	
6. Natural Environment	✓	✓	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, DM8, DM9, Site Allocations DPD In light of areas of environmental sensitivity around Retford, specific measures should be taken to ensure biodiversity is not adversely affected.
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, DM8
8. Natural Resources	?	?	Uncertainties exist in relation this policy's impact on use of natural resources. Despite policy measures seeking to avoid development in areas of known flood risk, growth/development in wider river catchment areas can contribute to increased surface runoff which affects water quality; a growing population will result in greater volumes of traffic; and greenfield housing development contributing to loss of soils.	SO6, DM5, DM9, DM10, DM11 Policy could be more explicit about the role of infrastructure developments in preventing loss of natural resources.
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.	SO4, SO7, DM11, DM12
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, DM8, 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.	
12. Employment	✓	✓	The PO for Retford seeks to increase the range of employment opportunities in the town.	SO2, SO4, DM7



13. Enterprise and Education	✓	?	Although the policy makes no explicit reference to this SAO criteria, sustaining Retford's role as a Core Service Centre will require proportionate growth of facilities offering a range of educational opportunities and infrastructure to support high-knowledge industries.	SO7, DM7, DM11 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 contribute to this objective, as well as making retail provision of an appropriate scale, to support the diversity of jobs available.	

<b>Main Regeneration Settlement: Policy CS3 – Harworth Bircotes</b>				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	✓✓	✓✓	Large-scale housing development. Diversification of the range of housing, including improvements to overall quality of stock.	
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	✓✓	✓✓	Harworth currently has a green infrastructure and open space deficit therefore commitment to making new provision, including leisure and play facilities.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	✓	Targeted improvements to the public realm, the town centre and integrating new development within the wider community will contribute to a greater sense of community cohesion, with the built form of new developments seeking to design-out anti-social behaviour (as per Building for Life standards). Given the current position of Harworth, it is expected that the benefits derived from	SO3, SO4, SO7, SO8

			new development will have more of a long-term impact.	
5. Social Capital	✓	✓✓	Makes a positive contribution to the SAO by promoting provision of facilities necessary to support 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. Natural Environment	?	✓	Current biodiversity deficit will take time to overcome and establish features of interest.	Long-term site management and species introduction 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.	Site Allocations DPD, SO3, SO6
9. Waste	✓	—	Short-term positive impact derived if resource intensive coal mining activity ends.	
10. Energy	?	✓	Decentralised and renewable energy opportunities may become feasible in Harworth 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 Map.	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.	
12. Employment	✓	✓	The PO proposes 46% of the District's employment land requirements to be located in Harworth and targets a greater range of jobs to be provided in the area, making provision for	SO2, SO3, DM7

			large-scale investment and for smaller businesses to grow.	
13. Enterprise and Education	✓	✓✓	Education is highlighted as one of Harworth's 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.	SO2, SO3, DM11 Effort should be made to establish connections between education establishments and employment opportunities in the area.
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

<b>Local Service Centres: Policy CS4, CS5, CS6 – Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold, Tuxford and Misterton</b>				
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, DM5 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.	SO3, SO8, DM9, DM11
3. Recreation	✓	✓	Green infrastructure and open space provision 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 cumulative, long-term effects of development proposals will enhance	SO3, SO7, DM4

			community cohesion and improve the quality of the public realm.	
5. Social Capital	✓	✓✓	Policies commit to providing community infrastructure to meet identified needs, thereby sustaining settlement roles	
6. Natural Environment	✓✓	✓	Prioritises redevelopment of brownfield sites before Greenfield developments are permitted.	SO3, SO7, SO8, DM9 Need to sensitively address landscape character issues relating to coal mining heritage – consider opportunities for recreation/biodiversity enhancement of spoil tips. 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.	SO6, DM5, DM9, DM10, DM12
9. Waste	—	—	No significant effect on this objective.	
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.	SO6, DM12 Explore future energy options
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.	SO1, SO2, SO6, DM4
12. Employment	✓	✓	Allocating some employment development in these areas will support a wider variety of local jobs and support restructuring of the local economy.	Site Allocations DPD, SO2, SO3, DM7

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, DM7 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.

<b>Rural Service Centres: Policy CS7</b>				
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 affordable housing in villages where there is an identifiable need and other residential development that ensures the continued viability of local employment and community facilities. Direct progression of SAO to meet rural housing needs.	Site Allocations DPD, SO5, DM5 Ensure appropriate mix of housing in villages to maintain rural areas' viability for local workers
2. Health	✓	✓	Promoting access to services supports this objective.	SO5, SO8, DM9, DM11
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.	SO8, DM9
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. Natural Environment	?	✓	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 its own, although in combination with design-related policies, should result in 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, 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.	
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 historic character of the area. Building Regulations requirements will influence long-term progress on the SAO.	DM10 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.	SO6
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. Also, All existing or vacant former employment sites in the Rural Service Centres will be protected for employment creating uses.	
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	—	?	While all existing or vacant former employment sites in the Rural Service Centres will be protected for employment creating uses, no further allocations are to be made. As such, the policy will maintain provision in the short-term the long-term contribution of the policy to this SAO is uncertain.	SO5, DM7

<b>All Other Settlements: Policy CS8</b>				
<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>		<b>Comments</b>	<b>Enhancement/Mitigation Measures</b>
	<b>S</b>	<b>L</b>		
1. Housing	—	—	The restrictions imposed on residential development mean that residential development must be located in more sustainable and accessible.	
2. Health	—	?	Uncertain impact. These settlements 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.	SO5, DM11
3. Recreation	✓	✓	Given 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.	SO5, SO8, DM9, DM11
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No likely significant impact on this objective given the nature of rural settlements and development proposals.	
5. Social Capital	?	?	Given 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.	SO5, DM11
6. Natural Environment	✓	✓	Limited development will secure the long-term protection of biodiversity and landscape character.	
7. Historic Environment	✓	✓	Restrictions on new development in these settlements in addition to the cumulative effect of other policies relating to design and protection of the historic environment will make a positive contribution to this objective.	

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 or require a rural location. Promote community transport schemes such as those identified in the Local Strategic Partnership's transport and accessibility action plan (car sharing, dial-a-ride). Where uses incurring a high level of trip generation are permitted, green travel plans should be developed.
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

<b>Policy DM1: Farm Diversification and Agricultural/Forestry Buildings</b>				
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	?	?	Uncertain impact – farm diversification may include leisure and recreation uses.	SO5, DM2
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No significant impact.	
5. Social Capital	?	✓	Policy is likely to have a positive impact on the SAO in the long-term as it seeks to protect existing services from new uses that would harm vitality and viability of rural centres.	
6. Natural Environment	?	?	Potential conflict with agricultural uses/wildlife conservation, although the policy restricts uses that would exacerbate environmental problems.	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	✓	✓	Policy promotes new development compatibility with surrounding area	SO9, DM8
8. Natural Resources	?	✗	Development on greenfield sites may be unavoidable in the long-term.	SO8 Promote HLS schemes, sustainable drainage and use of sustainable materials in construction of agricultural buildings
9. Waste	—	—	No direct impact.	
10. Energy	—	—	No direct impact.	

11. Transport and Accessibility	✓	✓	Seeks to ensure uses which attract higher visitor numbers are located in more sustainable locations and/or linked to existing uses. Seeks to void exacerbation of highway safety problems.	
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.	SO5, CS7, CS8, DM2, DM3
13. Enterprise and Education	?	✓	Long-term impact of the policy will provide a framework for ensuring flexibility and adaptability of traditional rural enterprise.	SO5, DM11
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.	

<b>Policy DM2: Development in the Countryside</b>				
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	✓	✓✓	Policy is supportive of rural enterprises, including recreation, that require a rural location, subject to compatibility with location/visual impact criteria. Will provide long-term positive impact on opportunities to participate in recreation activities.	

4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No direct relevance to this SAO.	
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	Limited positive impact on provision of community facilities where need can be demonstrated and in-line with the Spatial Strategy.	
6. Natural Environment	✓	✓	Restricts expansion onto greenfield sites and promotes restoration and natural regeneration of brownfield sites. Positive landscaping is promoted that supports the landscape character of the area.	SO8, DM9 Proposals could demonstrate how they avoid or mitigate any impacts on features of interest. Promote pre-application discussion with relevant parties.
7. Historic Environment	—	—	No direct impact.	
8. Natural Resources	✓	✓	Restricts development on greenfield sites only to that which is necessary.	DM9, DM12
9. Waste	—	—	No direct impact.	
10. Energy	—	—	No direct impact.	
11. Transport and Accessibility	?	?	The impact of the policy on this objective is dependent on the types of development and the level of associate road use.	DM11, DM13
12. Employment	✓	✓	Policy supports replacement of buildings for business, equine and other rural economy uses.	
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	No impact on this objective.	
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.	SO5, DM1, DM3

<b>Policy DM3: Conversion of Rural Buildings</b>				
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 and makes no real contribution to this SAO.	
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	—	?	Uncertain of the long-term impact of this policy. Protection sought for existing services to protect vitality and viability while allowing for provision of new community facilities where need arises.	
6. Natural Environment	—	✓	Long-term positive impact from cumulative contribution of landscaping schemes.	
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 primarily for economic uses	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.	

<b>Policy DM4: Design and Character</b>				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	?	✓	Uncertain impact – although the policy does not directly meet the SAO criteria, the location, design and layout of housing developments can have both positive effects on the overall quality. In the short-term, affordability may be affected by building to Building for Life standards.	Enhanced by DM5
2. Health	?	?	Although design considerations do not have direct implications for health and reductions of health inequalities, the incorporation of Building for Life standards requires development proposals to consider provision and accessibility of community facilities (including parks and healthcare).	SO7, SO8
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, but a cumulative 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	?	?	It is uncertain as to how much the measures applied to new developments through this policy will impact on the amount of waste that is generated in construction and throughout its lifetime.	Provide recycling facilities on large-scale development sites.
10. Energy	?	?	Uncertain – energy efficiency is only one small part of achieving Building for Life standards.	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	?	?	Provision of appropriately located, good quality buildings can help	

and Education			attract the types of business and industry required to further this objective, however, it is not possible to quantify the extent of the impact.	
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, although may take time to establish.	

<b>Policy DM5: Housing Mix and Density</b>				
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 - supports provision of specialist accommodation and accommodation for the elderly.	
3. Recreation	—	—	No direct impact.	
4. Community Safety and Crime	?	?	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.	SO7 Development proposals should have regard to 'Secured by Design' guidance.
5. Social Capital	—	—	Policy only changes the mix of houses available and does not impact on community accessibility issues, although housing should largely be delivered in the most sustainable locations.	
6. Natural Environment	—	—	Policy is of no relevance to this SAO.	
7. Historic Environment	✓	✓	Policy responds to local character and sensitivity by delivering densities appropriate to the locality.	SO9, DM8

8. Natural Resources	✓	✓	Support for higher densities, where appropriate, makes more efficient use of land.	
9. Waste	—	—	No significant effect on SAO.	
10. Energy	?	?	Uncertain impact of this SAO, although density of specific sites can determine the feasibility of alternative energy options.	Site Allocations DPD, SO6, DM10 Use Energy Opportunities Map to explore feasibility of energy options and potential targets for strategic sites.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓	✓	Policy supports high 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 permanent and transit 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	—	—	The policy has no direct impact on this objective.	
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.	DM8 minimises impacts and Spatial Strategy to inform locations.
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.	

<b>Policy DM7: Protecting Economic Development Land</b>				
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 mixed use schemes potentially including housing development, where it can be demonstrated that no employment uses are viable.	DM4, DM5
2. Health	—	—	Policy has no direct impact on health or the reduction of health inequalities.	
3. Recreation	?	?	Policy has no impact on provision of open space, unless it is made as part of a mixed-use redevelopment.	SO8, DM9
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.	Site Allocations DPD

7. Historic Environment	—	—	No direct impact.	
8. Natural Resources	—	—	No direct impact.	Site Allocations DPD 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 DM10. Promote co-location of uses to utilise waste heat sources.
11. Transport and Accessibility	✓	✓	Sites that are identified as being worthy of retained as allocated employment are generally those that are located in sustainable locations and therefore make good use of the existing transport network.	
12. Employment	✓✓	✓✓	The policy seeks to retain existing employment land allocations 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	?	?	Although the policy aspires to protect employment land, this cannot secure or attract specific types of employment. Nor is it possible to determine the impact future uses will have on qualifications and training opportunities associated with the businesses that locate there.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	✓✓	The policy meets this objective by protecting the employment land in the most sustainable locations and that is capable of providing for and sustaining modern business/industry.	

<b>Policy DM8: Conservation and Built Heritage</b>				
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	?	?	The impact of this policy is uncertain, as improvements to the public realm through enhancements of historic assets may indirectly facilitate engagement in community activities.	
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 is a good way of reducing use of raw materials, however, the overall level of re-use cannot be determined, while conservation principles can restrict	Potential conflicts may be unavoidable.

			building densities in some sensitive areas. In some instances use of more sustainable building materials (such as double/triple glazing and prefabricated, high insulation materials) where it would effect the setting of listed buildings.	
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.

<b>Policy DM9: Green Infrastructure; Biodiversity; Landscape; Open Space and Sports Facilities</b>				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	Green infrastructure protection and enhancement has 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	—	—	Green infrastructure is unlikely to have any significant impact upon community safety.	
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	Recreation and leisure facilities are key components of green infrastructure; therefore, enhancement should improve residents' access to and satisfaction with such 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 contributing 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.	
9. Waste	—	—	The impact of the policy on this objective is uncertain as re-use of brownfield land and regeneration of spoil tips potentially constitutes re-use and recycling of previously unusable sites.	
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.	Site Allocations DPD, Area Action Plans 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 secondary long-term effect may stimulate job opportunities in land management and tourism.	DM7, Site Allocations DPD Identify sites 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 environmental enhancements can create a more attractive environment for investors.	

<b>Policy DM10: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</b>				
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 the introduction of renewable energy technologies may have a negative impact on the affordability of homes in the long-term.	
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 energy technologies may be incompatible with conservation principles and result in negative impacts on historic assets.	DM8, although largely unavoidable. Developer Contributions may be made to other schemes in the area to cut carbon emissions or explore alternative ways of reducing emissions.
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.	
9. Waste	—	?	Introduction of CHP plants utilising waste as fuel may contribute to an overall reduction of waste in the long-term.	
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	—	?	Potential for jobs to be created in conjunction with energy schemes.	
13. Enterprise and Education	?	?	As this is a growing sector and the Energy Opportunities Plan 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.	



<b>Policy DM11: Developer Contributions &amp; Infrastructure Provision</b>				
<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Potential Impact</b>		<b>Comments</b>	<b>Enhancement/Mitigation Measures</b>
	<b>S</b>	<b>L</b>		
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 an indirect positive impact on creating a safer and more secure built environment. Provision of CCTV may also help reduce crime and fear of crime, but ultimately cannot change patterns of behaviour.	
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	✓	✓	Contributions to green infrastructure enhancements and flood mitigation measures will have a significant impact on this objective and the overall quality of the environment, although 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	—	—	It is unlikely that the direct or combined effects of this policy will have an impact on the amounts of waste generated and collected in Bassetlaw.	
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 it.	
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 how CIL is implemented and delivered.	

<b>Policy DM12: Flood Risk, Sewerage and Drainage</b>				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	No foreseeable impact on the criteria associated with this objective, although new housing developments will not be permitted in areas that are prone to flooding.	
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.	DM11 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.	

<b>Policy DM13: Parking Standards</b>				
SA Objective	Potential Impact		Comments	Enhancement/Mitigation Measures
	S	L		
1. Housing	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
2. Health	✓	✓	Implementation of this policy would ensure an appropriate level of parking to support users' of healthcare facilities access.	SO6 SPD on Parking Standards to set out more detailed criteria. Promote non-car based travel options where appropriate.
3. Recreation	?	?	Future parking provision needs at destinations that attract high visitor numbers must have regard for standards set.	SO6, DM9 Promote sustainable access to and connectivity between recreation sites through green infrastructure policy.
4. Community Safety and Crime	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
5. Social Capital	✓	✓	Given the high car dependency of the area, as a rural District, accessibility of services and facilities is crucial to maintaining and enhancing quality of residents' lives.	SO6
6. Natural Environment	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	

7. Historic Environment	—	✓	Provision made in accordance with likely impact on the surrounding area.	DM8
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	?	?	The PO ensures road users have adequate parking provision once they have reached their destination, although reducing current standards may encourage use of other modes. Cumulative impact of other policies likely to make a significant contribution to this SAO.	
12. Employment	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
13. Enterprise and Education	—	—	No foreseeable impact on this objective.	
14. Economic Infrastructure	✓	✓	Provision of adequate parking facilities is a key feature of infrastructure required to support economic development in more isolated rural areas that require such locations.	DM2 Development will generally be limited to more sustainable locations, where access can be gained via alternative means.

## APPENDIX 5: COMMENTS RECEIVED ON SA SCOPING REPORT

Source	No.	Comment	Response/Action
Environment Agency		<b>Flood Risk</b>	
	1	<b>Page 20</b> The sequential test is a central pillar in the government's flood risk management approach as detailed in PPS25. The principle is that preference should be given to the location of development in Flood Zone 1 before consideration is given to Flood Zone 2 and then Flood Zone 3. This should be included in the key messages section.	Key messages section amended to include more explicit reference to the order of development preference, as set out by the EA.
	2	<b>Page 20</b> The River Trent Catchment Flood Management Plan (CFMP) has not been included in the SA Scoping Report. The River Trent CFMP is a high-level strategic planning tool which sets out the long-term investment on sustainable flood risk management for the next 50-100 years. The River Trent CFMP has six different policy options to inform investment decisions. Bassetlaw falls mainly within policy unit 3, although areas to the east of the LPA will be encompassed by policy unit 4. [Quote from CFMP]. We would wish to see the Trent CFMP included in the flood risk section on page 20 and at other junctions in the document where it would be relevant.	River Trent CFMP included in the review of relevant plans, as well as identifying as a 'source of message'.
	3	<b>Section 6</b> We would like to see the inclusion of a specific SA objective on flooding	Given that the SA Objectives are derived directly from those used in the RSS and having spoken directly to the EA, it was agreed that while an SAO in its own right is not necessary, sufficient credence must be given to the issue of flood risk through existing objectives and identifying it as a key message to be addressed in the SA process.
		<b>Waste</b>	
	4	<b>Section 3</b> We would like to see the following documents included in this review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste Strategy for England (2007)</li> </ul>	Documents added in the review of relevant plans and key messages included.

Source	No.	Comment	Response/Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Midlands Regional Waste Strategy (January 2006)</li> </ul> <p>Key messages: The reduction of construction and demolition waste should also be included with municipal and commercial waste. Another key message that we would like to be included is that waste should be considered as a resource.</p>	
	5	<b>Section 4</b> We would like to see a section on waste.	A section on waste has been included in the background text, although this merely highlights the limited responsibility BDC have in waste management as only a collection authority whilst NCC/Veolia deal with the waste at Mansfield. Recycling waste collection has, however, made significant progress in recent years.
	6	<b>Section 5</b> Ensure efficient use of resources: The need to comply with the 'waste hierarchy' during demolition, construction and use of developments is an important aspect of the resource efficiency issue. Moreover, we believe that the LDF has a role in promoting and influencing compliance with the 'waste hierarchy' and the principle of viewing waste as a resource.	Noted and amended to include reference to the waste hierarchy.
	7	<b>Section 6</b> Table 5: We would like the indicator 'Control waste produced', under objective 9, to be clarified.  We would like to add the following as an indicator under objective 9: 'Amount of residual household waste' and to support the decision-making criteria 'will it reduce household waste?'.	Indicators reviewed and amended to include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total amount of waste produced (tonnes)</li> <li>Amount of residual household waste produced</li> <li>Capacity of new waste management facilities as alternatives to landfill</li> <li>% household waste composted, land filled, recycled, used to recover energy</li> </ul>
	8	<b>Section 6</b> Instead of listing the different types of waste in the decision-making criteria under objective 9, we would rather the following statements were used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it assist or facilitate compliance with the waste hierarchy (i.e. reduce waste first, then re-use, recover, recycle and landfill as a last resort)?</li> <li>Will it assist in maximising the re-use of recycled and</li> </ul>	Decision-making criteria added to the table

Source	No.	Comment	Response/Action
		secondary materials (including aggregates)?	
		<b>Water Resources</b>	
	9	<p><b>Section 3</b></p> <p>We would like to see the following documents included in this review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency Water Resources Strategy for England and Wales (March 2009)</li> <li>• A Midlands Regional Action Plan for the Water Resources Strategy (currently being developed – due to be published Dec 2009)</li> </ul> <p>Key message: The strategy sets out how the Agency believes water resources should be managed over the coming decades so that water can be abstracted and used sustainably. Its implementation will help to ensure that there will be enough water for people and the environment now and in the future. It replaces the strategy produced in 2001 'Water Resources for the Future: A Strategy for England and Wales'</p>	The March 2009 document has been included in the list of relevant plans and policies, however, the latter was not available at the time of writing.
	10	<p><b>Section 3</b></p> <p>Bassetlaw falls within the boundaries of two Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS) areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Idle &amp; Torne CAMS</li> <li>2. Lower Trent &amp; Erewash CAMS</li> </ol> <p>[Feedback included quotes from documents]</p>	Document included in review of relevant plans and programmes.
	11	<p><b>Section 4</b></p> <p>Severn Trent Water have been faced with problems related to elevated Nitrate Levels within some of their boreholes. This leads to reduced abstraction due to the cost of treatment. Although they may not be pumping at licensed limits, it may be difficult to meet the demands of future population growth. There are no surface water abstractions for public water supply in the Bassetlaw area. Therefore, the Bassetlaw area will become more reliant on imported water from neighbouring catchments.</p> <p>The EA's Water Resources Strategy for England &amp; Wales</p>	Water-related issues have been identified through the Council's Water Cycle Study and will be addressed accordingly in the Core Strategy. The Bassetlaw Water Cycle Study Scoping Report (2009) has now been included in the list of relevant plans and programmes.



Source	No.	Comment	Response/Action
		states that the recent projections of housing growth are significantly higher than those contained in spatial plans in England. This equates to greater pressure than originally anticipated and actions will be needed sooner in high-risk water stress areas. To the west, Bassetlaw has been identified to be at moderate water stress and to the east as being in serious water stress. Underestimating demand will exacerbate this problem.	
	12	<b>Section 5</b> Minimise the impact of climate change: The conservation of water resources is also an important climate change adaptation measure. We believe that the LDF has a role in protecting and conserving water resources.	Although not explicitly quoted in any of the objectives, the impact of climate change is addressed through Objectives 6, 8, 9 and 10. Objective specifically addresses water resources.
	13	<b>Section 6</b> We would like to see an objective that promotes the protection and conservation of water resources. Table 4: We would like to see objective 8 to read “To <u>protect</u> and manage prudently ...”	Objective 8 has been amended accordingly, now reading: <i>To protect and manage prudently the natural resources of the District including water, air quality, soils and minerals</i>
	14	<b>Section 6</b> Table 5: We would like the objective 8 decision criteria to include “Will the measure protect and conserve water resources?”	Noted and amended.
English Heritage	15	<b>Non-technical summary</b> This fails to identify the historic environment as a key issue	Noted and amended under ‘Environmental’ issues.
	16	<b>Para 3.9 and Table 2 Key Messages, page 23</b> The historic environment should be identified as a separate message and not included under landscape. It is identified as a separate category in Annex 1(f) of the EU Directive, which refers to ‘cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage’. The European Landscape Convention (ELC) does cover urban as well as rural landscapes, and historic landscapes may be affected by the development plan proposals; however, for the purposes of the SEA, the impacts on the built heritage and townscape need to be assessed	Amended – separating landscape from the historic environment and rewording Objective 6 to cover landscape protection, leaving Objective 7 to focus on the historic built environment.

Source	No.	Comment	Response/Action
		separately from the natural landscape.	
	17	<b>Table 3 Sustainability Issues, page 37</b> The protection and enhancement of the historic environment of the District should be identified as a key issue, as this is justified by the baseline data and the potential impact of the Core Strategy on the historic environment; this could either be positive or negative.	Noted and amended.
	18	<b>Table 5 SA Framework, page 39</b> It is recommended that the second decision-making criteria for objective 7 is amended as follows: "Will it protect and enhance heritage assets and their setting?"	Decision-making criteria amended to include this question.
	19	<b>Table 5 SA Framework, page 39</b> An additional criterion should be added that covers townscape character.	Additional criterion added to read: <i>Will it protect or contribute to the enhancement of the townscape character?</i>
	20	<b>Table 5 SA Framework, page 39</b> The list of heritage assets under the indicators heading are not indicators. Suggestions on possible indicators are included in our draft guidance. Also, woodlands should be included under objective 6 (Biodiversity) or an additional 'Landscape' objective, although we note that Appendix 2 makes specific reference to Ancient Woodlands, which are of biodiversity, landscape and historic landscape value. However, planting of new woodland would be a landscape or biodiversity indicator.	Indicators for the two revised objectives have been reworded to ensure that the impact on environmental and heritage assets are recorded as a measure of change in the District.
	21	<b>Table 5 SA Framework, page 39</b> The increase/decrease of buildings at risk assets is often included as an indicator and may be appropriate if it covers Grade II and possibly local assets; work undertaken a few years ago by County Council did establish a baseline of these assets. Since 2008 EH has been developing its 'Heritage at Risk' register, which not only includes listed buildings, but also other designated assets.	Noted. The Council's BAR register will be used as an indicator of the impact of the Core Strategy.
	22	<b>Table 5 SA Framework, page 39</b> It is also recommended that an additional objective is included that addresses landscape character. This links back to the	Noted, although it is not felt that a specific landscape character objective is required as this will be adequately addressed through Objective 6 – protecting the natural

Source	No.	Comment	Response/Action
		ELC.	environment.
	23	<b>General comment</b> It is also suggested that more information is included in the scoping report explaining how the assessment will be undertaken. Advice on the assessment process with reference to the historic environment is included in our draft guidance.	Guidance not accessible, although the second stage of the SA will set out the assessment methodology in greater detail.
	24	<b>Appendix 1 Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes</b> The ELC should be added. Also, we recommend that you include the draft PPS15 Planning for the Historic Environment.	The European Landscape Convention and Draft PPS15 have both been added to the list of relevant plans and policies.
Natural England	25	In general Natural England considers that the Scoping Report is thorough and takes a clear approach to the SA/SEA process, following a logical methodology. There are however some areas where our interests should be given greater consideration. Our detailed comments below are set out in order of the consultation questions that you have posed:	N/A
	26	The retention of attractive landscapes should include reference to PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, which promotes the landscape character assessment approach to landscape protection. Likewise a similar reference to PPS7 should be made in the following section which covers natural, cultural and built environmental assets	The SA Framework acknowledges the recommendations of PPS7 with regard to landscape protection it is not felt appropriate to reference this specifically within the background text.
	27	Most <b>landscapes</b> , including those which have no national designation, have a distinctive character that gives them a sense of place, for example, the open, flat landscapes of the fens and levels; the rolling claylands with deep 'dumbles' in the Midlands;. We need to be alert to the opportunities for enhancing landscapes and look to persuade others to secure them through changes to plans and strategies.	Landscape protection will be sought through LDF policies and SA Objective 6, which promotes protecting the natural environment.
	28	Landscape Character Assessments can influence the <b>location, layout and design of new development</b> by providing landscape guidelines which cover issues such as: the form and location of settlements and their relationship to the landscape; the type of characteristic buildings, including materials, height	The Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment is referenced in the relevant plans and programmes section and will inform the Core Strategy and other DPD policies.

Source	No.	Comment	Response/Action
		and form, and detailing; particular local features which might add distinctiveness to the new development; use of space within new development; how to integrate landscape design proposals into the wider landscape setting of developments.	
	29	LDF should include policies that facilitate the enhancement of landscapes. This may be by identifying landscape policy areas where particular improvement to the landscape is desirable. Developer contributions, provided through planning obligations under the provisions of S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, can often assist with landscape improvements and management regimes (see further Guidance Note 16). Policies should also address urban landscapes, the rural-urban fringe and coastal areas where degraded landscapes could be enhanced.	Noted.
	30	Natural England vigorously promotes the concept of <b>Green Infrastructure</b> in our engagement with development plans. This approach is intended to ensure that sufficient green infrastructure is planned and delivered from the earliest phases of planning, matching other priorities afforded to transport, environmental services and social infrastructure.	Bassetlaw DC acknowledges the importance of Green Infrastructure in the Core Strategy. A Green Infrastructure Study is underway, but is not yet complete.
	31	Natural England promotes the use of <b>green space</b> standards. We recommend the adoption of quality standards through the Green Flag Award scheme and through the setting standards of quantity and accessibility in our Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt). These standards are Natural England's key drivers in providing quality green spaces particularly close to where people live.	Background work on this issue is ongoing.
	32	Action is needed to ensure that the resilience of the natural environment is increased and protected to allow adaption to the impacts of <b>climate change</b> .	Although not explicitly quoted in any of the objectives, the impact of climate change is addressed through Objectives 6, 8, 9 and 10. Specific policies will also be developed to address climate change.
	33	There are also a number of Natural England publications that would be relevant to the Core Strategy objectives and should be referred to in Appendix 2: Review of Other Relevant Plans,	Noted and added to the list of relevant plans and programmes.

Source	No.	Comment	Response/Action
		<p>Programmes and Policies:</p> <p><i>'Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning: Incorporating the natural, built and historic environment and rural issues in plans and strategies'</i> is a joint publication by the Countryside Agency, English Heritage, English Nature and the Environment Agency. The guidance is intended to help the preparation of plans and strategies under the new planning system. The ideas the document contains, some of them at the cutting edge of planning policy and practice, are intended to be inspirational and aspirational. In particular the document encourages moving away from a 'topic-based' to an 'objectives-led' approach for plans and strategies. It promotes the environment and rural issues in a new and better-integrated policy framework, addressing wider sustainability issues whilst meeting local needs within a national, regional and district wide context. The agencies key aspirations for development are that it should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable in both built form and location</li> <li>• Respects the ability of the environment to accommodate change, including climate change</li> <li>• Avoids damage to and increases or enhances the environmental resource</li> <li>• Reduces risks to, and potentially arising from, the environment</li> <li>• Respects local distinctiveness and sense of place and is of high quality design, so that it is valued by communities</li> </ul> <p>Reflects local needs and provides local benefits.</p>	
	34	<p><i>The Countryside in and around towns'</i>, a joint vision between the Agency and Groundwork which provides a vision for connecting town and country</p>	<p>The more up to date <i>Green Infrastructure and the Urban Fringe (Natural England, 2009)</i> has been added instead.</p>

