



www.landuse.co.uk

Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan

Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan)

Prepared by LUC
January 2019

Project Title : Sustainability Appraisal of the Bassetlaw Local Plan

Client : Bassetlaw District Council

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
1	14/12/18	Draft SA Report for the Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan)	Kate Nicholls Sarah Smith Kieran Moroney Laura Field	Taran Livingston	Taran Livingston
2	08/01/19	Final SA Report for the Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan)	Sarah Smith Kieran Moroney	Taran Livingston	Taran Livingston



www.landuse.co.uk

Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan

Prepared by LUC
January 2019

Planning & EIA
Design
Landscape Planning
Landscape Management
Ecology
GIS & Visualisation

LUC BRISTOL
12th Floor Colston Tower
Colston Street Bristol
BS1 4XE
T +44 (0)117 929 1997
bristol@landuse.co.uk

Offices also in:
Edinburgh
Glasgow
Lancaster
London
Manchester



Land Use Consultants Ltd
Registered in England
Registered number: 2549296
Registered Office:
43 Chalton Street
London NW1 1JD
LUC uses 100% recycled paper

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	Context for the Bassetlaw Local Plan	1
	The new Local Plan	1
	Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment	2
2	Methodology	6
	SA Stage A: Scoping	6
	SA Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects	26
	SA Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal report	27
	SA Stage D: Consultation on the Bassetlaw Local Plan and this SA Report	28
	SA Stage E: Monitoring implementation of the Local Plan	28
	Appraisal methodology	28
	Difficulties Encountered	29
3	Sustainability Context for Development in Bassetlaw	31
	Introduction	31
	Review of Plans and Programmes	31
	Key Objectives and Policy Issues	37
	Baseline Information	44
	Key Sustainability Issues	44
4	Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Policy Options	48
	Spatial Options	48
	Housing Target	61
	Employment Land Target	64
	Thematic Policies	67
	Strategic site options	74
5	Sustainability Appraisal Findings for Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan)	79
	SA findings for Vision and Objectives	80
	Summary of SA findings for Spatial Strategy and Growth Targets (Policies 1 and 2)	84
	Summary of SA findings for Strategic Spatial Policies (Policies 8 to 12)	92
	SA findings for Thematic Policies (Policies 13 to 24)	97
6	Cumulative Effects of the Draft Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan	108
7	Monitoring and Recommendations	122
	Recommendations	122
8	Conclusions	131
	Next steps	132

The appendices are contained in a separate document and comprise:

Appendix 1

Consultation Comments

Appendix 2

Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes

Appendix 3

Baseline Information

Appendix 4

SA Matrices for the Policy Options

Appendix 5

SA Matrices for the Strategic Site Options

Appendix 6

SA Matrices for Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) Policies

Appendix 7

Assumptions to be applied in the SA of Site Options

Appendix 8

7 c i b W] ` Đ g ` ^ i g h] Z] W U h] c b ` Z c f ` g Y ` Y W h] of [a l t e r n a t i v e s Y b ` g Y h h ` Y a Y b h `

Appendix 9

7 c i b W] ` Đ g ` ^ i g h] Z] W U h] c b ` Z c f ` g Y ` Y W h] b [` d c `] W] Y g `] b ` `] [\ h `

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Sustainability Appraisal Report has been prepared by LUC on behalf of Bassetlaw District Council as part of the integrated Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Bassetlaw Local Plan.
- 1.2 This report relates to the Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) (January 2019) and it should be read in conjunction with that document. Note that Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) includes only the strategic elements of the emerging Local Plan. Consultation on the more detailed elements, including site allocations, is expected to take place later in 2019. SA of the more detailed elements of the Local Plan will be undertaken as they are developed.

Context for the Bassetlaw Local Plan

- 1.3 Bassetlaw District is located within the north of Nottinghamshire covering approximately 63,000ha with a population of approximately 116,300¹. To the north, the District is bordered by Doncaster and North Lincolnshire; to the west, Rotherham and Bolsover bound the District; to the east, West Yorkshire, Mansfield, Newark and Sherwood border Bassetlaw.
- 1.4 The District is mostly rural with Worksop to the south west and Retford towards the central part of the District acting as important service centres. The District has close links to the surrounding local authority areas as well as being an important gateway between the major cities of Sheffield and Nottingham. Reflecting its more rural undeveloped character, approximately 17,000 people commute out of Bassetlaw on a daily basis². Worksop has strong links with South Yorkshire in particular and provides access to strategic transport infrastructure in the form of the A57, A1 and east-west rail links allowing access to Lincoln and Cleethorpes and Sheffield. An emerging context for the City Region, with the Council currently being a member of the City Region Combined Authority.
- 1.5 Bassetlaw contains a wealth of locally and nationally designated biodiversity sites with over 300 Local Wildlife Sites within its boundary. Furthermore, the northern part of Sherwood Forest extends into Bassetlaw and a total of over 10,000ha of woodland (600ha of which are ancient woodlands) is present in the District which is almost double the average woodland cover for England at local authority level³.

The new Local Plan

- 1.6 Bassetlaw District Council began work on its new Local Plan in 2015. The new Local Plan will provide the long term approach to development in the District up to the year 2034 and once adopted will replace the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) which was adopted in December 2011.
- 1.7 The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan was published for consultation in October 2016 and set out a Vision and 11 Strategic Objectives for the Local Plan as well as six Strategic Proposals which detailed the spatial hierarchy for the District and a proposed planning approach and development principles for each tier of the hierarchy. The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan also set out proposed

¹ Nomis (Accessed December 2018) Labour Market Profile – Bassetlaw, Online at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157163/report.aspx?town=bassetlaw>

² Nomis (Accessed December 2018) Location of usual residence and place of work by method of travel to work, Online at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/WU03UK/chart/1132462277>

³ Bassetlaw District Council (October 2016) Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan

thematic policy approaches relating to housing growth; economic development; town and service centres; the historic environment; the natural environment; design; affordable and specialist housing; rural buildings and residential development in wider rural Bassetlaw; responding to a changing climate; infrastructure delivery and planning obligations; and Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. These proposed policy approaches were high level indications of the likely direction of the Local Plan policy and did not comprise detailed draft policy wording.

- 1.8 Bassetlaw District Council has now prepared the next iteration of the Local Plan, the Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) . This document focuses on the strategic elements of the Local Plan, including how much development is proposed and broadly how it will be distributed. This document includes strategic policies (including a policy to allocate new garden villages) and thematic policies, which are focused on various topics for development management purposes. These policies set out the requirements that development within the District should meet. The Part 2 Draft Plan Consultation will take place in summer 2019 and will include site allocations and more detailed policies .

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 1.9 Sustainability Appraisal is a statutory requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It is designed to ensure that the plan preparation process maximises the contribution that a plan makes to sustainable development and minimises any potential adverse impacts. The SA process involves appraising the likely social, environmental and economic effects of the policies and proposals within a plan from the outset of its development.
- 1.10 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is also a statutory assessment process, required under the SEA Directive ⁴, transposed in the UK by the SEA Regulations (Statutory Instrument 2004, No 1633). The SEA Regulations require the formal assessment of plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment and which set the framework for future consent of projects requiring Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) ⁵. The purpose of SEA, as X Y Z] b Y X :] b : 5 f h] W : Y : % : c ~~to provide for a high level of protection of the~~ environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the d f Y d U f U h] c b : U b X : U X c d h] c b : c Z : d : U b g Å " k] h \ : U : j] . Y k : h c : d f c a c h .
- 1.11 SEA and SA are separate processes but have similar aims and objectives. Simply put, SEA focuses on the likely environmental effects of a plan whilst SA includes a wider range of considerations, extending to social and economic impacts. National Planning Practice Guidance ⁶ shows how it is possible to satisfy both requirements by undertaking a joint SA/SEA process, and to present an SA report that incorporates the requirements of the SEA Regulations. The SA/SEA of the Bassetlaw Local Plan is being undertaken using this integrated approach and throughout h \] g : f Y d c f h : h \ Y : U V V f Y j] U h] c b : _ 6 5 8 c g K X Z Y X : h X Y f 8 8 c f 8 W W Y d b f f Y e i] f Y a Y b h g : c Z : G 9 5 8 " : :

Structure of this report

- 1.12 This report is the SA report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan - Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) (January 2019). Table 1.1 below signposts how the requirements of the SEA Regulations have been met within this report.

⁴ SEA Directive 2001/42/EC

⁵ Under EU Directives 85/337/EEC and 97/11/EC concerning EIA.

⁶ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/>

Table 1.1 Requirements of the SEA Regulations and in this SA Report

where these have been addressed

SEA Regulations Requirements	Where covered in this SA report
Preparation of an environmental report in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated (Reg. 12) . The information to be given is (Schedule 2):	
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes	Chapter 3 and Appendix 2.
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	Chapter 3 and Appendix 3.
c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected	Chapter 3 and Appendix 3.
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 Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC.	Chapter 3 and Appendix 3.
e) The environmental protection, objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into account during its preparation	Chapter 3 and Appendix 2.
f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long - term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects)	Chapters 4 and 5 and Appendix 4 , Appendix 5 and Appendix 6 .
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;	Chapters 4 and 5, Appendix 4, Appendix 5 and Appendix 6.
h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;	Chapters 2 and 4, Appendix 8 and Appendix 9 .
i) a description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Reg. 17 ;	Chapter 6.
j) a non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	A separate non -technical summary document will be prepared to accompany the SA report for the Publication version of the Local Plan .
The report shall include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision -making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment (Reg. 12(3))	Addressed throughout this SA report.

SEA Regulations Requirements	Where covered in this SA report
<p>Consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information which must be included in the environmental report (Reg. 12(5)) 	<p>Consultation on the SA Scoping Report was undertaken between March and April 2016. A further consultation on the proposed methodology for the remaining stages of the SA was undertaken between July and August 2018.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> authorities with environmental responsibility and the public, shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Reg. 13) 	<p>Consultation is being undertaken in relation to Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) between 14th January and 10th March 2019. The consultation document is accompanied by this SA report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other EU Member States, where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country (Reg. 14). 	N/A
Taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision-making (Reg. 16)	
<p>Provision of information on the decision: When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any countries consulted under Reg. 14 must be informed and the following made available to those so informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the plan or programme as adopted a statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report, the opinions expressed and the results of consultations entered into have been taken into account, and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and the measures decided concerning monitoring 	To be addressed after the Local Plan is adopted.
Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation (Reg. 17)	To be addressed after the Local Plan is adopted.
Quality assurance: environmental reports should be of a sufficient standard to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive.	This report has been produced in line with current guidance and good practice for SEA/SA and this table demonstrates where the requirements of the SEA Directive have been met.

1.13 This section has introduced the SA process for the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The remainder of the report is structured into the following sections:

- Chapter 2: Methodology describes the approach that is being taken to the SA of the Bassetlaw Local Plan.
- Chapter 3: Sustainability Context for Development in Bassetlaw describes the relationship between the Bassetlaw Local Plan and other relevant plans, policies and programmes; summarises the social, economic and environmental characteristics of the District and identifies the key sustainability issues.
- Chapter 4: Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Policy Options summarises the SA findings for the reasonable alternative strategic and other policy options that have been considered for the Local Plan to date.
- Chapter 5: Sustainability Appraisal findings for Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) summarises the SA findings for the draft policies that are set out in the current consultation document.

- ◁ Chapter 6: Monitoring describes the approach that should be taken to monitoring the likely significant effects of the Local Plan and proposes monitoring indicators.
- ◁ Chapter 7: Conclusions summarises the key findings from the SA of the Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) and describes the next steps to be undertaken.

1.14 The main body of the report is supported by a number of appendices as follows:

- ◁ Appendix 1 presents the consultation comments received in relation to the SA Scoping Report, the Interim SA Report and the SA Methodology Consultation, and explains how they have been addressed.
- ◁ Appendix 2 presents the updated review of relevant plans, policies and programmes.
- ◁ Appendix 3 presents the updated baseline information for Bassetlaw District.
- ◁ Appendix 4 presents SA matrices for the policy options.
- ◁ Appendix 5 presents SA matrices for the strategic site options.
- ◁ Appendix 6 presents SA matrices for the draft policies in the Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan).
- ◁ Appendix 7 presents the assumptions that applied during the SA of site options.
- ◁ Appendix 8 sets out how the garden village options were identified and why the proposed approach was selected.
- ◁ Appendix 9 sets out the reasonable alternatives considered by the Council for each policy and outlines why the proposed approach was taken forward and why alternatives were not selected.

2 Methodology

- 2.1 In addition to complying with legal requirements, the approach being taken to the SA of the Bassetlaw Local Plan is based on current best practice and the guidance on SA/SEA set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance, which involves carrying out SA as an integral part of the plan-making process. Table 2.1 below sets out the main stages of the plan-making process and shows how these correspond to the SA process.

Table 2.1 Corresponding stages in plan making and SA

Local Plan Step 1: Evidence Gathering and engagement
SA stages and tasks
Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives < 2: Collecting baseline information < 3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems < 4: Developing the SA framework < 5: Consulting on the scope of the SA
Local Plan Step 2: Production
SA stages and tasks
Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 1: Testing the Local Plan objectives against the SA framework < 2: Developing the Local Plan options < 3: Evaluating the effects of the Local Plan < 4: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects < 5: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan
Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 1: Preparing the SA Report
Stage D: Seek representations on the Local Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 1: Public participation on Local Plan and the SA Report < 2(i): Appraising significant changes
Local Plan Step 3: Examination
SA stages and tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 2(ii): Appraising significant changes resulting from representations
Local Plan Step 4 & 5: Adoption and Monitoring
SA stages and tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 3: Making decisions and providing information
Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < 1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring < 2: Responding to adverse effects

- 2.2 The sections below describe the approach that has been taken to the SA of the Bassetlaw Local Plan to date and provide information on the subsequent stages of the process.

SA Stage A: Scoping

- 2.3 The SA process began in March 2016 with the production of a Scoping Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan⁷. The SA Scoping Report was prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler on behalf of Bassetlaw District Council.

⁷ Amec Foster Wheeler (March 2016) The Bassetlaw Plan Sustainability Appraisal: Scoping Report

- 2.4 The Scoping stage of the SA involves understanding the social, economic and environmental baseline for the plan area as well as the sustainability policy context and key sustainability issues. The Scoping Report presented the outputs of the following tasks:
- ◁ Policies, plans and programmes of relevance to the Local Plan were identified and the relationships between them and the Local Plan and the SA were considered, enabling any potential synergies to be exploited and any potential inconsistencies and incompatibilities to be identified and addressed.
 - ◁ Baseline information was collected on environmental, social and economic issues in Bassetlaw District. This baseline information provides the basis for predicting and monitoring the likely effects of options for policies and site allocations and helps to identify alternative ways of dealing with any adverse effects identified.
 - ◁ Key sustainability issues for Bassetlaw District were identified.
 - ◁ A Sustainability Appraisal framework was presented, setting out the SA objectives against which options and subsequently policies would be appraised. The SA framework provides a way in which the sustainability impacts of implementing a plan can be described, analysed and compared. It comprises a series of sustainability objectives and associated sub-questions that SA objectives define the long-term aspirations of the District with regard to social, economic and environmental considerations. During the SA, the performances of the plan options (and later, policies) are assessed against these SA objectives and sub-questions.
- 2.5 The SA Scoping Report also set out information about the methodology that was intended to be followed for the later stages of the SA, including proposed criteria for the appraisal of site options and definitions of significance which would inform the appraisal of policy options.
- 2.6 Public and stakeholder participation is an important part of the SA and wider plan-making processes. It helps to ensure that the SA report is robust and has due regard for all appropriate information that will support the plan in making a contribution to sustainable development. The SA Scoping Report was published between March and April 2016 for a five week consultation period with the three statutory consultees (Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England). The consultation responses received were later listed and addressed in Appendix B of the Interim SA Report (October 2016).
- 2.7 Once LUC was commissioned in 2018 to undertake the remaining stages of the SA process for the Local Plan, the original proposed methodology as set out in the Scoping Report was reviewed and a number of changes were proposed. These changes were described in an SA Methodology Note (July 2018) which was sent to the three statutory consultees (Natural England, Historic England and Environment Agency) for comment.
- 2.8 Appendix 1 lists the comments that were received during the original Scoping consultation and describes how each one was addressed during the preparation of the 2016 Interim SA Report⁸ (this table was originally presented in Appendix B of the Interim SA Report). In light of the comments received, a number of amendments were made to the scoping work during the preparation of the Interim SA Report, including some minor amendments to the SA framework. These changes have been carried forward in this SA report. Appendix 1 also lists the comments received from the statutory consultees during the consultation on the revised methodology in July 2018. As noted in the table, no changes needed to be made to the proposed revisions as a result of the comments received.
- 2.9 As well as changes that have been made to address consultation comments, some parts of the Scoping Report (namely the review of plans, policies and programmes and the baseline information) have been subject to a general update as part of the preparation of this SA Report in order to ensure that they reflected the current situation in Bassetlaw District. Updated versions of the review of plans, policies and programmes and the baseline information are presented in Appendices 2 and 3 respectively of this report and are summarised in Chapter 3.
- 2.10 Table 2.2 overleaf presents the SA framework for the Bassetlaw Local Plan which includes 14 headline SA objectives along with their associated sub-questions. The table also shows how all of

⁸ The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan - Interim SA Report, Amec Foster Wheeler, October 2016.

Schedule 9 of the SEA Regulations) have been covered by the SA objectives in the SA framework, reflecting the fact that an integrated approach is being taken to the SA and SEA of the Local Plan. The methodology revisions described above did not affect the SA framework and no changes have been made to the SA objectives since they were presented in the Interim SA Report (October 2016). However, an additional sub-question has been added to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape, with regards to tranquillity. This has been added in response to a comment from Natural England, received in response to the Interim SA Report. Natural England highlighted that tranquillity can be an important landscape attribute and that the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) have mapped areas of tranquillity, which could inform the SA. The maps produced by CPRE are too coarse to inform the assessment of individual site options, but this has been used to inform the assessment of the cumulative effects of the growth proposed by the Local Plan over the plan period.

- 2.11 In order to ensure consistency in the appraisal of options and policies considered for the Bassetlaw Local Plan, a set of significance criteria was developed and set out in the Scoping Report. These criteria set out parameters within which certain scores would be given against each SA objective. As part of the methodology revisions described above, a number of changes were made to the significance criteria and the updated set are presented in Table 2.3.

Table 2.2 Framework for the Bassetlaw Local Plan

SA objectives	Sub -questions	Relevant topic(s) as set out in the SEA Regulations
<p>1. Biodiversity : To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements in the green infrastructure network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it conserve and enhance international designated nature conservation sites (Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Sites)? ◁ Will it conserve and enhance nationally designated nature conservation sites such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest? ◁ Will it conserve and enhance Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites? ◁ Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to indigenous species of principal importance, or priority species and habitats? ◁ Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process? ◁ Will it enhance ecological connectivity and maintain and improve the green infrastructure network, addressing deficiencies and providing green spaces that are well connected and biodiversity rich? ◁ Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management? ◁ Will it avoid damage to, and protect, Regionally Important Geological Sites? ◁ Will it provide opportunities for people to access the natural environment including green and blue infrastructure? ◁ Will it enhance the resilience of the natural environment to the impacts of climate change? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Biodiversity ◁ Fauna and Flora ◁ Human Health
<p>2. Housing : To ensure housing needs are met.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it meet current and emerging need for market and affordable housing? ◁ Will it reduce homelessness? ◁ Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? ◁ Will it help to ensure the provision of good quality, well designed homes? ◁ Will it deliver pitches required for Gypsies and Travellers and Showpeople? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Population
<p>3. Economy and Skills: To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it provide a supply of flexible, good quality employment land to meet the needs of the district? ◁ Will it help to diversify the local economy and support the delivery of the District's Regeneration and Growth Strategy, Nottinghamshire Growth Plan, Sheffield City Region and the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan? ◁ Will it provide good quality, well paid employment opportunities that meet the needs of local people? ◁ Will it increase average income levels? ◁ Will it improve the physical accessibility of jobs? ◁ Will it support rural diversification? ◁ Will it promote a low carbon economy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Population

SA objectives	Sub -questions	Relevant topic(s) as set out in the SEA Regulations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it improve access to training to raise employment potential? ◁ Will it increase levels of qualification? ◁ Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors? ◁ Will it promote investment in educational establishments? 	
<p>4. Regeneration and Social Inclusion: To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it maintain and enhance community facilities and services? ◁ Will it enhance accessibility to key community facilities and services including schools and public transport? ◁ Will it contribute to regeneration initiatives? ◁ Will it encourage engagement in community activities? ◁ Will it promote participation in cultural activities? ◁ Will it enhance the public realm? ◁ Will it align investment in services, facilities and infrastructure with growth? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Population ◁ Human health
<p>5. Health and Wellbeing: To improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it maintain and improve access to green infrastructure, open space, leisure and recreational facilities? ◁ Will it increase the opportunities for physical activity and accessibility of recreational services and facilities? ◁ Will it improve access to healthcare facilities and services? ◁ Will it reduce health inequalities? ◁ Will it support those with disabilities? ◁ Will it promote community safety? ◁ Will it reduce actual levels of crime and anti-social behaviour? ◁ Will it reduce the fear of crime? ◁ Will it promote design that discourages crime? ◁ Will it align healthcare facilities and services with growth? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Population ◁ Human health
<p>6. Transport: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it reduce travel demand and the distance people travel for jobs, employment, leisure and services and facilities? ◁ Will it encourage a shift to more sustainable modes of transport? ◁ Will it encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport? ◁ Will it help to address highways capacity issues and reduce traffic congestion? ◁ Will it capitalise on the District's good transport accessibility, links to Robin Hood Airport and the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Population ◁ Human health ◁ Air

SA objectives	Sub -questions	Relevant topic(s) as set out in the SEA Regulations
	new Worksop Bus Station? < Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment and public health? < Will it reduce the level of freight movement by road? < Will it help to enhance the connectivity of more remote, rural settlements?	
7. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	< Will it promote the use of previously developed (brownfield) land and minimise the loss of greenfield land? < Will it avoid the loss of agricultural land including best and most versatile land? < Will it make best use of and reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land in the District? < Will it encourage the reuse of existing buildings and infrastructure? < Will it prevent land contamination and facilitate remediation of contaminated sites? < Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?	< Soil < Material assets
8. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources	< Will it result in a reduction of run-off of pollutants to nearby water courses that lead to a deterioration in existing status and/or failure to achieve the objective of good status under the Water Framework Directive? < Will it improve ground and surface water quality? < Will it reduce water consumption and encourage water efficiency? < Will it ensure that new water/wastewater management infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner to support new development?	< Water
9. Flood Risk: To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	< Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? < Will it ensure that new development does not give rise to flood risk elsewhere? < Will it manage effectively, and reduce the likelihood of, flash flooding, taking into account the capacity of sewerage systems? < Will it discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding? < Will it deliver sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs) and promote investment in flood defences that reduce vulnerability to flooding?	< Climatic factors < Water
10. Air Quality: To improve air quality	< Will it maintain and improve air quality? < Will it avoid locating development in areas of existing poor air quality/odour? < Will it minimise emissions to air including odour from new development?	< Air < Human health
11. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change.	< Will it minimise energy use and reduce or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions? < Will it plan or implement adaptation measures for the likely effects of climate change? < Will it support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy in the District and reduce dependency on non-renewable sources? < Will it promote sustainable design and layout that is energy efficient, minimises greenhouse	< Climatic factors

SA objectives	Sub -questions	Relevant topic(s) as set out in the SEA Regulations
<p>12. Resource Use and Waste: To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).</p>	<p>emissions and is adaptable to the effects of climate change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Will it minimise the demand for raw materials and assist in maximising the use of recycled and secondary materials (including aggregates)? < Will it promote the use of local resources? < Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported? < Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling? < Will it avoid sterilisation of mineral reserves? < Will it support the objectives and proposals of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan? < Will it assist or facilitate compliance with the waste hierarchy (i.e. reduce first, then re-use, recover, recycle, landfill)? < Will it compromise the ongoing operation of existing waste management facilities? < Will it support investment in waste management facilities to meet local needs? < Will it support the objectives and proposals of the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Material Assets
<p>13. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the built environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Will it help to conserve and enhance existing features of the historic built environment and their settings, including archaeological assets? < Will it reduce the instances of inappropriate development in the built environment? < Will it promote sustainable repair and reuse of heritage assets? < Will it protect or enhance the significance of designated heritage assets and their settings? < Will it protect or enhance the significance of non-designated heritage assets and their settings? < Will it promote local cultural distinctiveness? < Will it improve the quality of the built environment, and maintain local distinctiveness and historic townscape character in the built environment? < Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and reuse? < Will it provide opportunities for people to value and enjoy the built environment? < Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Cultural heritage
<p>14. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and enhance the built environment character and townscapes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Will it conserve and reinforce special landscape features? < Will it promote high quality design in context with its urban and rural landscape? < Will it protect and enhance visual amenity? < Will it maintain tranquillity in the most tranquil areas of the District? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Landscape

Table 2.3 Significance criteria to be applied in the SA of options and policies

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
1. Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the blue infrastructure network.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it conserve and enhance international designated nature conservation sites (Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and Ramsar Sites)? 	++	Significant Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would have a positive effect on European or national designated sites, habitats or species (e.g. enhancing habitats, creating additional habitat or increasing protected species populations).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would create new habitat and link it with existing habitats or significantly improve existing habitats to support local biodiversity.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have significant positive effects on protected geologically important sites.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it conserve and enhance nationally designated nature conservation sites such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest? 	+	Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would have a positive effect on sub-regional/local designated sites, habitats or species.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would improve existing habitats to support local biodiversity.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have positive effects on protected geologically important sites.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it conserve and enhance Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites? 	0	Neutral/No effect	<p>The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it consider local BAP requirements and UK protected species? 	-	Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would have negative effects on sub-regional or local designated sites, habitats or species (e.g. short term loss of habitats, loss of species and temporary effects on the functioning of ecosystems).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would lead to short-term disturbance of existing habitat but would not have long-term effects on local biodiversity.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have minor negative effects on protected geologically important sites.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to indigenous species of principal importance, or priority species and habitats? 			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it offer protection to existing corridors and opportunities to create and 			

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enhance/connect habitats to offer a wider network? Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process? Will it enhance ecological connectivity and maintain and improve the green and blue infrastructure network, addressing deficiencies and providing green spaces that are well connected and biodiversity rich? Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management? Will it avoid damage to, and protect, Regionally Important Geological Sites? Will it provide opportunities for people to access the natural environment including green and blue infrastructure? Will it enhance the resilience of the natural environment to the impacts of climate change? 	<p>---</p> <p>?</p>	<p>Significant Negative</p> <p>Uncertain</p>	<p>The policy/proposal would have negative effects on European or national designated sites, habitats and/or protected species (i.e. on the interest features and integrity of the site, by preventing any of the conservation objectives from being achieved or resulting in a long term decrease in the population of a priority species). These effects could not be reasonably mitigated.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in significant, long term negative effects on non-designated sites (e.g. through significant loss of habitat leading to a long term loss of ecosystem structure and function).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have significant negative effects on protected geologically important sites.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the green and blue infrastructure network.</p> <p>The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.</p>
2. Housing: To ensure that the needs are met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> objectively assessed housing need, providing a range of housing types to meet current and emerging need for market and affordable housing? Will it reduce homelessness? Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? 	<p>++</p> <p>+</p>	<p>Significant Positive</p> <p>Positive</p>	<p>The policy/proposal would provide a significant increase to housing supply and would provide access to decent, affordable housing for residents with different needs (e.g. housing sites with capacity for 100 or more units).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would provide an increase to housing supply and would provide access to decent, affordable housing for residents with different needs (e.g. housing sites of between 1 and 99 units).</p> <p>The policy/proposal would make use of/improve existing buildings or unfit, empty homes.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would promote high quality design.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would deliver sufficient pitches to meet requirements for Gypsies and Travellers and Showpeople.</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	◁ Will it make best use of the 8] g h f] Wh Đ g ` Y l] g h stock?	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
	◁ Will it help to ensure the provision of good quality, well designed homes?	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would reduce the amount of affordable, decent housing available (e.g. a net loss of between 1 and 99 dwellings).
	◁ Will it deliver housing to meet the needs of the elderly and those with special needs?	--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would significantly reduce the amount of affordable, decent housing available (e.g. a net loss of 100+ dwellings).
	◁ Will it deliver pitches required for Gypsies and Travellers and Showpeople?	?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
3. Economy and Skills : To promote a strong economy which offers high quality local employment opportunities.	◁ Will it deliver local economic growth?	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would significantly encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure which would lead to a more diversified economy, maximising viability of the local economy and reducing out-commuting (e.g.it would deliver over 5 ha of employment land). The policy/proposal would result in the creation of new educational institutions.
	◁ Will it provide a supply of flexible, good quality employment land to meet the needs of the 8] g h f] W existing businesses and attract inward investment?	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure (e.g. delivering between 0.1 and 4.99 ha of employment land). The policy/proposal would provide accessible employment opportunities. The policy/proposal would support diversification of the rural economy. The policy/proposal would support existing educational institutions. The policy/proposal would support economic growth in the low carbon sector.
	◁ Will it help to diversify the local economy and support the delivery of the District's Regeneration and Growth Strategy, Nottinghamshire Growth Plan, Sheffield City Region and the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan?	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
	◁ Will it provide good quality, well paid employment opportunities that meet the needs of local people?	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would have negative effects on businesses, the local economy and local employment (e.g. it would result in the loss of between 0.1 and 4.99 ha of employment land).
	◁ Will it increase average income levels?	--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would have significant negative effects on business, the local economy and local employment (e.g. policy/proposal would lead to the closure or relocation of existing significant local businesses, loss of employment land of 5 ha or more, or would affect key sectors).
	◁ Will it improve the physical accessibility of jobs?			The policy/proposal would result in the loss of existing educational establishments without replacement provision elsewhere within the District.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Will it support rural diversification? < Will it promote a low carbon economy? < Will it improve access to training to raise employment potential? < Will it increase levels of qualification? < Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors? < Will it promote investment in educational establishments? 	?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
4. Regeneration and Social Inclusion: To promote regeneration, tackle deprivation and ensure accessibility for all.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Will it maintain and enhance community facilities and services? < Will it enhance accessibility to key community facilities and services including schools and public transport? < Will it help to promote shared community use and the co-location of services and facilities? 	++	Significant Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would create new, or significantly enhance existing, community facilities and services.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would significantly improve social and environmental conditions within deprived areas and support regeneration.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would significantly enhance the vitality and viability of h \ Y ' 8] g h f] Wh Đ g ' h</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Will it protect and enhance the vitality and viability of h \ Y ' 8] g h f] Wh Đ g ' h villages? 	+	Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would enhance existing community facilities and services.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would improve social and environmental conditions within deprived areas.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would enhance the vitality U b X ' j] U V] '] h m ' c town centres and/or villages.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Will it tackle deprivation in h \ Y ' 8] g h f] Wh Đ g ' a 	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> < Will it reduce inequalities? < Will it contribute to regeneration initiatives including in those areas which have been affected by the decline of the coal industry and the closure of 	-	Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would reduce the accessibility, availability and quality of existing community facilities and services.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have an adverse effect on the vitality and j] U V] '] h m ' c Z ' h \ Y ' 8] g h f] Wh Đ g ' h c k b ' WY b h f Y</p>
		--	Significant Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would result in the loss of existing community facilities and services without their replacement elsewhere within the District.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would have a significantly adverse effect on the vitality and j] U V] '] h m ' c Z ' h \ Y ' 8] g h f] Wh Đ g ' h c k b ' WY b h</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in new residential development being inaccessible to existing services and facilities.</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> collieries? ◀ Will it encourage engagement in community activities? ◀ Will it promote participation in cultural activities? ◀ Will it enhance the public realm? ◀ Will it align investment in services, facilities and infrastructure with growth? 	?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
5. Health and Wellbeing: To improve health and reduce health inequalities.	◀ Will it avoid locating development in locations that could adversely affect	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would have strong and sustained impacts on healthy lifestyles and improve well-being through physical activity, recreational activity, improved environmental quality, etc. Different groups within the society are taken into consideration. The policy/proposal would deliver new healthcare facilities and/or open space. The policy/proposal would significantly reduce the level of crime through design and other safety measures.
	◀ Will it maintain and improve access to green and blue infrastructure, open space, leisure and recreational facilities for all?	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would promote healthy lifestyles and improve well-being through physical activity, recreational activity, improved environmental quality, etc. Different groups within the society are taken into consideration. The policy/proposal would reduce crime through design and other safety measures.
	◀ Will it maintain and improve access to healthcare facilities in areas?	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
	◀ Will it increase the opportunities for physical activity and accessibility of recreational services and facilities?	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would reduce access to healthcare facilities and open space. The policy/proposal would lead to an increase in reported crime and the fear of crime in the District. The policy/proposal would have effects which could cause deterioration of health.
	◀ Will it improve access to health and social care facilities and services?	--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would result in the loss of healthcare facilities and open space without their replacement elsewhere within the District. The policy/proposal would lead to a significant increase in reported crime and the fear of crime. The policy/proposal would have significant effects which would cause deterioration of health within the community (i.e. increase in pollution)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◀ Will it reduce health inequalities? ◀ Will it meet the needs of the ◀ Will it support those with disabilities and promote 			

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> accessible buildings and public spaces? < Will it promote community safety? < Will it reduce actual levels of crime and anti-social behaviour? < Will it reduce the fear of crime? < Will it promote design that discourages crime? < Will it align healthcare facilities and services with growth? < Will it minimise noise levels associated with new development and avoid locating sensitive development in areas affected by noise? 	?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
6. Transport: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	< Will it reduce travel demand and the distance people travel for jobs, employment, leisure and services and facilities?	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would significantly reduce need for travel, road traffic and congestion. The policy/proposal would create opportunities/incentives for the use of sustainable travel/transport of people/ goods. The policy/proposal would significantly reduce out-commuting. The policy/proposal would support investment in transportation infrastructure and/or services.
	< Will it encourage a shift to more sustainable modes of transport?	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would reduce need for travel. The policy/proposal would encourage the use of sustainable travel/transport of people/goods.
	< Will it encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport?	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
	< Will it help to address highways capacity issues and reduce traffic congestion?	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would increase the need for travel by less sustainable forms of transport, increasing road traffic and congestion.
	< Will it deliver investment in infrastructure and support proposals identified in the	--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would significantly increase the need for travel by less sustainable forms of transport, substantially increasing road traffic and congestion. The policy/proposal would result in the loss of transportation infrastructure and/or services.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Transport Plan? < Will it capitalise on the District's good transport accessibility, links to Robin Hood Airport and the new Worksop Bus Station? < Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment and public health? < Will it help deliver traffic management and calming measures to reduce road injuries? < Will it reduce the level of freight movement by road? < Will it help to enhance the connectivity of more remote, rural settlements? 	?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
7. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	< Will it promote the use of previously developed (brownfield) land and minimise the loss of greenfield land?	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would encourage significant development on brownfield land. The policy/proposal would result in existing land / soil contamination being removed. The policy/proposal would protect best and most versatile agricultural land.
	< Will it avoid the loss of agricultural land including best and most versatile land?	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would encourage development on brownfield.
	< Will it make best use of and reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land in the District?	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
	< Will it encourage the reuse of	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would result in development on greenfield or would create conflicts in land-use. The policy/proposal would result in the loss of agricultural land.
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The policy/proposal would result in land contamination.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<p>existing buildings and infrastructure?</p> <p>< Will it prevent land contamination and facilitate remediation of contaminated sites?</p> <p>< Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?</p>	?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
8. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	< Will it result in a reduction of run-off of pollutants to nearby water courses that lead to a deterioration in existing status and/or failure to achieve the objective of good status under the Water Framework Directive?	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would lead to a significant reduction of wastewater, surface water runoff and pollutant discharge so that the quality of groundwater and/or surface water would be significantly improved and all water targets (including those relevant to biological and chemical quality) would be met/exceeded. The policy/proposal would lead to a significant reduction in the demand for water. The policy/proposal would support investment in water resources infrastructure.
	< Will it improve ground and surface water quality?	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would lead to a reduction of wastewater, surface water runoff and/or pollutant discharge so that the quality of groundwater or surface water would be improved and some water targets (including those relevant to biological and chemical quality) would be met/exceeded. The policy/proposal would lead to a reduction in the demand for water.
	< Will it reduce water consumption and encourage water efficiency?	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
	< Will it ensure that new water/wastewater management infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner to support new development?	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to an increase in the amount of waste water, surface water runoff and pollutant discharge so that the quality of groundwater or surface water would be reduced. The policy/proposal would lead to an increase in the demand for water.
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to a significant increase in the amount of wastewater, surface water runoff and pollutant discharge so that the quality of groundwater or surface water would be decreased and water targets would not be met. The policy/proposal would lead to deterioration of the current WFD classification. The policy/proposal would lead to a significant increase in the demand for water placing water resource zones in deficit over the lifetime of the Severn Trent Water and/or Anglian Water Water Resources Management Plans. The policy/proposal would result in the capacity of existing wastewater management infrastructure being exceeded without appropriate mitigation.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
9. Flood Risk: To minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in the District, taking into account the effects of climate change.	Will it help to avoid or reduce the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would significantly reduce flood risk to new or existing infrastructure or communities (currently located within the 1 in 100 year floodplain).
	Will it ensure that new development does not give rise to flood risk elsewhere?	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would reduce flood risk to new or existing infrastructure or communities (currently located 1 in 1000 year floodplain).
	Will it manage effectively, and reduce the likelihood of, flash flooding, taking into account the capacity of sewerage systems?	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective. It is anticipated that the policy will neither cause nor exacerbate flooding in the catchment.
	Will it discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding?	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would result in an increased flood risk within the 1 to 1000 year floodplain.
	Will it deliver sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs) and promote investment in flood defences that reduce vulnerability to flooding?	--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would result in an increased flood risk within the 1 to 100 year floodplain.
	Will it deliver sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs) and promote investment in flood defences that reduce vulnerability to flooding?	?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
10. Air Quality: To improve air quality.	Will it maintain and improve air quality?	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would significantly improve air quality.
	Will it avoid locating development in areas of existing poor air quality/odour?	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would improve air quality.
	Will it minimise emissions to air including odour from new development?	0	Neutral	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
	Will it minimise emissions to air including odour from new development?	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to a decrease in air quality.
	Will it minimise emissions to air including odour from new development?	--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to a decrease in air quality and would result in new AQMAs being declared.
	Will it minimise emissions to air including odour from new development?	?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
11. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change.	◁ Will it minimise energy use and reduce or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions?	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the District. The policy/proposal would significantly reduce energy consumption or increase the amount of renewable energy being used/generated.
	◁ Will it plan or implement adaptation measures for the likely effects of climate change?	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the District. The policy/proposal would increase resilience/decrease vulnerability to climate change effects. The policy/proposal would reduce energy consumption or increase the amount of renewable energy being used/generated. The policy/proposal would support/encourage sustainable design.
	◁ Will it support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy in the District and reduce dependency on non-renewable sources?	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
	◁ Will it promote sustainable design and layout that is energy efficient, minimises greenhouse emissions and is adaptable to the effects of climate change?	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions from the District. The policy/proposal would not increase resilience/decrease vulnerability to climate change effects.
		--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions from the District. The policy/proposal would increase vulnerability to climate change effects.
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
12. Resource Use and Waste: To encourage sustainable resource use and promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover).	◁ Will it minimise the demand for raw materials and assist in maximising the use of recycled and secondary materials (including aggregates)?	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would reduce the amount of waste generated through prevention, minimisation and re-use. The policy/proposal would significantly reduce the amount of waste going to landfill through recycling and energy recovery. The policy/proposal would support/encourage investment in waste management facilities.
	◁ Will it promote the use of local resources?	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would reduce the amount of waste going to landfill through recycling and energy recovery. The policy/proposal would encourage the use of sustainable materials.
	◁ Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
	◁ Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would result in an increased amount of waste going to landfill. The policy/proposal would increase the demand for local resources.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it avoid sterilisation of mineral reserves? ◁ Will it support the objectives and proposals of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan? 	--	Significant Negative	<p>The policy/proposal would result in a significantly increased amount of waste going to landfill.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would significantly increase the demand for local resources.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in inappropriate development within a minerals safeguarding area.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it assist or facilitate compliance with the waste hierarchy (i.e. reduce first, then re-use, recover, recycle, landfill)? ◁ Will it compromise the ongoing operation of existing waste management facilities? ◁ Will it support investment in waste management facilities to meet local needs? ◁ Will it support the objectives and proposals of the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy? 	?	Uncertain	<p>The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.</p>
13. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the historic built environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it help to conserve and enhance existing features of the historic built environment and their settings, including archaeological assets? 	++	Significant Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would protect and enhance the sites, areas and features of historic, cultural, archaeological and architectural interest with national designations (including their setting).</p> <p>The policy/proposal will make use of historic buildings, spaces and places through sensitive adaptation and re-use allowing these distinctive assets to be accessed.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in an asset(s) being removed from the At Risk Register.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it reduce the instances and circumstances where heritage assets are identified as being at risk of harm? 	+	Positive	<p>The policy/proposal would protect and enhance the sites, areas and features of historic, cultural, archaeological and architectural interest with local designations (including their setting).</p> <p>The policy/proposal will increase access to historical/cultural/archaeological/architectural buildings/spaces/places.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it promote sustainable repair and reuse of heritage assets? 	0	Neutral/No effect	<p>The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Will it protect or enhance the 			

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	significance of designated heritage assets and their settings?	-	Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to the deterioration of and/or harm to sites, areas and features of historic, cultural, archaeological and architectural interest with local designations. The policy/proposal would temporarily restrict access to historical/cultural/archaeological/architectural buildings/spaces/places.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it protect or enhance the significance of non-designated heritage assets and their settings? Will it promote local cultural distinctiveness? Will it improve the quality of the built environment, and maintain local distinctiveness and historic townscape 	--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would lead to the deterioration of and/or harm to sites, areas and features of historic, cultural, archaeological and architectural interest with national designation or result in the destruction of heritage assets (national or local). The policy/proposal would permanently restrict access to historical/cultural/archaeological/architectural buildings/spaces/places. The policy/proposal would result in an asset being placed on the At Risk Register.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use? Will it provide opportunities for people to value and enjoy historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use? Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value? 	?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.
14. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and enhance the character and townscapes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it conserve and enhance character and townscapes? 	++	Significant Positive	The policy/proposal would offer potential to significantly enhance landscape/townscape character.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it conserve and reinforce special landscape features? 	+	Positive	The policy/proposal would offer potential to enhance landscape/townscape character.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote high quality design in context with its urban and rural landscape? 	0	Neutral/No effect	The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.
		-	Negative	The policy/proposal would have an adverse effect on landscape/townscape character.

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
	< Will it protect and enhance visual amenity?	--	Significant Negative	The policy/proposal would have a significant adverse effect on landscape/townscape character.
		?	Uncertain	The policy/proposal has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.

SA Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects

- 2.12 Developing options for a plan is an iterative process, usually involving a number of consultations with the public and stakeholders. Consultation responses and the SA can help to identify where the most significant effects are likely to occur and where the most significant effects are likely to occur.
- 2.13 Regulation 12 (2) of the SEA Regulations requires that:
the plan or programme shall be subject to an appraisal of the likely significant effects on the environment of
(a) implementing the plan or programme; and
(b) reasonable alternatives, taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme.
- 2.14 Options that are not reasonable do not need to be subject to appraisal. Examples of unreasonable alternatives could include policy options that do not meet the objectives of the plan or national policy (e.g. the National Planning Policy Framework) or site options that are unavailable or undeliverable.
- 2.15 The SA findings are not the only factors taken into account when determining a preferred option to take forward in a plan. Indeed, there will often be an equal number of positive or negative effects identified for each option, such that it is not possible to select a preferred option on the basis of performance in order to select a preferred option. Factors such as public opinion, deliverability and conformity with national policy will also be taken into account by plan-makers when selecting preferred options for their plan.
- 2.16 This section describes how the appraisal of options has fed into the development of the current consultation document, Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan). Some options appraisal work was undertaken previously and presented in the Interim SA Report (October 2016) and this has been brought forward and amended/supplemented as needed during the preparation of this current SA report.
- 2.17 The Interim SA Report (October 2016) included an appraisal of the Vision and Strategic Objectives for the Local Plan as well as an appraisal of:
- < five alternative options for the level of housing growth (housing target options).
 - < three alternative options for the level of employment growth (employment target options).
 - < six alternative spatial options for distributing the growth within the District.
- 2.18 The sets of reasonable alternative options for the levels of housing have changed, as a result of updated evidence being prepared. In particular, the publication of a Strategic Housing Needs Assessment (SHMA)⁹, publication of a draft Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA)¹⁰, the publication of a standard methodology for calculating Objectively Assessed Need (OAN)¹¹ and the publication of updated household projections by the Office for National Statistics. The revised sets of options have again been subject to SA and the findings are presented in Chapter 4 and Appendix 4 of this report. In appraising the revised options, regard has been had to the updated significance criteria described in the previous section.
- 2.19 The Planning for Employment background paper¹², available alongside the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan, set out how the employment targets were identified. The employment targets were

⁹ GL Hearn (2017) North Derbyshire and Bassetlaw SHMA – E OAN Update

¹⁰ The EDNA is being undertaken by GL Hearn and was still in progress at the time of writing. The Council shared draft outputs with regards to implications for housing with LUC in December 2018.

¹¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-right-homes-in-the-right-places-consultation-proposals>

¹² Bassetlaw District Council (2016) Planning for Employment, exploring delivery options for Bassetlaw

appraised in the SA of the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan and have been reproduced in Chapter 4 and Appendix 4 of this report.

- 2.20 The spatial options were identified through consideration of a number of evidence studies. This includes work on the relative sustainability of different villages in Bassetlaw, market trends and known strategic opportunities.
- 2.21 In addition, two further reasonable alternative spatial options have been identified by the Council and these have now been subject to SA. These options which consider different ways of combining the other spatial options. The SA work undertaken previously in relation to the original six spatial options has also been revised to take into account the updated significance criteria. This work is presented in Chapter 4 and Appendix 4 of this report.
- 2.22 In preparing Part 1 of the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan), the Council also considered approaches to distributing the identified housing target within different areas of the District. The appraisal of these alternatives is presented in Chapter 4.
- 2.23 The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan also included a number of other proposed policy approaches that were not subject to SA at the time. These have now been appraised. Consideration was also given to whether there were any reasonable alternative approaches to the proposed policy approaches that were set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan and where reasonable alternatives were identified, these have also been appraised. This work is presented in Chapter 4 of this report.
- 2.24 Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) includes strategic site allocations. BDC identified a total of six reasonable strategic site options, which were subject to SA (see Chapter 4 and Appendix 4). These options were identified through the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study¹³, which sets out the methodology in full. The New Settlement Study explains that the Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Survey (2016) Technical Statement & Evidence was used to identify the location of all the rural parishes within the District, as the study was looking for a new settlement to deliver benefits to existing rural communities and improve sustainability within rural settlements. The study then identified those parishes with at least one primary service (convenience retail, GP Surgery, primary school or Post Office facility) for further consideration. Using these parishes as a starting point, the study undertook a desktop review of land capable of accommodating a sufficient scale of growth for a new settlement, while avoiding coalescence of settlements. For each parish area, environmental and landscape designations and constraints, and the level of existing service provision was analysed, from which six reasonable alternative sites with potential for accommodating a new garden village were identified.
- 2.25 Options for smaller-scale site allocations to be made in the Local Plan will be subject to SA prior to the preparation of the Draft Plan Part 2 and the findings will be presented in an updated version of this SA report. At that time, a number of other policy topics not addressed in the current consultation document will also be considered.
- 2.26 The Council considered various approaches to thematic policies, based on responses to early consultation and engagement, achieving the vision and compliance with the NPPF. These were presented in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan (October 2016). These were not subject to SA at the time but have now been appraised in Chapter 4, along with reasonable alternative policy approaches.

SA Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal report

- 2.27 This SA Report describes the process that has been undertaken to date in carrying out the SA of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. It sets out the findings of the appraisal of options, draft policies and strategic sites, highlighting any likely significant effects (both positive and negative, and taking into account the likely secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term and permanent and temporary effects). It also describes the reasons for selecting or rejecting certain options during the preparation of the Local Plan to date.

¹³ ADAS (2018) Bassetlaw New Settlement Study

SA Stage D: Consultation on the Bassetlaw Local Plan and this SA Report

- 2.28 Bassetlaw District Council is inviting comments on the Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) and is conducting a public consultation between 14th January and 10th March 2019.
- 2.29 Appendix 1 presents the consultation comments that were received in relation to the SA Scoping Report, the Interim SA Report and the SA Methodology Consultation and explains how each one has been addressed in the SA work undertaken since then.

SA Stage E : Monitoring implementation of the Local Plan

- 2.30 Recommendations for monitoring the likely significant social, environmental and economic effects of implementing the Bassetlaw Local Plan are presented in Chapter 6.

Appraisal methodology

- 2.31 Reasonable alternative policy and spatial options for the Local Plan have been appraised against the SA objectives in the SA framework (see Table 2.2 earlier in this section), with scores being attributed to each option or policy to indicate its likely effects on each SA objective as follows:

Figure 2.1: Key to symbols and colour coding used in the SA of the Bassetlaw Local Plan

++	The option or policy is likely to have a significant positive effect on the SA objective(s).
+	The option or policy is likely to have a minor positive effect on the SA objective(s).
0	The option or policy is likely to have a negligible or no effect ¹⁴ on the SA objective(s).
-	The option or policy is likely to have a minor negative effect on the SA objective(s).
--	The option or policy is likely to have a significant negative effect on the SA objective(s).
?	It is uncertain what effect the option or policy will have on the SA objective(s).
+/-	The option or policy is likely to have a mixture of positive and negative effects on the SA objective(s).

- 2.32 Where a potential positive or negative effect is uncertain, a question mark was added to the relevant score (e.g. +? or -?) and the score has been colour coded as per the potential positive, negligible or negative effect (e.g. green, yellow, orange, etc.).
- 2.33 The likely effects of options and policies need to be determined and their significance assessed, which inevitably requires a series of judgments to be made. The appraisal has attempted to differentiate between the most significant effects and other more minor effects through the use of the symbols shown above. The dividing line in making a decision about the significance of an effect is often quite small. Where either (++) or (--) has been used to distinguish significant effects from more minor effects (+ or -) this is because the effect of an option or policy on the SA objective in question is considered to be of such magnitude that it will have a noticeable and measurable effect taking into account other factors that may influence the achievement of that objective. However, scores are relative to the scale of proposals under consideration. The significance definitions for policies are set out in Table 2.3 earlier in this chapter and have been used to achieve consistency in making judgements.

¹⁴ These terms are used interchangeably throughout this SA.

Assumptions to be applied during the SA

- 2.34 SA inevitably relies on an element of subjective judgement. However, at the next stage of the SA when a large number of site options will be appraised, it will be necessary to ensure consistency in the appraisal of those options and so a detailed set of assumptions for site appraisals, referred to as the 'Assumptions for Site Appraisal', has been developed. These assumptions set out clear parameters within which certain SA scores will be given, based on factors such as the distance of site options from features such as biodiversity designations, public transport links and areas of high landscape sensitivity.
- 2.35 The site assessment criteria are presented in Appendix 7 and will be applied through the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) data where appropriate. The assumptions were originally set out in the SA Scoping Report and a number of changes have been made as part of the consultation on the revised SA methodology (July 2018). These changes are reflected in Appendix 7.
- 2.36 Garden communities will be expected to be relatively self-contained communities. As such, they will provide more than just housing. In order to acknowledge this in the SA, LUC has agreed a number of assumptions with the Council, which have been applied to the assessment of all garden community sites on a consistent basis. Any new garden community would be expected to provide:
- < > 1,000 homes .
 - < Low density development .
 - < Primary school .
 - < Local centre.
 - < Small -scale employment/job provision (<5 ha for the purposes of applying the site assessment assumptions presented in Appendix 7).
 - < High level of open space / greenspace .
 - < Bus stops / cycle routes.
 - < GP surgery .

Difficulties Encountered

- 2.37 It is a requirement of the SEA Regulations that consideration is given to any data limitations or other difficulties that are encountered during the SA process. During the appraisal of the policy options, the fact that options had not yet been worked up in detail (comprising only suggested policy approaches) meant that at times it was difficult to assess in detail the likely effects of the options on each SA objective. Once the draft policies are worked up in more detail it is possible to draw more certain conclusions about their likely effects.
- 2.38 The strategic site options were sent by BDC to LUC as an image in PDF format. As such, LUC had to digitise site boundaries in its GIS software. As such, the boundaries used for the assessment of site options were approximate. Given the strategic scale of these sites and the strategic nature of the SA process, this is considered sufficient for the purposes of the SA.
- 2.39 The options for different housing and employment targets are not associated with any particular spatial pattern or location of development. It was difficult to assess these figures against the baseline, as spatial implications of each are unknown. As such, whilst the SA generally assesses each option individually against the baseline, the assessments of these options are necessarily comparative to an extent.
- 2.40 Many of the effects identified in the assessments depend on the exact location of development, which, aside from the strategic spatial options, is yet to be decided. This has led to uncertainty in many of the assessments.
- 2.41 There could be undiscovered archaeological features at any location within the District. For the purposes of this SA, we have focused on assessing the likely effects of development on known

archaeological sites, but further archaeological work may be necessary prior to any development in order to avoid loss of archaeological resources.

2.42 The rate at which emissions from private vehicles will change over the course of the plan period as a result of technological improvements cannot be predicted or realistically factored in to judgements about air quality.

2.43 The assumptions presented in Appendix 7 include a number of distance thresholds used to estimate likely effects of spatial options. It cannot be known which route people will take and this is likely to vary depending on the start and end points. For consistency, these thresholds will use straight line measurements from the boundary of a site.

2.44 Uncertainties and assumptions have been detailed in the SA matrices in Appendix 4 and Appendix 6.

3 Sustainability Context for Development in Bassetlaw

Introduction

- 3.1 One of the first steps in undertaking SA is to identify and review other relevant plans and programmes that could influence the Local Plan. The requirement to undertake a plan and programme review and identify the environmental and wider sustainability objectives relevant to the plan being assessed is set out in the SEA Regulations " 5 b i 9 b j] f c b a Y b h U " F Y d c f h F under the SEA Regulations should include:
[An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other f Y Y j U b h d U b g U b X d f c [f U a a Y g I h c X Y h Y f a] b Y [h \ Y Y b j] f c b established at international (European) community or national level, which are relevant to the d U b c f d f c [f U a a Y U b X h \ Y k U m h \ c g Y c V ^ Y W r a t i o n s h a v e U b X U b m Y been taken into account during its preparation I Schedule 2 (a), (e)].
- 3.2 Plans and programmes relevant to The Bassetlaw Plan may be those at an international/ European, UK, national, regional, sub -regional or local level, as relevant to the scope of the document. The review of relevant plans and programmes aims to identify the relationships between the Local Plan and these other documents i. e. how the Local Plan could be affected by h \ Y c h \ Y f d U b g U b X d f c [f U a a Y g e t s U o r h o w i t c o u l d c o n t r i b u t e t o U b X # c f the achievement of their sustainability objectives. The review also ensures that the relevant environmental protection and sustainability objectives are integrated into the SA. Additionally, reviewing plans and programmes can provide appropriate information on the baseline for the plan area and help identify the key sustainability issues.
- 3.3 The SA Scoping Report included a review of plans and programmes, consistent with the requirements of the SEA Directive, and which informed the development of the SA Framework. This review has been updated as part of the preparation of this SA Report to take into account consultation responses to the Scoping Report.

Review of Plans and Programmes

- 3.4 Over 100 international/European, national, regional/sub -regional and local level plans and programmes have been reviewed in preparing this SA Report. These are listed in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Plans and Programmes Reviewed for the SA of the Local Plan

Geographic scale	Plan/Programme
International /European	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The Cancun Agreement - UNFCCC (2011) ◁ The Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada Convention 1985) ◁ The European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Valetta Convention 1992) ◁ Council Directive 91/271/EEC for Urban Waste-Water Treatment ◁ European Commission (EC) (2011) A Resource - Efficient Europe - Flagship Initiative Under the Europe 2020 Strategy, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions (COM 2011/21) ◁ European Landscape Convention 2000 (became binding March 2007) ◁ European Union (EU) Nitrates Directive (91/676/EEC) ◁ EU Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (92/43/EEC) & Subsequent Amendments ◁ EU Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive (94/62/EC) ◁ EU Drinking Water Directive (98/83/EC) ◁ EU Directive on the Landfill of Waste (99/31/EC) ◁ EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) ◁ EU on the Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment (SEA Directive) (2001/42/EC) ◁ EU Directive 2010/31/EU (2010) on the Energy Performance of Buildings ◁ EU Environmental Noise Directive (Directive 2002/49/EC) ◁ EU Bathing Waters Directive 2006/7/EC ◁ EU (2006) European Employment Strategy ◁ EU (2009) Renewed EU Sustainable Development Strategy ◁ EU Floods Directive 2007/60/EC ◁ EU Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC) and previous directives (96/62/EC; 99/30/EC; 2000/69/EC & 2002/3/EC) ◁ EU Directive on Waste (Directive 75/442/EEC, 2006/12/EC 2008/98/EC as amended) ◁ EU Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds (09/147/EC) (codified version of Council Directive 79/409/EEC as amended) ◁ EU Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC) ◁ EU (2011) EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 – towards implementation ◁ United Nations (2015) United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 21) Paris Agreement ◁ UNESCO World Heritage Convention (1972)

Geographic scale	Plan/Programme
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ UNFCCC (1997) The Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC ◁ World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) Our Common Future (The Brundtland Report) ◁ The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), Johannesburg, September 2002
National	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) (2001) The Historic Environment: A Force for our Future ◁ DCMS (2008) Heritage Protection for the 21st Century - White Paper ◁ DCMS (2008) Play Strategy for England ◁ Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2011) Planning for Schools Development ◁ MHCLG (2018) National Planning Policy Framework ◁ MHCLG (2018) Planning Practice Guidance ◁ DCLG (2014) National Planning Policy for Waste ◁ DCLG (2014) House of Commons: Written Statement on Sustainable Drainage Systems ◁ DCLG (2015) Planning Policy for Traveller Sites ◁ Department for Education (2014) Home to School Travel and Transport Guidance ◁ Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) (2009) The UK Low Carbon Transition Plan: National Strategy for Climate and Energy ◁ Defra (2018) A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment ◁ Defra(2007) The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland ◁ Defra (2007) Strategy for England's Trees, Woods and Forests ◁ Defra (2009) Safeguarding Our Soils: A Strategy for England ◁ Defra (2011) Natural Environment White Paper: The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature ◁ Defra (2012) UK post 2010 Biodiversity Framework ◁ Defra (2018) The National Adaptation Programme and the Third Strategy for Climate Adaptation Reporting – Making the Country Resilient to a Changing Climate Defra (2013) Waste Management Plan for England ◁ Environment Agency (2013) Managing Water – Abstraction ◁ Environment Agency (2013) Water Stress Areas – Final Classifications ◁ Forestry Commission (2005) Trees and Woodlands Nature's Health Service ◁ Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice

Geographic scale	Plan/Programme
	<p>in Planning Note 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ HM Government (1979) Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act ◁ The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 ◁ HM Government (1990 Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) ◁ HM Government (2000) Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 ◁ HM Government (2005) Securing the future - delivering UK sustainable development strategy ◁ HM Government (2006) The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (as amended) ◁ HM Government (2008) The Climate Change Act 2008 (as amended) ◁ HM Government (2009) The UK Renewable Energy Strategy ◁ HM Government (2010) The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 ◁ HM Government (2010) Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (as amended) ◁ HM Government (2011) Carbon Plan: Delivering our Low Carbon Future ◁ HM Government (2011) UK Marine Policy Statement ◁ HM Government (2011) Water for Life, White Paper ◁ HM Government (2013) The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013 ◁ NHS England (2014) Five Year Forward View
Regional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Anglian Water (2015) Water Resources Management Plan ◁ Defra and the Environment Agency (2015) Water for Life and Livelihoods: Humber District River Basin Management Plan ◁ East Midlands Airport (2015) Sustainable Development Plan ◁ Environment Agency (2016) Humber River Basin District Flood Risk Management Plan 2015 - 2021 ◁ Natural England (2009) East Midlands Landscape Character Assessment ◁ Network Rail (2010) East Midlands Route Utilisation Strategy ◁ Severn Trent Water (2014) Water Resources Management Plan
Sub -Regional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ D2N2 Local Economic Partnership (2013) Strategy for Growth 2013 - 2023 ◁ Environment Agency (2010) River Trent Catchment Flood Management Plan ◁ Environment Agency (2011) Isle of Axholme Flood Risk Management Strategy ◁ Environment Agency (2013) Lower Trent and Erewash Abstraction

Geographic scale	Plan/Programme
	<p>Licensing Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Environment Agency (2013) The Idle and Torne Abstraction Licensing Strategy ◁ Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Group (1998) Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2005) Minerals Local Plan Adopted December 2005 ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2007) Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2007 – 2012 ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2010) Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 – 2020 ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2011) A Cultural Strategy for Nottinghamshire County Council 2011 – 2021 ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2011) Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2026 ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2011) Mobility Strategy for Nottinghamshire (as amended) ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2013) Economic Development Strategy 2014 – 2018 ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2013) Green Estate Development Strategy and Plan 2013 -2023 ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council (2013) Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan – Part 1: Waste Core Strategy ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2018) Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2018 – 2022 ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottinghamshire Health and Wellbeing Board (2018) Strategic Plan 2018 -2022 ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2015) Integrated Passenger Transport Strategy ◁ Nottinghamshire County Council (2018) Minerals Local Plan (Draft Plan consultation) River Idle Catchment Partnership (undated) ◁ Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership (2014) Strategic Economic Plan ◁ Sheffield City Region (2017) Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2018 – 2040
Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2008) Langold Country Park Management Plan for Local Nature Reserve ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2008) Retford Cemetery Management Plan ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2008) Woodsetts Pond Management Plan ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2009) Landscape Character Assessment ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2010) Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 – 2020

Geographic scale	Plan/Programme
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2011) Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2012) Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2017) Homelessness Prevention Strategy 2017-2022 ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2012) Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2012) Sports Development Strategy ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2016) The Canch Management Plan 2016 - 2019 ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2013) Climate Change Strategy 2013 ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2016) Kings Park Management Plan 2016 - 2019 ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2013) Successful Places Supplementary Planning Document ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2013) Sustainability Strategy ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2014) Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document. ◁ Bassetlaw District Council, Council Plan 2017 -2020 ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2014) A Guide to Good Shopfronts and Signage Supplementary Planning Document ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2014) Night Time Economy Strategy ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2014) Regeneration and Growth Strategy 2014 - 2028 ◁ Bassetlaw District Council (2017) Housing Strategy 2017 - 2020 ◁ Bolsover District Council Local Plan 2018 ◁ Carlton-in-Lindrick Neighbourhood Plan (Publication) (2018) ◁ Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (Adopted) Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) ◁ Chesterfield Local Plan; Core Strategy (Adopted 2013) and emerging New Local Plan (Draft) ◁ Clarborough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2017) ◁ Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck & Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2017) ◁ Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (2012) Core Strategy Development Plan Document ◁ Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (emerging) Local Plan ◁ East Markham Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2018) ◁ Elkesley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015 -2028 (Made 2015) ◁ Everton Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2034 (Submission) ◁ Harworth & Bircotes Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015 -2028

Geographic scale	Plan/Programme
	<p>(Made 2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Headon, Upton, Grove and Stokeham (HUGS) Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2018) ◁ Mansfield District Council (emerging) Local Plan (2013 -2033) ◁ Mattersey Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033 (Submission) ◁ Misson Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2017) ◁ Misterton Neighbourhood Plan 2018 -2034 (Draft) ◁ Newark and Sherwood District Council (2011) Core Strategy ◁ Newark and Sherwood District Council (2013) Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document ◁ Newark and Sherwood District Council (Emerging) Plan Review ◁ North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2014-2034 (Submisison) ◁ North Lincolnshire Council Core Strategy (2011) ◁ Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (2014) Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028 ◁ Shireoaks Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016 -2028 (Made 2016) ◁ Sturton Ward Neighbourhood Plan 2015 -2030 (Made 2016) ◁ Sutton-cum-Lound Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2018) ◁ Treswell and Cottam Neighbourhood Plan (Submission) (2018) ◁ Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan (Made 2016) ◁ Village Design Sta tements (Lound, East Markham, South Leverton and North and South Wheatley Village) ◁ Woodland Trust Hannah Park Woodland Management Plan 2017 - 2022

Key Objectives and Policy Issues

3.5 The review of plans and programmes presented in Appendix C has identified a number of objectives and policy issues relevant to the Local Plan and the scope of the SA across the following topic areas:

- ◁ Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure .
- ◁ Population and Community .
- ◁ Health and Wellbeing .
- ◁ Transport and Accessi bility.
- ◁ Land Use, Geology and Soil .
- ◁ Water.
- ◁ Air Quality .
- ◁ Climate Change .
- ◁ Material Assets.

< Cultural Heritage .

< Landscape.

3.6 These objectives and policy issues are summarised in Table 3.2 together with the key sources and implications for the SA Framework. Only the key sources are identified; however, it is acknowledged that many other plans and programmes could also be included.

Table 3.2 Key Objectives and Policy Issues Arising from the Review of Plans and Programmes

Key Objectives and Policy Issues	Key Source(s)	Implications for the SA Framework
<p>Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Protect and enhance biodiversity, including designated sites, priority species, habitats and ecological networks. ◁ Identify opportunities for green infrastructure provision. 	<p>Natural Environment White Paper: The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature; Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for 9 b [` U b X Ð g ` K] ` } Ecosystem Services; UK post 2010 Biodiversity Framework; NPPF; Bassetlaw District Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD; Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan.</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include a specific objective relating to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity including green infrastructure provision. <i>This has been addressed by SA objective 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity (see Table 2.2).</i></p>
<p>Population and Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Address deprivation and reduce inequality through regeneration. ◁ Ensure social equality and prosperity for all. ◁ Provide high quality services, community facilities and social infrastructure that are accessible to all. ◁ Enable housing growth and deliver a mix of high quality housing to meet local needs. ◁ Make appropriate provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. ◁ Ensure that there is an adequate supply of employment land to meet local needs and to attract inward investment. ◁ Encourage economic diversification including growth in high value, high growth, and high knowledge economic 	<p>NPPF; Planning Policy for Traveller Sites; D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership strategy for Growth; Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership (2014) Strategic Economic Plan; Bassetlaw District Council Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 - 2020; Bassetlaw District Council Housing Strategy 2017 - 2020; Bassetlaw District Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD; Bassetlaw District Council Council Plan 2017 - 2020; Bassetlaw District Council Regeneration and Growth Strategy 2014 - 2028.</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include objectives and/or guide questions relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ addressing deprivation and promoting equality and inclusion; ◁ the provision of high quality community facilities and services; ◁ the provision of housing to meet local needs; ◁ the enhancement of education and skills; ◁ delivery of employment land that supports economic diversification and the creation of high quality, local jobs; ◁ support for rural diversification; and ◁ enhancing town centres and villages. <p><i>This has been addressed by SA objectives 2: Housing, 3: Economy and skills and 4: Regeneration and social inclusion (see Table 2.2).</i></p>

Key Objectives and Policy Issues	Key Source(s)	Implications for the SA Framework
<p>sectors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Encourage rural diversification and support rural economic growth. ◁ Create local employment opportunities. ◁ Enhance skills in the workforce to reduce unemployment and deprivation. ◁ Improve educational attainment and ensure the appropriate supply of high quality educational facilities. ◁ Promote the vitality of town centres and villages and support retail and leisure sectors. 		
<p>Health and Wellbeing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Promote improvements to health and wellbeing. ◁ Promote healthier lifestyles. ◁ Minimise noise pollution. ◁ Reduce crime including the fear of crime. ◁ Reduce anti-social behaviour. ◁ Ensure that there are appropriate facilities for the disabled and elderly. ◁ Deliver safe and secure networks of green infrastructure and open space. 	<p>NPPF; Nottinghamshire Green Estate Development Strategy and Plan 2013-2023; B c h h] b [\ U a g \] f Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 É 2020; Nottinghamshire Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 201 8 É 2022; Bassetlaw District Council Council Plan 2017 - 2020; Bassetlaw District Council Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 -2020; Bassetlaw District Council Regeneration and Growth Strategy 2014 É 2028.</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include a specific objective and/or guide questions relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ the promotion of health and wellbeing; ◁ the delivery of health facilities and services; ◁ the provision of open space and recreational facilities; and ◁ reducing crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. <p><i>This has been addressed by SA objective 5: Health and wellbeing (see Table 2.2).</i></p>
<p>Transport and Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Encourage sustainable transport and reduce the need to travel. ◁ Reduce traffic and congestion. 	<p>NPPF; Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 2011 -2026; Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 201 8 É 2040/ B c h h] b [\ U a g \] f Sustainable Community Strategy</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include objectives and/or guide questions relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ reducing the need to travel, particularly by car; ◁ the promotion of sustainable forms of transport; ◁ encouraging walking and cycling;

Key Objectives and Policy Issues	Key Source(s)	Implications for the SA Framework
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Improve public transport provision. ◁ Encourage walking and cycling. ◁ Enhance accessibility to key community facilities, services and jobs for all. ◁ Ensure timely investment in transportation infrastructure to accommodate new development. ◁ Reduce road freight movements. 	<p>2010 E 2020; Bassetlaw District Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD; Bassetlaw District Council Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 - 2020.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ maintaining and enhancing accessibility to key facilities, services and jobs; ◁ investment in transportation infrastructure to meet future needs. <p><i>This has been addressed by SA objective 6: Transport (see Table 2.2).</i></p>
<p>Land Use, Geology and Soil</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Encourage the use of previously developed (brownfield) land. ◁ Promote the re-use of derelict land and buildings. ◁ Reduce land contamination. ◁ Protect soil quality and minimise the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. ◁ Promote high quality design. ◁ Avoid damage to, and protect, geologically important sites. ◁ Encourage mixed use development. 	<p>Safeguarding Our Soils: A Strategy for England; NPPF; Bassetlaw District Council Successful Places Supplementary Planning Document; Bassetlaw District Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD.</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include objectives and/or guide questions relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ encouraging the use of previously developed land and buildings; ◁ reducing land contamination; ◁ avoiding the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land; ◁ promoting high quality design including mixed use development; ◁ protecting and avoiding damage to geologically important sites. <p><i>This has been addressed by SA objective 7: Land use and soils (see Table 2.2).</i></p>
<p>Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Protect and enhance surface and groundwater quality. ◁ Improve water efficiency. ◁ Avoid development in areas of flood risk. ◁ Reduce the risk of flooding arising from new 	<p>Water Framework Directive; Drinking Water Directive; Floods Directive; Flood and Water Management Act 2010; Water for Life, White Paper; NPPF; Humber District River Basin Management Plan; Anglian Water Resources Management Plan; Severn Trent Water Resources Management</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include specific objectives relating to the protection and enhancement of water quality and quantity, avoidance of flood risk and minimising surface water run-off.</p> <p><i>This has been addressed by SA objective 8: Water (see Table 2.2).</i></p>

Key Objectives and Policy Issues	Key Source(s)	Implications for the SA Framework
<p>development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Ensure timely investment in water management infrastructure to accommodate new development. ◁ Promote the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. 	Plan 2014.	
<p>Air Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Ensure that air quality is maintained or enhanced and that emissions of air pollutants are kept to a minimum. 	Air Quality Directive; Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland; NPPF.	<p>The SA Framework should include a specific objective and/or guide question relating to air quality.</p> <p><i>This has been addressed by SA objective 10: Air quality (see Table 2.2).</i></p>
<p>Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Minimise the effects of climate change. ◁ Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases that may cause climate change. ◁ Encourage the provision of renewable energy. ◁ Move towards a low carbon economy. ◁ Promote adaptation to the effects of climate change. 	Climate Change Act 2008; Carbon Plan: Delivering our Low Carbon Future; UK Renewable Energy Strategy; NPPF; Bassetlaw District Council Climate Change Strategy 2013.	<p>The SA Framework should include a specific objective relating to climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p><i>This has been addressed by SA objective 11: Climate change (see Table 2.2).</i></p>
<p>Material Assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover). ◁ Ensure the adequate provision of local waste management facilities. ◁ Promote the efficient and sustainable use of mineral resources. ◁ Promote the use of local resources. 	Waste Framework Directive; Landfill Directive; Waste Management Plan for England; NPPF; National Planning Policy for Waste; Minerals Local Plan; Waste Local Plan.	<p>The SA Framework should include objectives and/or guide questions relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ promotion of the waste hierarchy; ◁ the sustainable use of minerals; ◁ investment in infrastructure to meet future needs. <p><i>This has been addressed by SA objective 12: Resource use and waste (see Table 2.2).</i></p>

Key Objectives and Policy Issues	Key Source(s)	Implications for the SA Framework
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Avoid the sterilisation of mineral reserves. ◁ Promote the use of substitute or secondary and recycled materials and minerals waste. ◁ Ensure the timely provision of infrastructure to support new development. ◁ Support the delivery of high quality communications infrastructure. 		
<p>Cultural Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Conserve and enhance cultural heritage assets and their settings. ◁ Maintain and enhance access to cultural heritage assets. ◁ Respect, maintain and strengthen local character and distinctiveness. ◁ Improve the quality of the built environment. 	<p>NPPF; Bassetlaw District Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD; A Cultural Strategy for Nottinghamshire County Council 2011 – 2021; Conservation Area Appraisals ; Heritage at Risk Programme; Bassetlaw District Council Successful Places Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include a specific objective relating to the</p> <p><i>This has been addressed by SA objective 13: Cultural heritage (see Table 2.2).</i></p>
<p>Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ Protect and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of natural landscapes and townscapes. ◁ Promote access to the countryside. ◁ Promote high quality design that respects and enhances local character. 	<p>NPPF; East Midlands Landscape Character Assessment; Bassetlaw District Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD; Bassetlaw District Council Successful Places Supplementary Planning Document; Bassetlaw District Council Landscape Character Assessment.</p>	<p>The SA Framework should include a specific objective relating to the protection and enhancement of landscape and townscapes.</p> <p><i>This has been addressed by SA objective 14: landscape and townscape (see Table 2.2).</i></p>

Baseline Information

- 3.1 Baseline information provides the context for assessing the sustainability of proposals in the Bassetlaw Local Plan and it provides the basis for identifying trends, predicting the likely effects of the plan and monitoring its outcomes. Baseline data must be relevant to environmental, social and economic issues, be sensitive to change and should ideally relate to records which are sufficient to identify trends.
- 3.2 Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations requires data to be gathered on biodiversity, population, human health, flora, fauna, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the inter-relationship between the above factors. As an integrated SA and SEA is being carried out, baseline information relating to other sustainability topics has also been included; for example information about housing, education, transport, energy, waste and economic growth. This information was originally presented in the Scoping Report (March 2016), although the Interim SA Report (October 2016) updated this to reflect consultation responses received on the Scoping Report, where relevant. The full baseline analysis is presented in Appendix 3, which includes further updates to take account of the most up to date information available. The SEA Regulations also require the SA report to describe the likely evolution of the baseline situation without implementation of the plan being assessed. This is also presented in Appendix 3.

Key Sustainability Issues

- 3.3 From the analysis of the baseline presented in Appendix 3, a number of key sustainability issues affecting the District have been identified. These issues are summarised in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Key Sustainability Issues

Topic	Key Sustainability Issues
Biodiversity, Green and Blue Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◀ The need to conserve and enhance biodiversity including sites designated for their nature conservation value. ◀ The need to maintain, restore, protect and expand the District's priority habitats. ◀ The need to protect and increase populations of protected and priority species. ◀ The need to prevent the spread of invasive species. ◀ The need to adapt ecological communities to climate change. ◀ The need to safeguard and enhance existing green and blue infrastructure assets/networks. ◀ The need to enhance the green infrastructure network, addressing identified gaps, improving accessibility and encouraging multiple uses where appropriate. ◀ The need to improve the connectivity of green space. ◀ The need to prevent harm to geological conservation interests.
Population and Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◀ The need to meet the District's objectively assessed housing need including for affordable housing. ◀ The need to provide an adequate supply of land for housing. ◀ The need to make best use of, and improve, the quality of the existing housing stock.

Topic	Key Sustainability Issues
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to diversify the local economy and support the delivery of the District's Regeneration and Growth Strategy, Nottinghamshire Growth Plan and Sheffield City Region and the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plans. ◁ The need to provide a range of quality sites, infrastructure and wider environment for business development. ◁ The need to support the development of innovative and knowledge-based businesses. ◁ The need to support the growth and development of existing businesses. ◁ The need to increase local employment opportunities. ◁ The need to provide job opportunities in sustainable locations. ◁ The need to tackle deprivation, particularly in those areas of the District that are most deprived, and deliver regeneration. ◁ The need to raise educational attainment and skills in the local labour force. ◁ The need to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the District's town centres and larger villages. ◁ The need to safeguard existing community facilities and services (social capital) and ensure the timely delivery of new facilities to meet needs arising from new development.
Health and Wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to protect the health and wellbeing of the District's population. ◁ The need to promote healthy lifestyles. ◁ The need to tackle inequalities in health. ◁ The need to protect and enhance open space provision across the District. ◁ The need to improve access to green space. ◁ The need to support high quality design. ◁ The need to reduce crime levels, minimise risk and increase community safety. ◁ The need to safeguard existing health care facilities and services and ensure the timely delivery of new facilities and services to meet needs arising from new development. ◁ The need to plan for an ageing population. ◁ The need to address health inequalities.
Transport and Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to ensure timely investment in transport infrastructure and services. ◁ The need to support proposals contained in the Local Transport Plan and address highways capacity issues in the District. ◁ The need to capitalise on the District's good transport accessibility, links to Robin Hood Airport and the new Worksop Bus Station. ◁ The need to encourage alternative modes of transport to the private car.

Topic	Key Sustainability Issues
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to ensure that new development is accessible to community facilities and services and jobs so as to reduce the need to travel. ◁ The need to enhance the connectivity of more remote, rural settlements. ◁ The need to encourage walking and cycling. ◁ The need to protect and enhance the Public Rights of Way network.
Land Use, Geology and Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to encourage development on previously developed (brownfield) land. ◁ The need to make best use of existing buildings and infrastructure. ◁ The need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. ◁ The need to protect and enhance sites designated for their geological interest.
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to protect and enhance the quality of the District's water sources. ◁ The need to promote the efficient use of water resources. ◁ The need to ensure the timely provision of new water services infrastructure to meet demand arising from new development. ◁ The need to locate new development away from areas of flood risk, taking into account the effects of climate change. ◁ The need to ensure the timely provision of flood defence/management infrastructure. ◁ The need to encourage the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems. ◁ The need to manage surface water to greenfield run off rates.
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to minimise the emission of pollutants to air.
Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to ensure that new development is adaptable to the effects of climate change. ◁ The need to mitigate climate change including through increased renewable energy provision and encouraging more sustainable modes of transport.
Material Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to minimise waste arisings and encourage reuse and recycling. ◁ The need to promote the efficient use of mineral resources. ◁ The need to ensure the protection of the District's mineral resources from inappropriate development, in accordance with the emerging Minerals Local Plan. ◁ The need to promote resource efficiency through sustainable design and construction techniques to minimise resource depletion and waste creation.
Cultural Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to protect and enhance the District's cultural heritage

Topic	Key Sustainability Issues
	<p>assets and their settings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to avoid harm to designated heritage assets and their settings. ◁ The need to recognise the value of non -designated heritage assets and protect these where possible, taking into account the requirements of the NPPF. ◁ The need to tackle heritage at risk. ◁ The need to recognise the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of landscapes and townscapes.
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◁ The need to conserve and enhance the District's landscape character. ◁ The need to protect the character of rural areas. ◁ The need to promote high quality design that respects local character. ◁ The need to maximise opportunities associated with new development to enhance townscape character and the quality of urban environments.

4 Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Policy Options

4.1 This chapter sets out the findings of the SA for the policy and strategic site options considered during development of Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) (January 2019). Where detailed appraisal matrices have been prepared, these are presented in Appendix 4. The chapter is divided into the different types of policy options considered:

- ◁ Spatial options.
- ◁ Housing target options.
- ◁ Employment target options.
- ◁ Strategic site options.

Spatial Options

Spatial Strategy Options

4.2 The Interim SA Report (October 2016) included an appraisal of six reasonable alternative spatial options for the Local Plan:

- ◁ Option 1: A U] b h U] b ` h \ Y ` Wi f f Y b h ` g h f U h Y [m ` fl 6 U g g Y h ` U k ` 8] g h f] Wh
- ◁ Option 2: A new hierarchy based on functional geography
- ◁ Option 3: Focus new development along t he A1 corridor
- ◁ Option 4: New/expanded rural settlements
- ◁ Option 5: Large scale urban extensions
- ◁ Option 6: Hybrid option

4.3 The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan (October 2016) set out a proposed spatial strategy which took forward Option 6 i.e. a hybrid option. The hybrid option takes elements from several of the other c d h] c b g " ` ` H \] g `] b W ` i X Y g ` U ` ` c W U h] b [` i f V U b ` Y I h Y b g] c b g ` c b ` h settlements, supporting urban intensification, using functional geography to establish clusters of mutually supportive rural settlements allowing for organic growth and exploring the opportunity for a new or expanded rural settlement. This option also incorporates the potential for development of a new rural settlement and maximising employment growth opportunities along the A1 corridor

4.4 Bassetlaw District Council has since identified two additional reasonable alternative spatial options:

- ◁ Option 7: Equitable distribution of growth
- ◁ Option 8: Parallel strategies

4.5 Option 7 ranks each settlement in Bassetlaw by size, based on the number of existing dwellings and would allocate planned growth commensurate to settlement size. This would mean that all settlements could contribute to the District growth target up to a cap of 20%. As such, the larger settlements would still deliver the greatest number of new homes, but it would allow for a fairer spread of growth and thereby give potential for a degree of uplift for all settlements.

4.6 Option 8 moves away from viewing settlements within tiers of a development hierarchy. Instead, through this option, the spatial strategy would comprise a series of parallel strands. As far as is reasonable to do so, this approach acknowledges that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development by supporting some measure of growth, commensurate to settlement

size. This approach builds on Option 7, and would apportion higher levels of focused growth to specific areas that play specific roles in the District. As such Option 8 would help to drive economic growth, regeneration and enhancement of services and facilities across the District with development delivered at levels which is considerate of the District's role as a sub-regional centre, settlement and employment. This option also includes an aspect of Option 6 insofar as supporting large scale development that follows the principles of Garden Villages.

- 4.7 The SA work undertaken previously in relation to the six original options has now been revised to take into account the minor changes made to the SA methodology (described in Chapter 2) and the two new options have also been appraised. This work is presented in detail in Appendix 4. The SA scores are summarised in Table 4.1, and the findings described below.

Table 4.1 SA scores for the spatial options

Option	1: Maintain current strategy	2: New hierarchy based on functional geography	3: A1 corridor focus	4: New/ expanded rural settlements	5: Large scale urban extensions	6: Hybrid option	7: Equitable distribution of growth	8: Parallel strategies
SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	+/-	+/-	+/-	-?	++/-	++/-	+/-	+/-
SA2: Housing	+	++	+	+/-	+	++	++	++
SA3: Economy and skills	+	+/	+/-	+/-	+	++	++/-	++
SA4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion	++/-	++	+/-	++/-	++/-	++	++/-	++
SA5: Health and Wellbeing	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-?	++/-	++/-?	++/-?	++
SA6: Transport	+	++/-	--	-	+	++/-	+/-	++/-
SA7: Land Use and Soils	-	-	-	-?	-	-?	-	-
SA8: Water	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SA9: Flood Risk	0?	0?	+	-?	-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?
SA10: Air Quality	-	-	--	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
SA11: Climate Change	?	+	?	?	+	+	+	+
SA12: Resource Use and Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA13: Cultural Heritage	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?
SA14: Landscape and Townscape	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?

- 4.8 The high level of growth supported over the plan period has the potential to result in adverse impacts in relation to SA objective 1: biodiversity and geodiversity, in relation to each of the spatial options considered. The adverse effects of delivering high levels of development may include habitat loss, fragmentation and disturbance as well as recreational pressures associated with the delivery of new homes. The negative effect is expected to be significant where new development would be provided in close proximity to designated biodiversity and geodiversity sites. Of particular note is proximity to the Sherwood Forest potential proposed Special Protection Area (ppSPA), where parts of the forest area are being considered for future classification as SPA due to their importance for breeding bird (nightjar and woodlark) interest (see Appendix 3 for more information). This area is located towards the south western part of the District. While those options which distribute development across a wider number of locations would result in higher levels of growth at rural locations, which has the potential to impact a higher number of locally designated sites, the broad range of potential development sites means there may be potential to avoid significant negative effects on sensitive areas and also to deliver habitat improvements. Improvements are likely to relate to the incorporation of green infrastructure at new developments. Significant negative effects are expected in relation to Option 1, Option 2, Option 5, Option 6 and Option 7. Considering the potential for the delivery of habitat improvements, a positive effect is expected in relation to this SA objective for each of these five options, as well as for Option 3 and Option 8. The positive effect for Option 5 and Option 6 is likely to be significant given that these options would be likely to include sites that are well related to existing green infrastructure provision in the District, thereby presenting opportunities for specific habitat creation to be integrated within the existing pattern of these features. No positive effect has been identified for Option 4 considering that providing new settlements or expansion at existing rural settlements would leave the remaining areas of the District relatively unaffected by development. This approach would thereby limit the potential for enhancements (for example through green infrastructure provision) to areas of importance for biodiversity throughout the rest of the District.
- 4.9 It is expected that all of the spatial options considered would support housing delivery, employment growth and encouraging development to the benefit of the wider regeneration of the District. The positive effect expected in relation to SA objective 2: housing is likely to be significant for Option 2, Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8. These options would increase the range of locations in which residential development would take place. This will help meet the requirements of the rural areas of the District. Furthermore, providing homes at a range of locations in the District is likely to help increase the range of affordable housing available. The significant positive effect is expected because these options would be likely to deliver a high level of growth at greenfield locations, thereby resulting in beneficial impacts in terms of scheme viability. Option 4 is the only option considered which is likely to have a minor negative effect combined with the minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 2. This option would provide development at new or expanded rural settlements, thereby diverting large scale development away from the towns of Retford and Worksop, which could result in not meeting the identified requirement for these locations. Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8 are also expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 3: economy and skills. These policies provide the most flexibility in relation to new economic development in the District, recognising the roles of Worksop and Retford as the main centres of employment and continuing support for the economic regeneration of Harworth and Bircotes. Option 6 and Option 8 would not support economic growth at the smallest rural settlements in the District; however they provide some scope for rural diversification. These options would furthermore result in the delivery of new settlements in Bassetlaw, which is likely to provide the critical mass of development and new infrastructure needed to attract additional economic investment to Bassetlaw. Of these options only Option 6 would support economic growth along the A1 corridor, which might support warehouse provision in the District. The significant positive effect expected for Option 7 is likely to be combined with a minor negative considering that some growth would be provided at the more rural and isolated villages of the District, where existing employment opportunities will be less accessible and more significant amounts of new infrastructure will be required to support this growth.
- 4.10 All of the options considered apart from Option 3, are expected to have significant positive effect (some as part of a mixed effect) in relation to SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion. This is reflective of the high level of growth and potential for improved access to

services and facilities in many parts of the District, which would result as part of this growth. Option 3 would focus much of the new growth within the A1 corridor to the west. As development within the settlements to the east of the District would be limited, this approach is expected to have adverse effects on those settlements in the east, in terms of their long term vitality. Furthermore, this approach would not result in new development occurring in close proximity to the existing concentrations of services and facilities in Worksop and Retford. As such the minor positive effect expected in relation to this SA objective for Option 3 is likely to be combined with a significant negative effect. With consideration for the high level of new growth supported over the plan period, the significant positive effect expected for Option 4 and Option 5 is likely to be combined with a significant negative effect. Given that Option 4 would support the delivery of development at new and expanded settlements, it would not make best use of existing concentrations of services and facilities and furthermore would not address issues of deprivation at Retford and Worksop. Option 5 would not deliver new development at the villages throughout the District thereby potentially limiting regeneration opportunities and resulting in a lack of service provision at these locations. Both of these options would also not address the need for new services and facilities, which other options may be more likely to achieve.

- 4.11 The provision of new development that would make use of the existing services and facilities, as described above, will have broadly similar positive effects in relation to public health in the District, as the services and facilities are likely to include healthcare facilities, such as GP surgeries and hospitals. Access to open space and areas of the countryside would also help to encourage high levels of physical activity among residents. Option 5, Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8 are expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 5: health and wellbeing, because much of the new development is to be focussed at the urban edge or within the larger settlements of the District. However, there is potential for these options to limit provision of new services and facilities (including those relating to healthcare) at the smaller, more rural settlements. This is because, while these options distribute development across the District, much of this will still be at the larger settlements and therefore there may not be the critical mass of additional development at smaller settlements to stimulate provision of new services and facilities. Furthermore, while the provision of urban extensions may provide opportunities for the incorporation of green infrastructure, access to the surrounding countryside for the existing urban area may be limited or lost. As such, the significant positive effect expected for Option 5, Option 6 and Option 7 is likely to be combined with a minor negative effect. No overall negative effect is expected in relation to Option 8, given that this option would provide new settlements in line with Garden Village principles, which is likely to result in the incorporation of new services and facilities, including healthcare. Furthermore, this option would also allow for some scope to support the expansion of existing rural service offer given that the levels of growth to be delivered at different settlements would be in line with the role of those settlements in Bassetlaw.
- 4.12 It is considered likely that all options would result in adverse effects in relation to the SA objectives which are associated most directly with the natural environment, given the high level of growth to be supported over the plan period. A minor negative effect has been identified in relation to SA objective 7: land use and soils for all options considering the high level of growth to be provided over the plan period, and therefore the need for development of greenfield land. Some options (most notably options other than Option 4, which would provide new/expanded rural settlements) would provide opportunities to re-use of brownfield land, particularly through development within or at the immediate edges of the larger settlements and regeneration centres of Bassetlaw, such as Worksop, Retford and Harworth and Bircotes. It is expected that each option would still require a large amount of greenfield land to deliver the level of growth and associated infrastructure required over the plan period. The development of large areas of greenfield land in the District is also likely to result in the development of sites that contain significant areas of Grade 3 or higher value agricultural land. There are areas of Grade 2 agricultural land to the south of the District, to the north and south of Retford and to the west of Worksop, with a limited amount of Grade 1 (highest value) agricultural located in the northernmost part of the District. The minor negative effect identified for Option 4 is uncertain. This option would not provide a high level of new development at urban locations (which might be achieved through Option 1, Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8) where there is potentially more brownfield land. However, the unknown siting of a new settlement has the potential to avoid

areas of higher value agricultural land in the District. As Option 6 is a hybrid option which includes the potential to provide new settlements at unknown locations within Bassetlaw, the minor negative effect expected in relation to this SA objective is also uncertain.

- 4.13 Each of the options considered is also expected to have an uncertain mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) in relation to SA objective 13: cultural heritage and SA objective 14: landscape and townscape. Allowing for a pattern of development which is not limited only to the larger settlements of the District, and would include development at a range of rural locations (most notably through Option 2, Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8) is likely to help avoid the settlements to experience negative impacts in terms of their significance and settings. However, these options have the potential to adversely affect heritage assets across a wider area in Bassetlaw. New development through each option would present opportunities for the enhancement of heritage assets as well the established character of the District. Similarly the pattern of growth supported by each option has the potential to adversely affect areas of the District identified as having particular sensitivities in terms of landscape character. Those options (most notably Option 1 and Option 5) which support the concentration of most of the growth within or at the edges of the larger settlements and regeneration centres of the District are likely to help to limit the potential for erosion of rural character in Bassetlaw. Conversely, the wider distribution of development supported through the remaining options would allow for a smaller portion of growth to be distributed to many rural areas which will help to limit the significance of impacts on the existing landscape character. Most options include some development to be delivered as urban intensification and other elements of growth which would be more limited at the rural settlements of the District. As such it is less likely that adverse impacts on existing townscape would result and opportunities for the enhancement of the existing townscape may result.
- 4.14 A greater loss of greenfield land in the District has the potential to result in higher levels of run-off into waterbodies as the area of impermeable surfaces increases through new development. As such, all options considered are expected to have a minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 8: water. While increasing reliance on development which is to be delivered away from the larger settlements (through Option 2, Option 3 and Option 4) has the potential to result in increased land take at greenfield sites, focussing much of the development at or around the settlements of Worksop and Retford (through Option 1, Option 5, Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8) has the potential to increase run-off into the Rivers Ryton and Idle, and the Chesterfield Canal.
- 4.15 Development of greenfield land and increased surface run-off may also exacerbate flooding in the District, however the level of flood risk will also be influenced by the specific location of new growth in relation to existing areas of high flood risk. Development set out through each option would be managed through the sequential approach to the allocation of sites. Option 3 would focus development at areas identified as being at low risk of fluvial flooding and therefore this is the only option for which a minor positive effect alone has been identified in relation to SA objective 9: flood risk. A minor negative effect has been identified for Option 4, Option 5, Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8 as these options are likely to include areas for development which are at high risk of flooding. These areas include land by Worksop and Retford town centres, south and east of Retford as well as at the service centres of Misterton, Walkeringham, Mattersey, Beckingham, North and South Wheatley, North Leverton, Sturton-le-Steeple, Rampton and Everton. As Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8 have the potential to distribute development across a wider range of settlements, many of which are less constrained by flood risk, the minor negative effect expected in relation to this SA objective is likely to be combined with a minor positive effect for these options.
- 4.16 Considering the high level of growth each option would support over the plan period, air quality in the District is likely to be most influenced by the level of trip generation that a given pattern of development would result in. Supporting the delivery of much of the new growth over the plan period within the more densely populated locations may help to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport, which are more accessible in urban areas. However, Option 1 also has the potential to increase traffic emissions that would be concentrated on a single location, resulting in particularly adverse impacts in terms of air quality at such locations. These locations (particularly Worksop and Retford) are currently affected by issues of congestion. A minor negative effect has also been recorded in relation to SA objective 10: air quality for Option 2, considering that a

dispersed pattern of rural development may increase reliance on private vehicles. The negative effect expected for Option 3 is likely to be significant as concentrating development along the A1 corridor may generate increased congestion at peak times. Furthermore, focusing employment growth on warehousing will potentially increase the number of HGV movements along this route. Option 4, Option 5, Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8 are expected to have a mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) in relation to SA objective 10. Option 4 would provide new growth as new settlements or expansions to existing rural settlements and thereby help to minimise adverse impacts on existing traffic congestion and associated air quality issues, by supporting provision of more services and facilities at these locations. However, this approach is likely to result in high levels of road traffic occurring at new locations. By providing large scale development at the urban edges of Worksop and Retford, issues relating to congestion and cumulative air quality problems may emerge in these locations. Conversely through this approach, Option 5 may help to reduce the requirement to undertake long journeys in the District and may also support sustainable transport use. The wide range of potential site options included as part of Option 7 and Option 8 would include high levels of growth at the larger settlements as well as some limited growth at more rural settlements. As such some of this new development may exacerbate air quality issues at the more developed locations, while also providing opportunities for sustainable transport improvements.

- 4.17 The impact of new development in the plan area in terms of climate change will be more influenced by the scale of new growth to be delivered and associated emissions, rather than the spatial distribution of development. The level of greenhouse gas emissions will be influenced by sustainable transport provision and car use but will also be affected in part by on site practices as well as the incorporation of low carbon energy schemes within development. Providing residents with access to existing sustainable transport provision as well as supporting the potential for enhancing existing sustainable transport provisions in the District will be of benefit in terms of limiting greenhouse gas emissions. A minor positive effect is therefore expected for SA objective 11: climate change for Option 2, Option 5, Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8, as these options would provide much of the new growth at the larger settlements of the District, which could help to promote the viability of existing sustainable transport links in the District. Furthermore, these options provide opportunities for urban intensification or the delivery of a high level of growth as urban extensions, where the incorporation of energy efficiency and renewable energy measures may be more viable. It is recognised that Option 6, Option 7 and Option 8 would deliver some growth at the more rural locations of the District, however this would be a small proportion of the overall growth supported. As such, many new residents would still have access to the more extensive sustainable transport links in the urban areas and much of the new development may support the incorporation of energy saving measures.

Housing distribution options

- 4.18 Following on from the consideration of overall spatial options for the District, in preparing Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan), the Council has considered further options for distributing future housing growth within the different areas of the District. These housing distribution options have been assessed and are as follows:

1: Rural Bassetlaw

- a. 27% of overall growth
- b. Deliver fewer homes
- c. Deliver more homes
- d. No change to Core Strategy approach

2: Worksop

- a. 24% of overall growth
- b. Deliver fewer homes

3: Retford

- a. 13% of overall growth
- b. Deliver more homes

4: Harworth and Bircotes

- a. 21% of overall growth
- b. Deliver fewer homes
- c. Deliver more homes

5: Garden Villages

- a. 15% of overall growth (two new villages)
- b. Deliver no new villages
- c. Deliver one new village

- 4.19 A higher growth option was not considered reasonable for Worksop, due to lack of land availability and viability issues. A lower growth option was not considered reasonable for Retford, as this would not provide the critical mass necessary to support local services, infrastructure improvements or the local economy. Appendix 9 sets out the reasonable alternatives considered and why the selected approach was taken forward in more detail.
- 4.20 The SA scores are summarised in Table 4.2, and the findings described below.
- 4.21 Whilst the assessments below consider each of these spatial strategy strands individually, in reality multiple options will be taken forward by the Council. As such, where assessments identify, for example, that a lower level of growth would be beneficial in terms of environmental impact, due to less greenfield land take, this may be counteracted by greater greenfield land take elsewhere. The distribution of growth is assessed on a District-wide basis in Chapter 5.

Table 4.2 SA scores for the Housing Distribution Options

Site	1: Rural Bassetlaw				2: Worksop		3: Retford		4: Harworth & Bircotes			5: Garden Villages		
Alternative Options Considered	a) 27% of overall growth	b) Deliver fewer Homes	c) Deliver More Homes	d) No Change	a) 24% of overall growth	b) Deliver fewer Homes	a) 13 % of Overall Growth	b) Deliver More Homes	a) 21% of overall growth	b) Deliver fewer homes	c) Deliver more homes	a) 15% of overall growth	b) Deliver no new villages	c) Deliver one new village
SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	0	+	-	0	0	+	0	-	0	+	-	-	0	-
SA2: Housing	++	+	++	0	++	+	++	++	++	+	++	++	0	+
SA3: Economy and skills	++	-	+/-	0	++	-	++	+	++	-	+	++	0	+
SA4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion	++	-	+/-	0	++	-	++	+/-	++	-	+/-	++	0	+
SA5: Health and Wellbeing	+	-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	+	-	+/-	++	0	+
SA6: Transport	-	+	-	0	+/-	+	+/-	-	+/-	+	-	+/-	0	+/-
SA7: Land Use and Soils	+	+	-	0	-	+	0	-	+/-	+	-	+/-	0	+/-
SA8: Water	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Site	1: Rural Bassetlaw				2: Worksop		3: Retford		4: Harworth & Bircotes			5: Garden Villages		
Alternative Options Considered	a) 27% of overall growth	b) Deliver fewer Homes	c) Deliver More Homes	d) No Change	a) 24% of overall growth	b) Deliver fewer Homes	a) 13 % of Overall Growth	b) Deliver More Homes	a) 21% of overall growth	b) Deliver fewer homes	c) Deliver more homes	a) 15% of overall growth	b) Deliver no new villages	c) Deliver one new village
SA9: Flood Risk	0	+	0	0	0	+	-	-	0	+	-	0	0	0
SA10: Air Quality	-	+	-	0	+/-	+	+/-	-	+/-	+	-	+/-	0	+/-
SA11: Climate Change	-	+	-	0	+/-	+	+/-	-	+/-	+	-	+/-	0	+/-
SA12: Resource Use and Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA13: Cultural Heritage	0	+	-	0	-	+	0	-	0	+	-	--	0	-
SA14: Landscape and Townscape	+	+	-	0	?	0	?	-	+/-	+	-	+/-	0	+/-

1: Rural Bassetlaw

a) 27% of overall growth

4.22 It is expected that this option will result in positive effects for SA objectives 2: housing, 3: economy, 4: regeneration and social inclusion, 5: health and wellbeing, 7: land use and soils and 14: landscape and townscape, as the provision of housing in a range of settlements will reduce the intensity of effects in any one location. The distribution of development will likely provide a positive effect in relation to cultural heritage, landscape and land use as development is likely to be fairly small-scale, thereby minimising the intensity of any effects on the landscape, and any cultural assets, as well as the amount of greenfield land which is to be developed in any one location. In addition, this option would reduce greenfield development around urban areas, which would also provide sufficient choice in sites so that the Council can direct housing to less sensitive areas. In addition, a positive effect is expected in relation to housing, as this growth option will provide 27% of the District's increased rural development which could likely help support rural services and facilities. As such, a positive effect has been identified for SA objectives 2, 4 and 5. However, a minor negative effect has been identified for SA objective 6: transport, SA objective 10: air quality and SA objective 11: climate change, as the increase in residential development in rural settlements will increase pressure on already limited rural transport services and could lead to increased traffic congestion and air pollution within rural communities. However, there is some uncertainty associated with this as an increase in residents in rural areas could support existing and improved public transport services.

b) Lower growth

4.23 It is expected that a lower growth option would not provide the support for or enhance existing rural services. As a result, this would threaten the long term sustainability of services and facilities in the villages, and this is likely to affect the health and wellbeing of residents living in rural areas, leading to minor negative effects for SA objectives 3: economy and skills, 4: regeneration and social inclusion and 5: health and wellbeing. However, it is predicted that a lower level growth would also have a minor positive effect on the environmental SA objectives 1: biodiversity and geodiversity, 6: transport, 7: land use and soils, 9: flood risk, 10: air quality, 11: climate change, 13: cultural heritage and 14: landscape and townscape, as a lower rate of development would keep transport-related issues, such as congestion and air pollution, to a minimum. Furthermore, a lower growth rate would also likely minimise the loss of greenfield land and negative effects on environmental features, such as biodiversity, landscape and cultural assets, due to the lower level of land take required. Similarly, a positive effect has been identified for 9: flood risk, as a lower rate of development will less likely contribute towards development on land in flood zones 2 or 3 and a reduced risk of surface run off and flooding. These minor positive effects are uncertain as they depend on the exact location and design of development.

4.24 Finally, a minor positive effect has been identified for SA objective 2: housing, as this growth option will still provide new housing, but this may not meet the full need arising within the rural area.

c) Higher growth

4.25 A higher growth option would lead to a number of potential negative effects identified. It is expected that a higher growth rate would fail to make effective use of brownfield land and the ease of access to services and employment in the larger settlements, yet a high residential growth rate could support rural services and encourage investment in the area, resulting in a mixed minor positive and negative effect for SA objectives 3: economy and skills and 4: regeneration and social inclusion. Similarly, whilst this option could encourage investment in rural services and facilities, including health services and recreation facilities, it could also result in greater pressure on existing services, resulting in mixed minor positive and minor negative effects on SA objective 5: health and wellbeing.

4.26 This growth option would result in a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 2: housing, as it will provide more than enough to meet rural housing needs. However, higher levels of growth could have potentially adverse impacts on the historic environment, landscape

and the prevailing character of rural villages, due to greater urbanisation of these areas, resulting in a uncertain minor negative impact for SA objectives 13: cultural heritage and 14: landscape and townscape . Furthermore, a higher level of growth could contribute towards increased traffic congestion and construction traffic leading to a negative effect for SA objectives 6: transport , 10: air quality and 11: climate change . However, there is some uncertainty associated with this as an increase in residents in rural areas could support existing and improved public transport services.

- 4.27 There is a potential that higher growth could further lead to an increased use of greenfield land on the edge of settlements, resulting in a negative effect for SA objective 7: land use and soil .

d) No change

- 4.28 5% of growth would result in a less sustainable pattern of growth that is not reflective of the dynamics that operate between rural settlements. This strategic growth option will likely result in a negligible effect for all SA objectives as it reflects the likely future baseline without the Local Plan .

2: Worksop

a) 24% of all growth

- 4.29 This level of growth is expected to result in significant positive effects in relations to a number of SA objectives. This proposal will deliver the highest level of housing development to one of the larger settlements in Bassetlaw and will help to support Worksop as the sub-regional centre. This high level of housing development will have directly significant positive impacts on SA objectives 2: housing , 3: economy and skills , and 4: regeneration and social inclusion as the additional housing will support the vitality of the town, the economy and community services. However, there is potential for the proposed level of housing to have mixed minor negative and minor positive effects on SA objectives 6: transport , 10: air quality , 11: climate change . This is expected as this high level of residential development will likely increase traffic in and around Worksop and as a result will have a negative impact on air quality and contribute to increased greenhouse gas emissions. However, development within the large towns will be within closer proximity to existing services such as healthcare, education and sustainable transport. In addition, it is possible that this greater level of development will have a minor negative impact on SA objective 13: cultural heritage , as cultural assets in the settlement could be impacted, either directly or through disturbance to setting. An uncertain negative effect has been identified for SA objective 7: land use and soils as new development at the edge of the settlement could lead to the loss of greenfield land, although this will depend on the specific location and design of development. Uncertain effects are expected for SA objective 14: landscape and townscape , as development in Worksop could improve the townscape through regeneration, although alternatively development with poor siting or design could degrade the townscape or the wider landscape.

b) Lower growth

- 4.30 An alternative considered by the Council is the delivery of fewer homes. It is expected that, as the largest town in the District with the most services and facilities, Worksop requires a level of growth which will sustain it as a sub-regional centre and less residential development will not support the town and its services. As such, a minor positive effect has been identified for SA objective 2: housing , as housing development will still be delivered, but this may not meet the full need arising within Worksop . This lower level of housing development will result in minor negative effects with uncertainty for SA objective 3: economy and skills and 4: regeneration and social inclusion . This lower growth option could result in a number of uncertain positive effects, as less development in Worksop could be more beneficial to SA objectives 1: biodiversity and geodiversity , 6: transport , 7: land use and soils , 9: flood risk , 10: air quality , 11: climate change and 13: cultural heritage . These positive effects are expected as lower growth will likely result in a minimised traffic influence, reduced risk to historic and wildlife designations in and near Worksop and a reduced use of greenfield or land at risk of flooding land on the edge of the settlement. These effects are uncertain as it depends on the location and design of development.

3: Retford

a) 13% of overall growth

- 4.31 This level of growth is expected to help support existing services and facilities, and deliver infrastructure improvements in Retford, including transport, education and health. This growth option will likely result in significant positive effects for a number of SA objectives such as 2: housing, 3: economy and skills and 4: regeneration and social inclusion). This is likely as this option will support existing services in Retford and contribute towards the local economy. It is expected that this option will result in mixed minor positive and minor negative effects in relation to SA objectives 6: transport, 10: air quality and 11: climate change, as development is expected to lead to increased construction traffic and emissions giving rise to minor negative effects. However, development in Retford is more likely to be within proximity to existing services and facilities and sustainable transport links, resulting in minor positive effects. In addition, an uncertain negative effect has been identified in relation to SA objectives 7: land use and soils and 9: flood risk, as there is potential that development could be located within flood zone 2 or 3 and/or lead to loss of greenfield land. However, this is uncertain as effects will depend on the location and design of new development. Uncertain effects are expected for SA objective 14: landscape and townscape, as development in Retford could improve the townscape through regeneration, although alternatively development with poor siting or design could degrade the townscape or the wider landscape.

b) Higher Growth

- 4.32 Higher levels of growth in Retford could result in more development occurring in areas at risk of fluvial flooding or exacerbating existing surface water flooding issues, resulting in an uncertain minor negative effect for SA objective 9: flood risk. In addition, higher levels of growth are likely to result in higher densities and could have adverse impacts on the historic environment and the prevailing character of the historic market town, resulting in a minor negative impact for SA objectives 13: cultural heritage and 14: landscape and townscape. A higher level of growth could also contribute towards increased traffic congestion and construction traffic leading to a minor negative effect for SA objectives 6: transport, 10: air quality and 11: climate change. Furthermore, it is expected that increased development will potentially encourage the loss of greenfield land and impacts on wildlife designations, as such an uncertain minor negative effect has been identified for SA objectives 1: biodiversity and geodiversity and 7: land use and soils. This is uncertain as the effects will depend on the location, scale and design of new development. A significant positive effect has been identified for SA objective 2: housing, as this option will contribute towards meeting local needs for housing. A higher growth rate could put pressure on local services and facilities, but could also support local services and encourage investment in the area, resulting in a minor positive effect for SA objective 3: economy and skills and mixed minor positive and negative effect for SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion.

4: Harworth and Bircotes

a) 21% of overall growth

- 4.33 This level of growth is expected to support the regeneration of Harworth and Bircotes and provide sufficient residential development to support existing services and facilities. As such a significant positive effect has been identified for SA objectives 2: housing, 3: economy and skills and 4: regeneration and social inclusion, and minor positive effects for SA objective 5: health and wellbeing. This level of growth is expected to provide supporting infrastructure such as transport infrastructure, roads, healthcare and education that will also likely enhance the town and access to services and facilities. However, as a result of this level of development there is potential that a number of mixed effects could occur. For example, despite the provision of improved transport infrastructure, including sustainable transport links, there could be an increase in traffic congestion in and around Harworth & Bircotes, resulting in a negative impact on air quality and contributing to increased greenhouse gas emissions. As such, mixed minor positive and minor negative effects are identified with regards to SA objectives 6: transport, 10: air quality and 11: climate change. Mixed minor positive and minor negative uncertain effects have also been identified with regards SA objectives 7: land use and soils and 14: landscape and townscape.

as development could lead to the potential loss of greenfield land on the edge of the settlement, but could also regenerate large brownfield sites.

b) Lower growth

- 4.34 It is expected that a lower level of growth would hinder the ongoing regeneration of the Harworth & Bircotes area, as a lower development rate is unlikely to sustain and enhance the services and facilities within the town, resulting in a minor negative effect for SA objectives 3: economy and skills, 4: regeneration and social inclusion and 5: health and wellbeing. In addition, a minor positive effect has been identified for SA objective 2: housing, as despite the lower rate of development this option will still contribute some way to meeting the housing need in Harworth and Bircotes. An uncertain minor positive effect has been identified for a number of SA objectives: 1: biodiversity and geodiversity, 6: transport, 7: land use and soils, 9: flood risk, 10: air quality, 11: climate change, 13: cultural heritage and 14: landscape and townscape. These have been identified because the lower growth option will still deliver housing, yet it is likely that a lower growth rate will better support the protection of greenfield land, land at risk of flooding and biodiversity/geodiversity designations and will minimise increases in traffic and associated emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases. In addition, the lower level of growth could help minimise impacts on cultural assets and the landscape as the scale of development within the settlement will be minimised.

c) Higher growth

- 4.35 A higher level of growth within Harworth and Bircotes could put more pressure on existing infrastructure provision, but could also support local services and encourage investment in the area. As such, a likely minor positive effect is identified for SA objective 3: economy and skills and a mixed minor positive and negative effect is identified for SA objectives 4: regeneration and social inclusion and 5: health and wellbeing. A higher level of growth could hinder aspirations to prioritise brownfield regeneration and result in an increased loss of greenfield and development of land at risk of flooding (primarily surface water flooding) and lead to adverse effects on wildlife designations. In addition, higher growth could increase traffic congestion and associated air pollution and carbon emissions. As such an uncertain minor negative effect has been identified for SA objectives; 1: biodiversity and geodiversity, 6: transport, 7: land use and soils, 9: flood risk, 10: air quality and 11: climate change. Furthermore, a higher level of residential growth could have more potential for adverse impacts on the landscape of the area and contribute towards the degradation of cultural heritage, therefore minor negative effects are expected with regards to SA objectives 13: cultural heritage and 14: landscape and townscape, although these are uncertain as the effects depend on the location and design of new development. Conversely, a significant positive effect has been identified for SA objective 2: housing because this growth option will still help to meet the housing need for Harworth and Bircotes.

5: Garden Villages

a) 15% of overall growth (two new villages)

- 4.36 This level of growth will be spread across two new villages (selected from the strategic site options considered earlier in this chapter) and is expected to result in significant positive effects for a number of SA objectives. This is the result of the new settlements and provision of necessary infrastructure, services and facilities including healthcare, education, employment and green space. As such a significant positive effect has been identified for SA objectives 2: housing, 3: economy and skills, 4: regeneration and social inclusion and 5: health and wellbeing. In addition, it is expected that this option will result in a number of mixed positive and negative effects. For example, the provision of improved transport infrastructure will encourage sustainable modes of transport but it is also likely that increased residential development will increase travel by private car leading to increased air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. It is likely that new garden communities will reflect sustainable design and encourage heat and electricity from renewable resources and may also provide services for surrounding rural areas. As such, a mixed effect is identified for SA objectives 6: transport, 10: air quality and 11: climate change. Uncertain significant negative effects have been identified in relation to SA objectives 1: biodiversity and geodiversity and 13: cultural heritage, as there is potential for a large loss of land for the new settlements which could affect a number of

wildlife designations and/or cultural assets. In addition, it is expected that this option will have an uncertain mixed minor positive and significant negative effect in relation to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape. This is the result of a new development leading to potential degradation and a negative visual impact on the landscape. However, there is potential for good design to reduce or mitigate these effects. A mixed minor positive and minor negative uncertain effect has been identified for SA objective 7: land use and soils, as this option could lead to the potential loss of large areas of greenfield land, although development could also occur on one of the large, brownfield sites in the District.

b) No Change: Delivery of no new villages

4.37 It is expected that this option will have an uncertain mixed minor positive and significant negative effect in relation to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape, as it reflects the likely evolution of the baseline without the Local Plan.

c) Lower growth: Delivery of one new village

4.38 It is expected that a lower level of growth may hinder the achievement of the housing target, although one new settlement would still provide a substantial amount of growth. Provision of one new settlement and necessary infrastructure, services and facilities including healthcare, education, employment and green space will result in a minor positive effect for SA objectives 2: housing, 3: economy and skills, 4: regeneration and social inclusion and 5: health and wellbeing. In addition, it is expected that this option will result in a number of mixed positive and negative effects. For example, the provision of improved transport infrastructure will encourage sustainable modes of transport but it is also likely that even a lower growth rate will increase travel by private car leading to increased air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. It is likely that a new garden village will reflect sustainable design and encourage heat and electricity from renewable resources and may also provide services for surrounding rural areas. As such, a mixed effect is identified for SA objectives 6: transport, 10: air quality and 11: climate change. Uncertain minor negative effects have been identified for SA objectives 1: biodiversity and geodiversity and 13: cultural heritage, as there is potential for a large loss of land for the new settlement which could have effects on a number of wildlife designations and/or cultural assets. In addition, it is expected that this option will have an uncertain mixed minor positive and minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape. This is the result of new development leading to potential degradation and a negative visual impact on the landscape. However, there is potential for good design to reduce or mitigate the potential negative effect. A mixed minor positive and minor negative uncertain effect has also been identified for SA objective 7: land use and soils, as this option could lead to the potential loss of large areas of greenfield land, although development could occur on one of the large, brownfield sites in the District.

Housing Target

4.39 The Interim SA Report (October 2016) included an appraisal of five reasonable alternative options for the housing target:

- ◁ Option 1: Trend-based: adopt a housing target based on projecting forward the past ten years of completions, an average of 299 dwellings per annum
- ◁ Option 2: Population Projection -based (2014) Objectively Assessed Need - 338 dwellings per annum (dpa)
- ◁ Option 3: Population Projection -based Objectively Assessed Need + Moderate Economic Growth - 383 dpa
- ◁ Option 4: Lower end of the 2013 Strategic Housing Market Assessment Range - 435 dpa
- ◁ Option 5: Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan - 636 dpa

4.40 The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan (October 2016) set out a proposed policy approach which took forward Option 4 i.e. 435 dpa.

4.41 Since the five options were originally identified, BDC has reviewed the housing target options, and is now considering the four options listed below. This is due to the publication of a standard

methodology for determining Objectively Assessed Need (OAN), updated ONS household projections and an updated evidence base, including a draft Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA).

- < Option 1: Standardised OAN figure (306dpa)
- < Option 2: SHMA-based OAN (374 dpa)
- < Option 3: Overall housing requirement to support economic growth based on the Oxford Economics midpoint scenario (EDNA -based) (390 dpa)
- < Option 4: EDNA -based higher requirement to support economic growth based on the Experian midpoint scenario (493 dpa)

4.42 The revised set of four housing target options has now been appraised and the findings are presented in detail in Appendix 4 and summarised below. Note that the Interim SA report also made commentary in relation to how the options would contribute to HMA-wide OAN and city region employment ambitions. These have not been considered in this iteration of the SA for two reasons. Firstly, up to date figures for wider needs were not available at the time of assessment. Secondly, the Council no longer considers the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan figure (636 dpa) to be a reasonable alternative, based on the updated evidence available.

4.43 The SA scores are summarised in Table 4.3, and the findings described below.

Table 4.3 SA scores for the housing target options

Option	Option 1: Standardised OAN figure (306dpa)	Option 2: SHMA-based OAN (374 dpa)	Option 3: Overall housing requirement (EDNA -based) (390dpa)	Option 4: EDNA -based higher requirement to support economic growth (493 dpa)
SA objective				
SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	-?	-?	-?	--?
SA2: Housing	++?	++	++	++
SA3: Economy and skills	+?	+?	++	++
SA4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion	0?	+?	+?	+?/-?
SA5: Health and Wellbeing	0?	+?	+?	+?/-?
SA6: Transport	-	-	-?	--?
SA7: Land Use and Soils	-?	-?	-?	--?
SA8: Water	-	-	-	--
SA9: Flood Risk	-?	-?	-?	-?
SA10: Air Quality	-?	-?	-?	-?
SA11: Climate Change	-?	-?	-?	-?

SA12: Resource Use and Waste	-	-	-	-
SA13: Cultural Heritage	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	-?
SA14: Landscape and Townscape	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	-?

- 4.44 Options 1, 2 and 3 scored a minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 1: biodiversity because the amount of housing they each propose could have an adverse effect on Sherwood Forest ppSPA or on one or more of the 20 SSSIs or 300 Local Wildlife Sites located within the District. The larger the housing target, the less selective the Council can be with regards to allocating sites with fewer links to important biodiversity sites. In addition, larger housing targets are likely to introduce more residents to the area, which may result in greater pressure on biodiversity in terms of recreation pressure, depletion of water resources and urban edge effects. As such, Option 4 is expected to have significant negative effects on SA objective 1, as it would provide for a much greater magnitude of growth. The actual effect is uncertain because it depends on where the housing is located within the District, and whether it is within or adjacent to any of the identified biodiversity sites.
- 4.45 All four options scored a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 2: housing because they would each provide a substantial amount of housing, which would meet or exceed the standard methodology Objectively Assessed Need (30 6 dpa). All four options will contribute significantly to the range of housing needs in the District, including affordable housing. The effect recorded against Option 1 is uncertain as the EDNA suggests that the standard methodology may not adequately account for economic growth in the District. The effect recorded against Option 4 is also uncertain, because there might not be market demand for this proposed level of housing, if economic growth does not increase in line with the underlying assumption in this option.
- 4.46 Options 3 and 4 scored a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 3: economy and skills because they both take into consideration the future economic needs of Bassetlaw District. For example, Option 3 was generated using a set of baseline economic growth forecasts whilst Option 4 assumes a stronger economic performance within Bassetlaw. Option 2 also scored a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 3 because it would support job creation through an increased labour supply. Options 1 and 2 scored a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 3 because, although they may not take into consideration the full future economic needs of the area, the provision of housing is likely to support job creation through an increased labour supply, whilst also contributing towards spending power within the local economy.
- 4.47 Two options (2 and 3) scored a minor positive effect in relation to SA objectives 4: regeneration and social inclusion and 5: health and wellbeing because the housing development proposed by each option will help sustain existing facilities. These options may also increase pressure on existing services, but both options may increase investment to support regeneration initiatives and enhancement or provision of new services in response to demand. Option 4 scored a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect with uncertainty because it proposes the largest amount of development out of all four options, and is therefore likely to place more pressure on existing services and facilities than the other options, whilst potentially securing more money to invest in the regeneration of the area, including new infrastructure. Option 1 scored a negligible effect with uncertainty because it proposes the smallest amount of housing development out of all four options, therefore it is more likely to result in a similar level of provision to the future baseline without the plan.
- 4.48 All four options are expected to have negative effects in relation to SA objective 6: transport because although they will each have a considerable impact on the highways network, it is expected that new housing delivery will result in an increase of investment to help offset some of these impacts. Option 4 scored a significant negative effect because if economic growth does not increase in line with the underlying assumption in this option, the amount of housing development proposed by the option would require a high level of out-commuting, with potential for more significant effects against this objective. Effects will depend on the location of development within the District.

- 4.49 Options 1, 2 and 3 scored a minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 7: land use and soils because the overall scale of housing required by each option cannot be accommodated solely on brownfield land. Option 4 is expected to have a significant negative effect, as it would require the greatest land take of all options. However, the effect is uncertain until the location of development is known.
- 4.50 Options 1, 2 and 3 scored a minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 8: water because housing development will result in an increase in demand for water, which will give rise to greater pressure on existing water and sewage treatment infrastructure. Furthermore, a loss of greenfield land to accommodate this growth will result in an increased likelihood of surface water run-off with varying consequences, depending on location. Option 4 is expected to have a significant negative effect, as it would require the greatest increase in water use of all options.
- 4.51 All four options scored a minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 9: flood risk because the wide range of sites available for development means that all options are unlikely to result in pressure to develop in high flood risk areas. However, the overall extent of new development is likely to lead to a large increase in impermeable surfaces, and therefore reduce the drainage ability of the ground. The effects are uncertain as they depend on where development is located within the District. The larger the housing target, the less selective the Council can be with regards to allocating sites in areas at lower risk of flooding.
- 4.52 All four options scored a minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 10: air quality and SA objective 11: climate change, because the housing development proposed by each will result in an increase in car numbers and people using the highways network, resulting in increases in emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases. However, new housing development may result in an increase of investment to help improve the highways network and encourage use of more sustainable transport modes, therefore the effect is not expected to be significant.
- 4.53 A minor negative effect is expected for each option in relation to SA objective 12: resource use and waste because the housing development proposed by each option is likely to result in a proportionate increase in waste generation.
- 4.54 Options 1, 2 and 3 scored a minor positive effect in relation to SA objectives 13: cultural heritage and 14: landscape and townscape because the lower annual growth targets proposed by each option enable the Council to be more selective about development sites, given the amount of land available in the District. However, the four options also scored a negative effect in relation to SA objectives 13 and 14 because the housing development proposed by each could be located within close proximity to sensitive receptors, and/or affect the setting of a number of historic assets. The larger the housing target, the less selective the Council can be with regards to allocating sites with minimal impacts on heritage assets, landscape and townscape, therefore Option 4 was not considered to have any potential minor positive effects, as the Council would not be able to be as selective about which sites to develop under this option. All effects are uncertain until the location of development is known.

Employment Land Target

- 4.55 The Interim SA Report (October 2016) included an appraisal of three reasonable alternative options for the employment land target:
- ◁ Option 1: No allocations – allow the market to deliver economic growth as demand dictates through the adoption of a criteria policy based approach to determine planning applications.
 - ◁ Option 2: Allocate to reflect market trends in Bassetlaw, with flexibility across the spatial hierarchy to support the ambitions of the Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) (delivering at least 11.8 hectares per annum).
 - ◁ Option 3: Large-scale, aspirational growth – allocating for sub-regional economic growth aspirations.
- 4.56 The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan (October 2016) set out a proposed policy approach which took forward Option 2 i.e. 11.8ha of employment land per annum.

4.57 Since the three options were originally identified, updated evidence is available, particularly the draft EDNA. Although this has not resulted in any new options, Option 2 would now only be able to deliver at least 8 hectares per annum, rather than 11.8 hectares. This does not affect the previous assessments, although matrices have been updated to consider updates to baseline information and to take into account the minor changes made to the SA methodology (described in Chapter 2). The updated appraisal matrix is presented in detail in Appendix 4 and summarised below. Note that the appraisal matrix and text below is largely taken from the Interim SA Report.

4.58 The SA scores are summarised in Table 4.4, and the findings described below.

Table 4.4 SA scores for the employment target options

Option	Option 1: No allocations	Option 2: Allocate to reflect market trends in Bassetlaw	Option 3: Large -scale, aspirational growth
SA objective			
SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	-?	-?	-
SA2: Housing	0	0	0?
SA3: Economy and skills	+?/-?	++?	++/?
SA4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion	?	+	+
SA5: Health and Wellbeing	0?	0?	0?
SA6: Transport	+?/-	+?/-?	+?/-?
SA7: Land Use and Soils	?	+?/-?	-?
SA8: Water	-	-	-
SA9: Flood Risk	?	+	-?
SA10: Air Quality	-?	-?	-?
SA11: Climate Change	+/-	+/-	+/-
SA12: Resource Use and Waste	-	-	-
SA13: Cultural Heritage	-?	+/-	-?
SA14: Landscape and Townscape	-?	+/-	-?

4.59 The traditional industries over the last 30 years. Economic development that is delivered through the emerging plan must initially sustain existing businesses and enterprises, then help secure investment through flexible policies and by delivering land in the right locations.

4.60 There are positive effects associated with SA objective 3: economy and skills arising from the three employment land target options, with these being significant for Options 2 and 3. By

allocating specific sites for development, Option 2 is expected to help sustain existing centres and assist new growth areas by providing opportunities for business start-up, expansion and relocation. Support for rural diversification has potential to boost prosperity and viability of rural areas as places to live and work in the long term, rather than restrictive policies that would limit regeneration of rural areas. The more aspirational levels of growth identified in Option 3 would also have positive effects in terms of boosting the economic prosperity of the area, although in addition to the uncertainty arising from not yet having identified sites for development, this option lacks clarity about the amount of land that should be developed as it is jobs-based, not land-based. Although Option 1 provides flexibility to deal with needs as they emerge, the lack of a land or jobs-based target may not provide sufficient certainty to secure investment commitment.

- 4.61 Options 2 and 3 are also likely to have positive effects on SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion. With specific locations targeted through allocations or place-based job creation targets, development can support regeneration of key sites and provide potential uplift to the public realm and investment in infrastructure.
- 4.62 Option 2 differs from Options 1 and 3 by proposing allocation of a specific quantity of land and is therefore identified as having positive effects in a number of areas that the other options do not. Specifically SA objective 7: land use and soils, SA objective 9: flood risk, SA objective 13: cultural heritage and SA objective 14: landscape and townscape. This helps to reduce some uncertainty about the deliverability of sites and facilitates avoidance or mitigation of potentially significant negative effects on people and the environment.
- 4.63 The appraisal of the three options for employment land has identified mixed effects or effects with uncertainty for the remaining SA objectives. Those where distinct effects have been identified are those where effects are generally clearly negative or provide no certainty. SA objective 12: resource use and waste typically shows that commercial operations will inevitably result in increased resource use and subsequently generation of waste. The extent to which this occurs would be expected to increase proportionately with the levels of growth achieved. Similarly, the effects in relation to SA objective 8: water quality and resources are likely to be negative due to construction and operation of businesses inevitably increasing demand for water in an area of identified water stress.
- 4.64 Negative uncertain effects are identified in relation to SA objective 1: biodiversity, with the need for development of land for employment uses increasing the likelihood of loss of greenfield sites on the edge of existing towns and villages causing habitat loss and fragmentation. Green infrastructure may be delivered as part of large scale schemes, in conjunction with supporting access to employment, although there is significant uncertainty about where development will occur and the levels of growth that may be achieved.
- 4.65 Economic development will have mixed effects on SA objective 6: Transport through increased vehicle movements from deliveries, visitors and in-commuting. These movements will impact on road capacity and existing congestion, but development will also provide developer contributions and CIL payments that will support enhancements and provision of new sustainable transport infrastructure.
- 4.66 SA objective 13: cultural heritage and SA objective 14: landscape and townscape, respectively, are also considered likely to have minor negative effects, mixed with positive effects for Option 2. Each of the three options has potential to generate negative effects on the existing townscapes, landscapes and cultural heritage assets in the District, although again there is uncertainty about where these will occur. Under both SA objectives, allocating sites in Option 2 gives opportunity to avoid impacts on the most sensitive receptors or to at least provide integrated mitigation. Larger scale developments can have more wide ranging impacts on landscapes and townscapes, therefore it is important to be able to plan proactively for these.
- 4.67 SA objective 2: housing is the theme that has been identified as having a limited relationship with economic development, at least in the context of Bassetlaw. Housing market evidence indicates that economic development has not traditionally been a significant driver in terms of housing demand in the District. While aspirations to change this may be promoted through the plan, raising demand for employment land could result in competition for sites for housing development.

Thematic Policies

- 4.68 The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan (October 2016) set out a number of proposed thematic policy approaches. These were not subject to SA at the time but have now been appraised below, along with reasonable alternative policy approaches, where relevant. The reasons for selecting the preferred approach are detailed in Appendix 9, in relation to the relevant proposed policy included in Part 1 of the Bassetlaw Draft Plan (Local Plan). Not all of the thematic policy approaches discussed below have an equivalent proposed policy in Part 1 of the Bassetlaw Draft Plan (Local Plan). It is expected that these policy approaches will feed into development of development management policies in preparation of Part 2 of the Bassetlaw Draft Plan. As such, the policy options audit table in Appendix 9 will be updated to outline the selection of the preferred approach at the next stage in the plan preparation process.
- 4.69 The appraisal takes the form of a high level commentary in relation to relevant SA objectives that the thematic policy approaches are likely to affect. As the thematic policy approaches are narrow in scope, they are generally only likely to have effects in relation to those SA objectives that cover the same themes as the policy approach and are therefore likely to have no effect on the remaining SA objectives (e.g. the proposed policy approach for Historic Environment and SA objective 13: cultural heritage).

Housing Growth

- 4.70 The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan proposed an annual housing target of 435 net dwelling completions. Whilst this figure is no longer one of the housing target options, the remaining aspects of the proposed policy approach are considered below. The revised housing target options (and the effects of delivering the scale of housing within them) have been assessed earlier in this chapter.
- 4.71 Allocating sufficient sites to provide choice and flexibility, ensuring sufficient housing provision and allocating a mix of sites is expected to have significant positive effects on SA objective 2: housing. This approach is also likely to have minor positive effects on SA objective 5: health and wellbeing, as it is expected to ensure a range of housing provision that is suitable for all residents, contributing to both physical and mental health and wellbeing.

Economic Development

- 4.72 The Initial Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan proposed an employment land target of 177ha over the life of the plan. Employment land targets are assessed in the preceding section of this chapter, therefore the commentary below addresses the remaining aspects of the proposed policy approach for economic development.
- 4.73 In being proactive and aspirational with regards to economic growth, and in having no maximum employment land target, this approach is expected to have significant positive effects on SA objective 3: economy and skills. However, it could lead to a high level of development, which could put pressure on environmental factors, therefore having negative effects on SA objectives 1: biodiversity, 7: land use and soils, 10: air quality, 13: cultural heritage and 14: landscape and townscape. However, these effects are expected to be minor, as the policy approach includes safeguards, such as ensuring development is at an appropriate scale and design, ensuring development can be served by sustainable infrastructure, and conserving and enhancing local heritage and environmental characteristics. Where heritage and environmental features are enhanced, this policy could also lead to minor positive effects on the SA objectives listed above.

Town and Service Centres

- 4.74 The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan on the basis of evidence contained in the Bassetlaw Retail and Leisure Study (April 2017). With no net need for additional retail floorspace over the lifetime of the plan there is no requirement to allocate land for future retail development.
- 4.75 Defining clear boundaries for town centres, primary shopping areas and primary and secondary frontages is expected to have a significant positive effect on SA objective 4: regeneration and

social inclusion as this approach will directly seek to protect and enhance the vitality and objective 3: economy and skills as a result of this and the associated stimulation of the town centre economy and employment opportunities.

- 4.76 Promoting a town centre first approach will promote the use of sustainable transport measures in place of cars which may be more widely used to access developments in out of town locations; therefore minor positive effects are likely in relation to SA objectives 5: health and wellbeing, 6: transport, 10: air quality and 11: climate change.
- 4.77 A minor positive effect is likely in relation to SA objective 2: housing as the proposed policy approach involves promoting residential uses above the ground floor in town centres.

Historic Environment

- 4.78 The proposed policy approach relating to the historic environment set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan would have a significant positive effect on SA objective 13: cultural heritage as the primary purpose of the proposed approach is to protect and enhance the historic environment. It sets out various measures to achieve this; including maintaining a presumption against development, alterations, advertising or demolition that would be harmful to a heritage asset, and giving designated heritage assets greater protection than non-designated assets.
- 4.79 The specific nature of the proposed policy approach means that effects on most of the other SA objectives are unlikely, although there could be potential minor negative effects on SA objectives 2: housing and 3: economy and skills, if the development of housing or commercial sites was to be restricted on the basis of heritage considerations.
- 4.80 The Council considers that a reasonable alternative approach to the historic environment would be more detailed policy criteria for the protection of non-designated heritage assets, further to the approach set out in the NPPF. It is envisaged that this would be specifically with regard to exploring in more detail the justification for demolition of non-designated heritage assets.
- 4.81 This reasonable alternative approach would have a significant positive effect on SA objective 13: cultural heritage because it provides additional detail to that in the NPPF on the protection of local, non-designated heritage assets, whilst also requiring detailed justification for the demolition of such buildings. It is envisaged that this would limit the circumstances in which the demolition of non-designated heritage assets would be considered acceptable. The NPPF guidance on designated and non-designated heritage assets alone is adequate, but could be reinforced through Local Plan policies.
- 4.82 As with the proposed policy approach, negligible effects on most of the other SA objectives are likely. However, the requirement to provide detailed justification for the demolition of non-designated heritage assets, and therefore minimising such demolition, could limit the amount of housing or commercial development if it prevents these being developed on the same site, resulting in minor negative uncertain effects in relation to SA objectives 2: housing and 3: economy and skills.

Landscape

- 4.83 The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The NPPF and national guidance provide a clear, hierarchical approach for planning policies to protect and enhance valued landscapes in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality, whilst also recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
- 4.84 The proposed policy approach relating to the landscape would have a significant positive effect on SA objective 14: landscape and townscape as the primary purpose of the proposed approach is including promoting development that is sensitive to its setting, in line with the local recommendations made for each Policy Zone in the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment and encouraging applicants to give careful consideration to how existing landscape features may be utilised and integrated within development proposals.

- 4.85 There could also be minor positive effects on SA objectives 1: biodiversity and 13: cultural heritage as one component of the proposed policy approach is to protect the separate identity of settlements and the intrinsic quality of the countryside (including its built and natural heritage).
- 4.86 The specific nature of the proposed policy approach means that negligible effects on most of the other SA objectives are likely, although there could be potential minor negative effects on SA objectives 2: housing and 3: economy and skills, if the development of housing or commercial sites was to be restricted on the basis of landscape considerations.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- 4.87 The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The NPPF requires planning policies to protect and enhance sites of biodiversity or geological value in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality, distinguishing between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites. The NPPF also promotes minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent ecological networks.
- 4.88 The proposed policy approach relating to biodiversity and geodiversity would have a significant positive effect on SA objective 1: biodiversity as the primary purpose of the proposed approach is to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the District. It sets out various measures to achieve this, including not permitting development that would be likely to result in the loss, deterioration or harm to habitats or species of importance to biodiversity or geological conservation interests, unless specific criteria are met. However, there is some uncertainty associated with the significant positive effect as the policy approach indicates that some harm may be permitted where the benefits of the proposed development outweigh the negative impacts on biodiversity.
- 4.89 The provision of open spaces would have minor positive effects on SA objectives 5: health and wellbeing, 7: land use and soils, 9: flood risk and 14: landscape and townscape. This is because open space can provide opportunities for active outdoor recreation, preserve areas of greenfield land from built development, facilitate the infiltration of surface waters and improve the setting of the wider built environment.
- 4.90 The specific nature of the proposed policy approach means that negligible effects on most of the other SA objectives are likely, although there could be potential minor negative effects on SA objectives 2: housing and 3: economy and skills, if the development of housing or commercial sites was to be restricted on the basis of biodiversity and geodiversity considerations.

Green Infrastructure

- 4.91 The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan, because specific enhancement measures cannot be identified at this stage. Specific opportunities may, however, be identified in relation to individual sites.
- 4.92 The proposed policy approach involves supporting the provision of a wide range of multifunctional green spaces and would have positive effects on a number of the SA objectives. Specific reference is made to recreational space for sports and leisure activities, which would have a minor positive effect on SA objective 5: health and wellbeing, and the policy approach also refers to green infrastructure contributing to flood storage capacity and so a minor positive effect on SA objective 9: flood risk is also likely. Further positive effects on health are likely as the policy approach promotes improved pedestrian and cycle accessibility and connectivity. This will also result in minor positive effects on SA objectives 6: transport, 10: air quality and 11: climate change.
- 4.93 The provision of Green Infrastructure within the District will have a significant positive effect on SA objective 1: biodiversity, particularly as the policy approach refers to BAP habitat creation, restoration or enhancement schemes and promotes the use of green corridors. The promotion of landscape buffers or screening for other forms of visually prominent development is likely to have minor positive effects on SA objective 14: landscape and townscape, as well as potentially SA objective 13: cultural heritage depending on the presence of nearby heritage assets that could otherwise be negatively impacted by development.

4.94 The policy approach promotes the regeneration of previously developed land in and around Worksop and Retford town centres which is likely to have minor positive effects on SA objectives 4: regeneration and social exclusion, 7: land use and soils and 12: resource use and waste.

Open space

4.95 The proposed policy approach to open space is expected to have a significant positive effect on SA objective 5: health and wellbeing as ensuring that provision is made to meet defined standards will mean that there is open space available for local residents to engage in active outdoor recreation, to the benefit of their physical and mental wellbeing. Minor positive effects on SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion are also likely as the proposed policy approach will maintain and enhance access to community facilities and services. Depending on the nature of open space provided, there could be minor positive effects on SA objectives 1: biodiversity, 7: land use and soils and 9: flood risk. There could also be minor positive effects on SA objectives 13: cultural heritage and 14: landscape and townscape, if the provision of open space enhances the setting of the wider built environment, which will depend on its nature and location.

4.96 The Council considers that a reasonable alternative policy approach to the delivery of open space as set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan would be to not seek provision of additional new open spaces, but to prioritise developer contributions to facilitate off-site enhancements to existing public open spaces. This approach would prioritise qualitative improvements to facilities and accessibility, rather than using provision standards per 1,000 population.

4.97 This reasonable alternative approach could have a mixed minor positive and significant negative effect on SA objective 5: health and wellbeing. This is because although it would result in enhancements to existing open spaces, the approach does not seek provision of additional new open spaces, despite the Open Space, Sport & Recreation Study (August 2012) identifying deficiencies within the District of natural and semi natural greenspace, amenity greenspace, provision for children and young people, and allotments. Additionally, enhancements to existing public open spaces may attract a larger number of visitors to them, which could contribute towards increased recreational pressure proportionate to the increase in housing numbers over the plan period. Mixed minor positive and significant negative effects on SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion are also likely because although the reasonable alternative policy approach prioritises improvements to the quality and accessibility of existing public open spaces, failure to provide additional new open spaces when deficiencies have been identified could reduce accessibility to open space, especially for those living in any new homes built over the plan period.

4.98 Minor positive uncertain effects on SA objective 1: biodiversity are likely because the reasonable alternative policy approach seeks to enhance existing public open spaces which could have a beneficial effect on biodiversity. Minor positive effects are also expected in relation to SA objectives 13: cultural heritage and 14: landscape and townscape because enhancements to existing public open spaces could improve the overall townscape and visual amenity of the area. However, provision of new open space could provide greater gains in biodiversity and townscape/visual amenity, although this depends on the current features and condition of the site and the design of any new open spaces.

Design

4.99 The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan because the recently updated NPPF provides a much stronger steer on the requirement for good design. Although the NPPF gives scope to make greater demands on the density of development in some circumstances, it is felt that it is more appropriate to pursue this in settlement-specific policies.

4.100 The primary purpose of the proposed policy approach is to achieve high quality design in the District which will have a significant positive effect on SA objective 14: landscape and townscape. In particular, requiring new development to respond to the character and pattern of its surroundings, paying attention to whether the site is urban, suburban or rural in character, will help to ensure that new development integrates with its wider setting.

4.101 Minor positive effects on SA objective 13: cultural heritage are also likely as achieving high quality design in new development will help to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on any nearby assets such as listed buildings. The requirement for proposals to demonstrate how they are integrated with existing built and natural forms in terms of layout, access to green infrastructure and access to cycling and walking networks will have minor positive effects on SA objectives 5: health and wellbeing, 6: transport, 10: air quality and 11: climate change.

4.102 Encouraging the use of more environmentally sustainable materials will have minor positive effects on SA objectives 11: climate change and 12: resource use and waste.

Affordable and Specialist Housing

4.103 The proposed policy approach will have a significant positive effect on SA objective 2: housing as its primary aims are to ensure that affordable housing is provided to meet local need and to deliver specific types of housing such as housing to meet the needs of older people. Minor positive effects on SA objective 5: health and wellbeing are also expected, as the provision of specialist housing will help to meet the needs of older and less able residents.

4.104 The Council has considered three reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the = b] h] U ` ` 8 f U Z h ` 6 U g Y h ` U k ` D ` U b " ` ` H \ Y ` Z] f g h ` c Z ` h \ Y g Y ` f Y U approach, in which the Council would work to the requirements of the NPPF with regard to affordable and specialist housing provision. This approach could have a mixed significant positive and minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 2: housing because although the NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to identify their affordable and specialist housing needs and provide accordingly, there are exceptions to this. These exceptions are if the identified affordable and specialist housing needs can be met off-site, or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified, and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. The second of these two exceptions could result in failure to provide the identified number of affordable and specialist homes. In addition, the NPPF requirements in relation to major and non-major residential developments may not help to achieve the identified affordable housing need within Bassetlaw. The NPPF states that affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas. Where major housing development is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area or significantly prejudice the U V] `] h m ` h c ` a Y Y h ` h \ Y `] X Y b h] Z] Y X ` U Z c f X U V ` Y ` \ c i g] b [` b Y Y X g ` approach, Bassetlaw would need to provide a minimum of 10% affordable housing in line with the NPPF, but this is unlikely to meet affordable housing needs within Bassetlaw. For example, according to the SHMA there is a net affordable housing need in Bassetlaw of 134 homes per annum, over a 21 year period to 2035. Taking the revised government standard methodology OAN of 299 dpa, this would equate to a need for around 48% of new housing to be affordable, and even taking the higher housing target proposed in the Initial Draft Local Plan of 435 dpa, this would still require around 33% of new housing to be affordable.

4.105 Lastly, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect on SA objective 5: health and wellbeing is likely because the provision of affordable housing will ensure that more of 6 U g g Y h ` U k D g ` f Y g] X Y b h g ` \ U j Y ` U W W Y g g ` h c ` \ c i affordable and i h `] h `] g ` specialist housing needs will be met.

4.106 The second reasonable alternative policy approach sets a higher target for affordable and specialist housing, including differential rates for greenfield and brownfield development. The provision of a higher number of affordable and specialist homes in general is likely to have a significant positive effect on SA objective 2: housing by contributing further to the delivery of the identified need for affordable and specialist accommodation. Minor positive effects on SA objective 5: health and wellbeing are also expected, as the provision of specialist housing will meet the needs of older and less able residents. It is assumed that this approach would lower the affordable and/or specialist housing requirement on brownfield land, but would still meet affordable and specialist housing needs through greenfield development. Encouraging the re-use of brownfield land for market homes is likely to have a minor positive effect on SA objective 7: land use and soils.

4.107 The third reasonable alternative policy approach seeks a proportion of development to meet higher accessibility standards as set out in the building regulations, subject to viability. This is expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objectives 2: housing and 5: health and wellbeing because this approach will require housing to be designed to a particular standard so as to meet the needs of older and less able residents. It is assumed that if this option were to be taken forward, affordable housing would still be delivered to meet local needs.

Rural Buildings and Residential Development in Wider Rural Bassetlaw

4.108 The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Part A of Section 14 of the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan, primarily because a restrictive policy would potentially prevent regeneration in rural areas and would result in increased numbers of rural buildings with no identified use falling in to disrepair.

4.109 Section B of the policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan is closely linked to the proposed reasonable alternative for the historic environment policy (above). Where demolition of an existing building is acceptable in principle there should be no reason to restrict redevelopment, subject to meeting the proposed criteria.

4.110 The proposed policy approach sets out criteria under which proposals for converting buildings to residential use or replacing existing residential dwellings will be permitted. It also sets out criteria that would apply to proposals for rural worker dwellings. There could be mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effects on SA objective 2: housing. Positive effects relate to the policy approach permitting the re-use of existing buildings for housing and the development of housing for rural workers in certain circumstances; however the criteria for allowing such proposals are quite restrictive, hence the minor negative effect as well.

4.111 The criteria set out in relation to housing for rural workers are likely to have minor positive effects on SA objective 14: landscape and townscape as they should help to avoid inappropriate and unnecessary development in the countryside. There are also likely to be minor positive effects on SA objective 3: economy and skills as the policy approach permits residential development to support rural workers where it can be proven to be necessary.

4.112 The proposed policy approach could have a minor positive effect on SA objective 13: cultural heritage as it allows for the conversion of buildings to residential use where they are of significant architectural or historic value and intrinsically worthy of retention in its rural setting.

Flood Risk

4.113 The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan in light of the clear approach to flood risk, as set out in national policy and guidance. Currently, Bassetlaw District Council has a good supply of land available to meet its future development needs without needing to allocate land in areas at higher risk of flooding.

4.114 The primary aim of the proposed policy approach is to reduce flood risk in the District; therefore a significant positive effect is likely in relation to SA objective 9: flood risk. There is also likely to be a minor positive effect on SA objective 8: water as the policy approach requires that development in settlements with identified drainage capacity issues must demonstrate that the proposed development will not exacerbate existing land drainage and sewerage problems. It is also stated that proposals that are likely to result in the deterioration of water courses and water quality will be resisted and that support will be given to development proposals designed specifically to conserve or enhance water quality.

4.115 A minor positive effect on SA objective 1: biodiversity is likely as preference will be given to SuDS that contribute to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and support will be given to development proposals which are designed to conserve or enhance the ecological value of the water environment.

Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

- 4.116 The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan. Based on the evidence of energy opportunity mapping and given the clear direction in NPPF Chapter 14¹⁵, the Council considers it prudent to allow community-led initiatives to be driven through neighbourhood plans, rather than at a strategic level. The only exceptions to this may be to safeguard former and existing coal-fired power station sites for energy infrastructure and where specific opportunities are identified as part of strategic housing or employment land allocations.
- 4.117 The proposed policy approach will have a significant positive effect on SA objective 11: climate change as its primary aim is to support renewable energy development in the District. The development of renewable energy infrastructure may also have a minor positive effect on SA objective 10: air quality.
- 4.118 While such developments can have adverse environmental impacts (depending on their nature and location), the policy approach specifies that proposals for renewable energy developments will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they will not result in unacceptable impacts on people and the built and natural environment. However, this wording indicates that some level of impacts may be permitted and so there are potential but uncertain minor negative effects in relation to SA objectives 1: biodiversity, 13: cultural heritage and 14: landscape and townscape.

Sustainable Design and Energy Efficiency

- 4.119 Acknowledging that the NPPF does not prevent LPAs from using their existing powers to set higher energy efficiency standards above building regulations and the national targets in the Climate Change Act 2008, the Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan. The proposed approach seeks to achieve the highest standards, subject to viability (as a limiting factor). Testing of other policy themes has indicated that development viability in Bassetlaw is marginal, therefore strictly imposing higher level requirements may adversely affect delivery of affordable housing and essential infrastructure.
- 4.120 The promotion of sustainable design and energy efficiency in new developments through this proposed policy approach is expected to have a significant positive effect on SA objective 11: climate change as the approach aims to increase energy efficiency in new developments, ensure that sustainable materials are used and minimise the net greenhouse gas emissions of the development. A minor positive effect on SA objective 12: resource use and waste is also expected as the policy approach seeks to minimise waste and maximise recycling. Minimising water consumption in new developments will have a minor positive effect on SA objective 8: water, and maximising low or zero carbon energy generation will have a minor positive effect on SA objective 10: air quality.

Enhance Accessibility and Promoting Sustainable Travel

- 4.121 The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan, because it is not possible to identify specific impacts relating to access to sustainable travel and accessibility and associated mitigation measures at this stage, as site allocations have not yet been identified. These will be explored in more detail in association with site allocations.
- 4.122 The policy approach sets out a range of measures to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars, and so would have significant positive effects on SA objectives 6: transport, 10: air quality and 11: climate change.
- 4.123 A minor positive effect on SA objective 5: health and wellbeing is also likely as the policy promotes walking and cycling which would help to increase the levels of day-to-day physical activity amongst residents.

¹⁵ Specifically the approach to wind energy in footnote 49

Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations

- 4.124 The Council does not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to the proposed policy approach set out in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan, because specific infrastructure needs must be determined in relation to specific site allocations as they are identified, and on a case-by-case basis as planning applications are submitted.
- 4.125 The proposed policy approach to infrastructure delivery and planning obligations would not have a direct effect on any of the SA objectives as it relates to how developer contributions will be secured. The likely sustainability effects of any infrastructure that may be funded through developer contributions would need to be considered separately, as specific site options and then site allocations are identified.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

- 4.126 The proposed approach is to allocate sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople to meet identified needs, which will have a significant positive effect on SA objective 2: housing . Giving preference to sites that are located within or adjoining settlements will have a minor positive effect on SA objective 14: landscape and townscape , and will also help to reduce the need to travel, resulting in minor positive effects on SA objectives 6: transport , 10: air quality and 11: climate change . The minor positive effect on SA objective 14: landscape and townscape will be further achieved through the policy requirement for proposals for sites to be assessed in terms of their scale, layout and design.
- 4.127 A range of other policy criteria are set out which will be taken into consideration when allocating sites. A minor positive effect on SA objective 7: land use and soils is likely as one of the criteria is making efficient use of land and another relates to avoiding land contamination. A minor positive effect on SA objective 9: flood risk is also likely as the policy requires consideration of flood risk when assessing potential locations.
- 4.128 Sites for Travelling Showpeople must demonstrate that, where sites contain work areas, use of these areas will not lead to unacceptable air or environmental pollution, noise or other nuisance or risk to the health and safety of residents on and adjacent to the site. This will have a minor positive effect on SA objective 5: health and wellbeing .
- 4.129 A reasonable alternative policy approach considered for provision of Gypsy, Traveller and Householder sites that responds to need arises. It is assumed that these criteria would be based on the considerations set out in the proposed policy approach in the Initial Draft Plan, such as the need to consider the scale of development in relation to the nearest settlement and making efficient use of land. As this approach would be expected to meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, and would include similar considerations to the preferred approach, the effects in terms of the SA objectives are expected to be very similar. However, there may be more uncertainty associated with this alternative approach, as sites would not be safeguarded to meet future requirements. On the other hand, this approach may provide additional flexibility to respond to changing needs.

Strategic site options

- 4.130 In preparing Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan), the Council considered strategic site options, i.e. new garden communities, for inclusion in the Local Plan. A number of potential sites were identified through the Bassetlaw New Settlement Study¹⁶, although only six of these were considered to be reasonable alternatives by the Council:
- ◁ Gamston Airport.
 - ◁ Former Bevercotes Colliery.
 - ◁ Land East of Carlton-in-Lindrick.
 - ◁ Land West of Beckingham.

¹⁶ ADAS (2018) Bassetlaw New Settlement Study

- < Land East of Clarborough.
- < Land North of Darlton.

4.131 The other sites considered in the New Settlement Study were not considered to be reasonable because they were deemed to have significant constraints, either in terms of environmental constraints or sensitivities, physical or technical constraints. In addition, the Council discounted sites that would be located near existing land uses that would be harmful to future residents. Appendix 8 sets out in more detail how strategic site options were identified and outlines the 7 c i b W] ` Drs for selecting the preferred approach in light of the alternatives.

4.132 The strategic site options have been appraised and the findings are presented in detail in Appendix 4 and summarised below. As stated in paragraph 2.36, new garden communities will be expected to be relatively self-contained communities. The assessments assumed that any new garden community would be expected to provide:

- < > 1,000 homes.
- < Low density development.
- < Primary school.
- < Local centre.
- < Small-scale employment/job provision (<5 ha for the purposes of applying the site assessment assumptions presented in Appendix 7).
- < High level of open space / greenspace.
- < Bus stops / cycle routes.
- < GP surgery.

4.133 In order to ensure that all garden communities are assessed on a consistent basis, the SA has made no assumptions about layout and design of these potential new garden communities and they have been assessed on the basis of the site boundary and the above assumptions regarding service and infrastructure provision only. The preferred options have been assessed in the context of the relevant policy (Policy 12) in Chapter 5, which takes into account design and mitigation considerations required in the policy.

4.134 The allocation of land at the strategic sites considered for inclusion in Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) has been identified as having a wide range of potential sustainability effects. The detailed appraisal of each proposed site is presented in Appendix 4 with a summary of the likely sustainability effects of all sites presented in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5 SA scores for strategic site options

Site	Land East of Carlton-Lindrick	Land West of Beckingham	Land East of Clarborough	Gamston Airport	Former Bevercotes Colliery	Land north of Darlton
SA objective						
SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	0	0	--	--	--?	-
SA2: Housing	++	++	++	++	++	++
SA3: Economy and skills	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
SA4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion	+	+	+	+	+	+

SA5: Health and Wellbeing	++/ --	++/ --	++/ --	++	++	++
SA6: Transport	+	+	+	+	+	+
SA7: Land Use and Soils	--	--	--	+/-	+/-	--
SA8: Water	--?	0	0	--?	--?	0
SA9: Flood Risk	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA10: Air Quality	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SA11: Climate Change	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SA12: Resource Use and Waste	0	0	0	--?	--	0
SA13: Cultural Heritage	-	-	0?	-	-	-
SA14: Landscape and Townscape	-	--	--	-	-	--

- 4.135 Three of the strategic site options are expected to have significant negative effects in relation to SA objective 1: biodiversity and geodiversity . These effects have been identified given that the sites by Clarborough , Gamston Airport and Former Bevercot es Colliery are in close proximity to local wildlife designations as well as national or international designations including the potential future designation of Sherwood Forest ppSPA.
- 4.136 Land north of Darlton is expected to have a minor negative effect in relation to this SA objective given that it lies within 100m of locally designated wildlife sites only. The two remaining sites considered, by Carlton-in-Lindrick and Beckingham respectively are not within 1 00m of any local wildlife sites or within 500m of any international or national wildlife sites. As such they are expected to have a negligible effect on this SA objective.
- 4.137 All of the strategic site options are expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 2: housing . This effect is expected given that the proposed garden settlement at each site is expected to provide in excess of 1,000 dwellings making a significant contribution to the 8] g h f] Wh D g ` \ c i g] b [` b d a s k help deliver a range of housing types and would furthermore contribute to meeting the affordable housing need in the District.
- 4.138 The majority of the strategic site options are expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 3: economy and skills . The proposed garden settlements to be delivered at each site are expected to provide small scale employment and job opportunities for residents .
- 4.139 The effect expected in relation to the site by Gamston Airport is however expected to be mixed (minor positive and minor negative). The redevelopment of the airport site is expected to lead to a loss of employment opportunities associated with the current use of the site , although the airport is small -scale and does not have a large number of employment opportunities . However , it is likely that a net gain in terms of employment opportunities will result.
- 4.140 All of the strategic site options are expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion . Each of the proposed garden settlements would provide a new local centre as well as a primary school and GP surgery. It is expected that

this provision of new local centres which include new services and facilities would help to address indicators of deprivation in the District. In addition, a number of the sites are within 800m of existing key services or within 2km of a town centre within the District where more services and facilities are available.

- 4.141 All of the strategic site options are expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 5: health and wellbeing, as each of the proposed garden settlements is to provide new open spaces, greenspaces and a GP surgery. As such the development would be accessible to health facilities, and could encourage increased physical activity among residents. In addition, some of these sites are also within close proximity (800m) to existing sports, recreation and/or healthcare facilities.
- 4.142 However, the significant positive effect identified for three of these sites is expected to be combined with a significant negative effect as part of an overall mixed effect. The sites by Carlton-in-Lindrick, Beckingham and Clarborough are located within areas of accessible countryside, which would be lost due to development. As such opportunities for residents to partake of more physical activity may be adversely affected.
- 4.143 Each of the proposed garden settlements to be provided at the strategic site options is to incorporate new sustainable transport links such as bus services and cycle routes. This approach is likely to help promote modal shift and limit the potential for adverse impacts to the existing road network related to issues such as congestion. As such a minor positive effect is expected in relation to all of the sites considered with regards to SA objective 6: transport. In addition, a number of sites are also within 400m of existing bus services and cycle infrastructure. However, none of the sites are within 1km of a railway station and as such no significant positive effects have been identified.
- 4.144 All of the strategic site options contain portions of greenfield land, the development of which is seen as a less efficient use of land resources in the District. Four of the sites are expected to have a significant negative effect in relation to SA objective 7: land use and soils, as they are located entirely on greenfield land and contain large areas of Grade 3 agricultural land. As the other two sites (Gamston Airport and Former Bevercotes Colliery) comprise areas of both brownfield and greenfield land, an overall mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) has been identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 4.145 Three of the strategic site options (Land East of Carlton-in-Lindrick, Gamston Airport and Former Bevercotes Colliery) lie within Source Protection Zone 3. The delivery of development at these locations may result in the contamination of groundwater sources. As such a significant negative uncertain effect is expected in relation to SA objective 8: water for these sites. A negligible effect is expected for the three remaining sites given that they are not within the boundaries of Source Protection Zones.
- 4.146 All of the strategic site options are expected to have a negligible effect with regards to SA objective 9: flood risk as they are not situated within flood zone 2 or 3. As such it is not expected that new development at these locations would contribute to any increase in flood risk in the District.
- 4.147 While the promotion of modal shift through the provision of sustainable transport links within each garden village is likely to help improve air quality in the District, the proximity of the strategic site options to sustainable transport links has already been considered separately under SA objective 6. There are currently no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) declared within the District. As noted in the SA assumptions set out in Appendix 7, it has not been possible to appraise the potential effect of development on air quality at a site specific level as effects will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. As such, strategic site options have not been assessed against SA objective 10: air quality.
- 4.148 It has also not been possible to appraise the potential effect of development on the level of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change at a site specific level. The effects on this SA objective will depend largely on the design of sites and onsite practices. The promotion of modal shift may also help to limit the level of greenhouse gas emissions from private vehicles and the proximity of the sites to sustainable transport links has been considered separately under SA objective 6. As such, strategic site options have not been assessed against SA objective 11: climate change.

- 4.149 The majority of sites are expected to have negligible effects in relation to SA objective 12: resource use and waste . These four sites are not located within a MSA and therefore are unlikely to adversely affect the extraction of finite mineral resources in the District. However, two of the sites (Gamston Airport and Former Bevercotes Colliery) are expected to have a significant negative effect in relation to resource use as they lie within a MSA. Gamston Airport site lies only partially within the MSA, so a level of uncertainty is attached to the overall effect given that it will be dependent upon the precise layout of the site.
- 4.150 All of the sites (apart from Land East of Clarborough) are expected to have minor negative effects in relation to SA objective 13: cultural heritage . Land East of Clarborough site does not contain or lie adjacent to any designated heritage assets beyond elements of ridge and furrow earthworks and the potential for archaeological deposits at the site is considered to be low, leading to an uncertain negligible effect. The remaining five sites contain local heritage assets or lie within the setting of, or within 500m of, designated heritage assets. Development at these sites therefore has the potential to result in adverse impacts on the settings of those identified heritage assets.
- 4.151 Half of the sites (Land West of Beckingham , Land East of Clarborough and Land north of Darlton) are expected to have significant negative effects in relation to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape . These sites are located within landscape policy zones which have been identified as V Y] b ['] b ' i j Y f m ' [c c X ' Wc b X] h] c b D ' U b e k p m z t i n t h e s e l o c a t i o n s [h a s D ' g Y b g] h] the potential to adversely affect the existing landscape character at these highly sensitive locations.
- 4.152 The remaining sites are expected to have a minor positive effect in relation this SA objective. These sites are located Y X ' k] h \] b ' ' U b X g W U d Y ' d c '] W m ' n c b Y g ' k \] W \ ' U f Y ' f Y W Wc b X] h] c b D ' U b X ' i a c X Y f U h Y D ' g Y b g] h] j] h m "

5 Sustainability Appraisal Findings for Part 1 of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan)

- 5.1 This chapter presents the SA findings for the Draft Plan Consultation Part 1: Strategic Plan (January 2019). Chapter 1 of this report has provided an overview of what the Draft Plan contains. The format of this chapter is divided between presenting the findings for the vision and strategic objectives, strategic policies and thematic policies contained within the Draft Plan.

Use of appraisal matrices

- 5.2 While the assessments for different elements of the Draft Plan have been presented slightly differently, all policies have been assessed against the same SA objectives, using the same criteria, as set out in Chapter 2. Policies relating to the quantum and distribution of growth (Policies 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12) have potential for a number of complex sustainability effects. As such, the appraisal of these options has been presented in full in appraisal matrices in Appendix 6 and the results are summarised in this chapter. For the vision and objectives and the remaining policies, effects are likely to arise in relation to a more limited number of sustainability issues. As such, matrices have not been used and the full assessment is presented in this chapter.

Alternatives

- 5.3 The majority of reasonable alternative options to the policies discussed below were identified in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan (October 2016), and the SA findings for them are presented in Chapter 4 of this SA Report. The alternatives in Chapter 4 are broad policy options considered prior to finalising the proposed policies and as such do not all have a one-to-one relationship with the policies in this chapter. The exception to this is the thematic policies, although the options assessed in Chapter 4 were broader and the policy wording was not worked up in detail at the reasonable alternatives stage. There is a section under each policy appraisal that states whether any reasonable alternatives were identified and where the assessments for these can be found.
- 5.4 When working up the policies in more detail for the Draft Plan Consultation Part 1, the Council recognised that some policies could be approached in different ways (for example, setting out a criteria-based policy or allocating specific sites) that were not identified at the options stage in 2016. Where such differing policy approaches have been identified, they have been recognised in this chapter, along with an explanation of how effects might differ from the preferred approach.

SA findings for Vision and Objectives

Bassetlaw District Vision

- 5.5 The Bassetlaw District Vision as set out in the Part 1 Draft Bassetlaw Plan (Local Plan) is:

By 2035, Bassetlaw District will be a place where rural and urban life prosper from investment and growth; new developments increase opportunities for enhanced health, wellbeing and quality of life; and residents and visitors are able to enjoy a valuable, attractive, diverse and accessible environment.

- 5.6 The potential sustainability effects of the vision are shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 SA scores for the Bassetlaw District Vision

SA Objective	Vision
1. Biodiversity	0
2. Housing	0
3. Economy and skills	+?
4. Regeneration and social inclusion	+?
5. Health and wellbeing	+?
6. Transport	0
7. Land use and soils	0
8. Water	0
9. Flood risk	0
10. Air quality	0
11. Climate change	0
12. Resource use and waste	0
13. Cultural heritage	0
14. Landscape and townscape	0

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.7 The Bassetlaw District Vision is expected to have mainly negligible effects on the SA objectives. However, a minor positive effect is expected on SA objective 3: economy and skills and SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion and SA objective 5: health and wellbeing as the vision identifies that the District will be a place where rural and urban life prosper from investment and growth; new developments increase opportunities for enhanced health, wellbeing and quality of life; and residents and visitors are able to enjoy a valuable, attractive, diverse and accessible environment.
- 5.8 The minor positive effects of the vision are reflective of its high level and aspirational nature. These effects are also subject to some uncertainty since their effects will depend on the details of the individual Local Plan policies.

Mitigation

5.9 Not applicable as only positive effects have been identified.

Assumptions

5.10 None identified.

Alternatives

5.11 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9.

6 U g g Y h` U k Đ g` g h f U h Y [] W` c V ^ Y Wh] j Y g`

5.12 There are ten strategic objectives, as follows:

- 1 Manage the scale and location of development to support a balanced pattern of growth across urban and rural areas.
- 2 Deliver the homes required to meet the needs of Bassetlaw.
- 3 To initiate the delivery of two new garden villages.
- 4 : U W] `] h U h] b [` X Y j Y ` c d a Y b h ` c d d c f h i b] h] Y g ` h \ U h ` k] ` ` ` Y b \ the delivery of new and the expansion of existing enterprises, providing jobs across urban and rural Bassetlaw.
- 5 7 c b g Y f j Y ` h \ Y ` 8] g h f] Wh Đ g ` X] g h] b Wh] j Y ` \.] g h c f] W` V i] ` h ` U
- 6 Promote rural Bassetlaw as a living and working landscape, where new development responds to local needs and opportunities, and protects the intrinsic character of the countryside.
- 7 Ensure the built environment is improved through high quality design and architecture.
- 8 Increase resilience to climate change through improved flood mitigation, better energy and water efficiency, and support for renewable energy production.
- 9 9 b \ U b W Y ` h \ Y ` j] h U `] h m ` U b X ` j] U V] `] h m ` c Z ` 6 U g g Y h ` U k Đ g ` h c
- 10 Promote health and wellbeing by delivering new and enhanced infrastructure which will improve the quality of life in Bassetlaw.

5.13 The potential sustainability effects of the strategic objectives are shown in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2 G 5 ` g W c f Y g ` Z c f ` 6 U g g Y h ` U k Đ g ` g h f U h Y [] W` c V ^ Y Wh] j Y g`

Strategic Objectives SA Objective	S01	S02	S03	S04	S05	S06	S07	S08	S09	S010
Biodiversity	0	-?	-?	0	++	0	0	0	0	++
Housing	+	++	++	0	0	+	+	0	0	0
Economy and skills	0	0	++	++	0	+	0	0	++	++
Regeneration and social inclusion	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	++	++
Health and wellbeing	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	++

Strategic Objectives SA Objective	SO1	SO2	SO3	SO4	SO5	SO6	SO7	SO8	SO9	SO10
Transport	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	++
Land use and soils	0	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+++	0	0	+	0	0
Water	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0
Flood risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0
Air quality	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+
Climate change	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	++	0	+
Resource use and waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cultural heritage	0	0	0	0	++	+	+	0	0	0
Landscape and townscape	+	+/-?	+/-?	0	++	+	++	0	+	+

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.14 No significant negative effects have been identified in relation to any of the strategic objectives of the Local Plan. Most objectives are expected to have negligible effects on most of the SA objectives, as each objective is fairly specific, with a number of minor positive, minor negative or mixed effects considered likely.
- 5.15 A number of significant positive effects are also expected, mostly where the objective seeks to directly address issues which relate to the individual SA objectives. Strategic objectives 5 and 10 are likely to have significant positive effects on SA objective 1: biodiversity as they support the delivery of enhancements to, and conservation of the natural environment including green infrastructure in the District. Strategic objectives 2 and 3 are expected to have significant positive effects on SA objective 2: housing. These strategic objectives seek to address the delivery of housing in the District, including the delivery of two new garden villages in Bassetlaw. Four of the strategic objectives (3, 4, 9 and 10) are expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA objective 3: economy and skills. These objectives seek to encourage and support economic growth in the District including at the two potential new garden villages. They also address investment at town centre locations in the District and access to jobs and services, including the provision of new infrastructure in Bassetlaw.
- 5.16 Strategic objectives 9 and 10 are considered likely to have significant positive effects on SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion given that they seek to enhance the vitality of town centres and access to community facilities. A significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 5: health and wellbeing for strategic objective 10 given that this objective directly seeks to address health and wellbeing in Bassetlaw through the provision of enhanced and improved social and environmental infrastructure. Strategic objective 10 is also likely to have significant positive effects on SA objective 5 given that it is supportive of a pattern of development in the District which is to help enhance health and wellbeing of residents. As strategic objective 10 promotes good access

to public transport, highway improvements and improvements to pedestrian and cycling routes a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: transport .

- 5.17 A significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 7: land use and soils is expected for strategic objective 5, which addresses making the most efficient use of land in Bassetlaw. Strategic objective 8 is likely to have significant positive effects in relation to both SA objective 8: water and SA objective 9: flood risk . This strategic objective aims to increase resilience to climate change through improved flood mitigation and water efficiency. Strategic objective 8 is also expected to have a significant positive effect on SA objective 11: climate change , as it seeks to deliver increased climate change resilience and mitigation in the District.
- 5.18 A significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 13: cultural heritage is expected for strategic objective 5 given that it aims to conserve, and where possible, enhance the 8] g h f] Wh Đ g ' \] g h c f] W' Y b j] f c b a Y b h " ' ' G h f U h Y [] W' c V ^ Y Wh] j Y g ' significant positive effect on SA objective 14: landscape and townscape . These strategic objectives address the conservation of the historic built and natural environments throughout the District and furthermore seek to ensure that the built environment is improved through high quality design and architecture.
- 5.19 A number of mixed effects are considered possible, predominantly in relation to SA objective 7: land use and soils . This is because Local Plan strategic objectives 2, 3 and 4 address the provision of new development in the District to meet requirements over the plan period. This development could be located either on brownfield land which would have positive effects in regards to land use, or on greenfield land, which would have negative effects. The effects are uncertain as the precise location of the new development to be delivered over the plan period is unknown. While strategic objective 3 states that the delivery of the two new garden villages will make use of mostly previously developed land the high level of growth to be supported is likely to require the development of a substantial area of greenfield land.
- 5.20 A similarly mixed effect is likely in relation to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape for strategic objectives 2 and 3. These policies support the delivery of a high level of new growth in the District which could affect landscape character and the existing character of the townscape. The minor negative effect expected for both of these strategic objectives is likely to be combined with minor positive effects given that strategic objective 2 is supportive of development which would minimise impact on local character and strategic objective 3 states that much of the new development should be provided on brownfield land.

Mitigation

- 5.21 Minor negative effects are considered possible for SA objective 1: biodiversity for strategic objectives 2 and 3, which relate to the delivery of new housing in the District. These strategic objectives are very high level and as such do not provide detail in terms of how the delivery of new housing growth over the plan period will reflect the requirement to be considerate of the natural environment and biodiversity in the District. Mitigation of potential effects in relation to these issues is set out through strategic objectives 5 and 10. Policy 19: Biodiversity and Geo diversity is likely to help mitigate the negative effects identified. Further mitigation will be provided through relevant development management policies and / or site specific policies once they are developed, which set out housing allocation in more detail. These policies, along with Policy 17: Landscape and Policy 22: Design, may also set out mitigation in relation to the mixed effects identified for SA objectives 7: land use and soils and 14: landscape and townscape .

Assumptions

- 5.22 Strategic objective 2 has been scored as having mainly negligible effects. This is because the wording of the objective, which relates to housing delivery, is very general and, while it is acknowledged that the delivery of housing could have more significant effects on SA objectives such as flood risk and air quality, these effects will be assessed in more detail when assessing individual policies and residential site allocations. These policies will

provide more detail about where and how much development is to be delivered, and therefore it will be more appropriate to make informed judgements about the potential effects once this detail provided. This is also the case for strategic objective 3. The likely sustainability effects of the delivery of new garden villages in the District will be appraised separately in line with the respective policies and / or allocations.

- 5.23 Many of the SA scores identified are uncertain. This is reflective of the high level and aspirational nature of the strategic objectives. Policies or site allocations that provide more detail will be appraised separately.

Alternatives

- 5.24 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9.

Summary of SA findings for Spatial Strategy and Growth Targets (Policies 1 and 2)

- 5.25 Policy 1 (The Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy) and Policy 2 (Housing and Economic Growth) set out the amount and distribution of growth across the District in terms of both housing and employment. While Policy 1 sets out the five strands of spatial strategy with which new development in the District should accord, Policy 2 sets out the level of growth to be met through each of these individual strands. Together, the policies set out the pattern of development to be achieved in Bassetlaw over the plan period. Considering the relatively high level of development supported through the policies and various sensitivities of the District, a mix of effects is expected in relation to the SA objectives.
- 5.26 A summary of the likely sustainability effects for Policy 1 and Policy 2 has been provided in Table 5.3 and the text below. The detailed appraisal of each policy is presented in the relevant matrices in Appendix 6. These matrices detail mitigation, assumptions and uncertainties in relation to these policies, therefore these have not been repeated here. A summary of the likely effects of these policies is included below.

Table 5.3 Summary of SA findings for strategic policies (Policies 1 and 2)

Strategic policy	The Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy	Housing and Economic Growth
SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	+/--?	+/--?
SA2: Housing	++	++
SA3: Economy and skills	++	++
SA4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion	++	++
SA5: Health and Wellbeing	++/-?	++/-?
SA6: Transport	++/-	+/-
SA7: Land Use and Soils	+/-	+/-

Strategic policy	The Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy	Housing and Economic Growth
SA8: Water	-	-
SA9: Flood Risk	+/-	+/-
SA10: Air Quality	+/-	+/-
SA11: Climate Change	+/-	+/-
SA12: Resource Use and Waste	-	--
SA13: Cultural Heritage	+/-?	+/-?
SA14: Landscape and Townscape	+/-?	+/-?

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.27 The relatively high level of growth to be provided across Rural Bassetlaw as supported by Policy 1 and Policy 2, has the potential to adversely impact upon a high number of biodiversity and geodiversity designations. While this more dispersed approach may allow for development to be distributed in a way that avoids the most sensitive sites, the loss of greenfield land which would result is still expected to result in habitat loss and fragmentation. It is also likely that the level of development supported would result in a significant increase in human activities in the District thereby increasing the potential for habitat disturbance. The District contains many local and national biodiversity and geodiversity sites, including part of the Sherwood Forest ppSPA, which may be adversely impacted by development. As such, a significant negative effect has been recorded in relation to SA objective 1: biodiversity and geodiversity for Policy 1 and Policy 2. Both policies are expected to include incorporation of green infrastructure as part of new development, particularly in terms of the new villages, as these are to follow garden city principles, including generous green space, which is likely to help improve wider habitat connectivity. A deficiency in this provision has been identified in the south east of the District and the strand of the spatial strategy which would support the dispersal of growth at Rural Bassetlaw is likely to help address this deficiency. As such the negative effect is likely to be combined with a minor positive effect.
- 5.28 Policy 1 and Policy 2 would both support relatively high levels of growth of both housing and employment at the larger settlements of Worksop, Retford and Harworth. The specific level of growth to be accommodated across the District has been set at 6,630 homes and 136ha of employment land by Policy 2. This policy also sets the specific level of growth to be delivered at the larger settlements as well as at the locations of the two new Garden Villages and Rural Bassetlaw. This overall level of growth will meet the identified requirement for the District as well as the market need for housing at Worksop and Retford in particular. These locations also benefit from high levels of connectivity to the surrounding South Yorkshire and therefore are expected to be attractive in terms of encouraging inward investment. The larger settlements of Bassetlaw also provide access to a wide range of services and facilities, although distributing some development to more rural areas is expected to support rural service provision. Furthermore, the scale of growth at the two new Garden Villages is expected to deliver new services and facilities to the benefit of the surrounding rural area in the longer term. As such, a significant positive

effect has been identified in relation to SA objective 2: housing , SA objective 3: economy and skills and SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion .

- 5.29 The distribution of development supported over the plan period through Policy 1 and Policy 2 is expected to help ensure that a majority of new residents would have access to healthcare facilities in the District. In addition, the relatively high level of growth provided for through these policies would help to support the delivery of new services and facilities over the plan period. This is of particular relevance at the two new Garden Villages , where the scale of growth (1,000 new homes distributed between both locations) is expected to support the incorporation of new services and facilities , including those which would benefit public health in Bassetlaw in the long term. While distributing up to 1,777 new homes to Rural Bassetlaw is expected to support existing rural service provision, and would provide new residents with access to the countryside, it is also expected that these residents would have a reduced level of access to healthcare provisions compared to residents in the larger settlements. This level of growth may also result in increased levels of pressure on existing services and facilities considering that critical mass may not be delivered at all rural locations to support new service provision. An overall mixed significant positive and minor negative effect is therefore expected in relation to SA objective 5: health and wellbeing for both policies.
- 5.30 The more limited range of service provision, in combination with the reduced nature of sustainable transport links at Rural Bassetlaw, is expected to result in a minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 6: transport for both policies. This negative effect is expected to be combined with a positive effect for both policies. This reflects the significant proportion of overall growth that is to be provided at the larger settlements, where a wider range of services and facilities and accessible and sustainable transport links (including rail services at Worksop and Retford) are strongest. The positive effect expected for Policy 1 is likely to be significant. This policy supports growth at Worksop, Retford and Harworth, allowing for town centre focused investment and regeneration at Harworth in particular. The accessibility of these areas to a high number of people (especially by sustainable modes of transport) is expected to help reduce the need to travel in the District. Furthermore the two new Garden Villages are expected to incorporate new services and facilities and will act as focal points for the wider rural area through infrastructure improvements . This strand of the spatial strategy is therefore expected to help minimise the need to travel to services and facilities at the larger settlements for residents in the adjoining areas. It is however noted that new residents at the Garden Villages may still be required to travel to access the wider range of services and facilities at larger settlements.
- 5.31 The negative effects identified for both policies in relation to SA objective 7: land use and soils , SA objective 8: water and SA objective 9: flood risk reflect the portion of growth that would be provided at greenfield land, notably at rural locations. It is expected that increases in impermeable surfaces in the District, as a result of development, could result in increases to the level of pollutants carried into water courses by surface water run-off. Larger settlements are more likely to provide opportunities for the re-use of brownfield, which may take in brownfield land at the former Harworth Colliery site to the south of Harworth. There may be opportunities for the re-use of brownfield at the new Garden Villages which are to be located at the Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery sites. A minor positive effect is therefore expected in combination with the minor negative effect previously described in relation to SA objective 8 and SA objective 9. Furthermore, much of the development set out through Policy 1 and Policy 2 would be provided in areas of low flood risk. It is also likely that the relatively dispersed approach to growth within Rural Bassetlaw may allow of the Council to select development sites at locations which would not increase the level of flood risk in the District.
- 5.32 It is likely that reducing the need to travel longer distances in the District will help to minimise increases in the release of air pollutants and the contribution the District makes in terms of climate change. The spatial distribution of development supported by both policies is expected to help promote modal shift where new development is to be delivered at the larger settlements as they provide the widest range of services and facilities, as well

as sustainable transport links. Allowing for growth at these settlements may allow for the incorporation of District heating schemes. However, this approach may also result in an adverse impact in relation to existing air quality and congestion pressures at Worksop and Retford in particular. Both policies would also support the delivery of a significant proportion of growth over the plan period at Rural Bassetlaw thereby reducing the potential for new residents to make use of more sustainable modes of transport in the District. As such a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect is expected in relation to SA objective 10: air quality and SA objective 11: climate change.

- 5.33 The relatively high level of growth over the plan period is likely to result in a high level of natural resource use. Both policies propose development in Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs), which could result in the sterilisation of finite mineral resources. However, only Policy 2 sets out the specific level of growth to be accommodated across the entirety of the District as well as at each individual location. Therefore the negative effect identified in relation to SA objective 12: resource use and waste is expected to be significant for Policy 2 and minor for Policy 1.
- 5.34 Dispersing a proportion of new growth across Rural Bassetlaw may help to avoid the most significant adverse effects on particularly sensitive heritage assets and landscapes considering the wide range of sites which could come forward for development. It is however likely that development across Rural Bassetlaw would result in the development of large areas of greenfield land, which may result in adverse impacts on the established character of Bassetlaw. Strands of the spatial strategy that would support growth at the larger settlements of Worksop and Retford in particular, are likely to present opportunities for enhancement of the urban interface with the countryside. Furthermore, development at larger settlements may allow for the development of brownfield land to the benefit of local character and the wider townscape. To the south of Harworth this may include the redevelopment of brownfield land at the former Harworth Colliery site. Development at the new Garden Villages at the Gamston Airport and former Bevercotes Colliery sites are expected to provide opportunities for the redevelopment of large areas of brownfield land. These elements of redevelopment are likely to benefit local character as well the relationships between each respective site and the surrounding landscapes. As such, a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect has been identified in relation to SA objective 13: cultural heritage and SA objective 14: landscape and townscape for both policies.

Alternatives

- 5.35 Alternatives to Policy 1 are discussed and assessment results for these are presented in Chapter 4 and Appendix 4.
- 5.36 ~~H \< 'cl i g] b [' 8] g h f] V i h section 10 Chapter 4 D~~ Presents the assessment of different levels of growth for each of the strands of the spatial strategy. These options are relevant to both Policy 1 and Policy 2.
- 5.37 Alternatives to the housing and employment targets in Policy 2 are explained and assessment results for these presented in Chapter 4 and Appendix 4.
- 5.38 The reasonable alternative to the distribution of economic development set out in Policy 2 is to set an overall target for the District and have a criteria-based approach to the sites. This would allow the market to deliver growth in locations that are accessible to the existing population. This approach would allow for the concentration of economic regeneration in areas where traditional industries have declined, and may limit this type of growth in the larger settlements of Bassetlaw. The specific effects of this alternative in relation to the SA objectives are largely uncertain and with some likely similarities to the preferred policy options, considering that a relatively high level of growth would still be supported, particularly at larger settlements. It is not possible to assess effects in more detail as these will be dependent upon the precise locations at which development would be supported and the criteria used to assess site suitability. However, this market-led approach would reduce the ability of the Council to plan comprehensively for growth, which could lead to further negative effects on SA objectives 6, 10 and 11, as employment sites

may not be delivered in locations accessible by sustainable modes of transport and may result in changes to commuting patterns.

SA Findings for Strategic Policies 3 to 7

5.39 The potential sustainability effects of Policies 3 to 7 are set out in Table 5.4 below.

Table 5.4 Summary of SA findings for Policies 3 to 7

SA Objective	Policy 3	Policy 4	Policy 5	Policy 6	Policy 7
1. Biodiversity	0	0	0	0	0
2. Housing	++	++	++	++	++
3. Economy and skills	0	+	0	0	0
4. Regeneration and social inclusion	+	+	0	+	+
5. Health and wellbeing	0	0	0	++	+
6. Transport	0	0	0	-	-
7. Land use and soils	0	0	0	0	0
8. Water	0	0	0	0	0
9. Flood risk	0	0	0	0	0
10. Air quality	0	0	0	-	-
11. Climate change	0	0	0	-	-
12. Resource use and waste	0	0	0	0	0
13. Cultural heritage	0	0	0	0	0
14. Landscape and townscape	0	0	0	0	0

Policy 3: Affordable housing

Likely sustainability effects

5.40 Given its narrow focus, Policy 3 is expected to have mainly negligible effects on the SA objectives.

5.41 The policy is however expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 2: housing as it specifically seeks to address the issue of affordable housing provision in Bassetlaw. The policy sets out that sites providing for more than five homes in rural areas and ten homes in other areas of the District should include at least 10% of homes to be delivered as affordable homes unless specific site viability issues are identified. This approach has been set out to help meet the affordable housing need in the District in line with the findings of the SHMA. The policy is reflective of viability findings for housing in the District and as such the requirements of the policy are not expected to be overly onerous as to adversely impact the rate of housing delivery in the plan area.

- 5.42 A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion . The provision of affordable housing as supported by this policy is expected to address this indicator of deprivation in the District.

Mitigation

- 5.43 Not applicable as only positive effects have been identified.

Assumptions

- 5.44 It is assumed that the overall rate of deliverability of new housing in the District will not be affected by the requirement of this policy considering the viability assessment work which has supported its drafting.

Uncertainties

- 5.45 None identified.

Alternatives

- 5.46 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9 .

Policy 4: Housing mix

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.47 Policy 4 is expected to have mostly negligible effects in relation to the SA objectives given its narrow focus. As the policy requires that new housing developments respond to the needs of the area of the District in which they would be provided in terms of delivering an appropriate mix of housing tenures, types and sizes, a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 2: housing .

- 5.48 As the supporting text of the policy sets out, economic growth can often be influenced by the range and quality of homes on offer in an area due to the relationship between this type of provision and local investment decisions. A minor positive effect is therefore expected in relation to SA objective 3: economy and skills . A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion . The provision of an appropriate mix of new homes in line with requirements for District is expected to address specific elements of deprivation which might otherwise emerge in Bassetlaw.

Mitigation

- 5.49 Not applicable as only positive effects have been identified.

Assumptions

- 5.50 None identified.

Uncertainties

- 5.51 None identified.

Alternatives

- 5.52 The reasonable alternative option for Policy 4 would be to provide a more prescriptive policy requirement that sets out the type, size and tenure of housing. This policy may result in a reduction in the rate of housing delivery over the plan period. However, this would not affect the assessment above or the scoring presented in Table 5.4.

Policy 5: Self and Custom Build Housing

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.53 Policy 5 has a particularly narrow focus and therefore is expected to have negligible effects in relation to the majority of the SA objectives. The policy sets out that the delivery of self-build and custom-build plots will be supported as part of larger developments and where need is identified as part of the development of Neighbourhood Plans. Proposals which would include 100% self-build or custom-build development are to be supported

where that development would accord with the spatial strategy. The policy is expected to help better address the specific requirements of the local population in terms of housing provision and therefore a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 2: housing .

Mitigation

5.54 Not applicable as only positive effects have been identified.

Assumptions

5.55 None identified.

Uncertainties

5.56 None identified.

Alternatives

5.57 The reasonable alternative option for Policy 5 would be to provide a more prescriptive policy requirement. This may help to deliver more self-build plots, but these may be in areas where there is no demand, and therefore self and custom builds may not be a suitable in that area. However, this would not affect the assessment above or the scoring presented in Table 5.4.

Policy 6: Specialist Housing

Likely sustainability effects

5.58 Considering its narrow focus Policy 6 is expected to have mainly negligible effects on the SA objectives. The policy is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 2: housing given that it specifically seeks to address the issue of specialist housing in Bassetlaw. The policy sets out that at major development sites a minimum of 45% of dwellings must be accessible (in line with the requirements of M4(2) of the Building Regulations) in terms of meeting the needs of different types of occupants and the potential changing needs of occupants over time. Furthermore a minimum of 10% of homes at such sites must be wheelchair accessible. This approach has been set out to help meet the specialist housing need in the District in line with the findings of the latest SHMA.

5.59 A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion . The provision of specialist homes (including specialist residential retirement schemes, extra care housing and accessible housing) as supported by this policy is expected to accommodate the growing ageing population of the District. The policy also sets out that specialist retirement housing should have good access to services and facilities.

5.60 As the policy requires that amenity space is provided at specialist retirement housing it is expected residents might be encouraged to partake in physical activity. The policy also specifically seeks to address the needs of an ageing population. Therefore a significant positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 5: health and wellbeing .

5.61 A minor negative effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 6: transport . This negative effect is expected given that the policy supports the appropriate provision of parking on-site, which may encourage the residents to undertake journeys by private car. This may furthermore reduce the potential for modal shift resulting in increases in road traffic, congestion and release of greenhouse gases and airborne pollutants. Minor negative effects have also been recorded in relation to SA objective 10: air quality and 11: climate change .

Mitigation

5.62 Mitigation of the negative effects identified might be achieved through the requirement for developments to contribute to sustainable transport links within the area. This would allow residents to undertake journeys by modes of transport which contribute to modal shift in Bassetlaw. In particular, Policy 24: Strategic Infrastructure requires new developments to

contribute to new transport improvements, including public transport and provision for cyclists and pedestrians.

Assumptions

- 5.63 It is assumed that the overall rate of deliverability of new housing in the District will not be affected by the requirement of this policy considering that it responds to the findings of the SHMA.

Uncertainties

- 5.64 None identified.

Alternatives

- 5.65 The reasonable alternative considered for Policy 6 would be to allocate land for specialist housing. The effects of this alternative on the SA objectives are largely uncertain, given that they will be dependent upon the precise location of the new sites to be allocated. If land was allocated it may remain vacant as there is no known demand from the development industry or specialist providers at this time.

Policy 7: Residential Care Homes

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.66 Policy 7 is also quite narrow in its focus and is therefore expected to have mainly negligible effects on the SA objectives. The policy is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 2: housing given that it specifically seeks to address the issue of residential care homes in Bassetlaw. The policy sets out that on major development sites consideration should be given to residential care home provision. This is expected to help meet the requirement for 819 units to be completed by 2035. The policy approach has been set out to help meet the residential care home need in the District in line with the findings of the latest SHMA.
- 5.67 A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion. The provision of residential care homes as supported by this policy is expected to help accommodate the growing ageing population of the District. The policy furthermore requires that development of this type provides a good access to services and facilities.
- 5.68 A minor negative effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: transport. This negative effect is expected given that the policy supports the appropriate provision of parking on-site, which may encourage the number of journeys made to and from residential care home sites to be by car, thereby increasing road traffic and congestion. This is likely to increase the contribution journeys to and from the site make in terms of release of greenhouse gases and airborne pollutants. Minor negative effects have therefore also been recorded in relation to SA objective 10: air quality and 11: climate change.

Mitigation

- 5.69 Mitigation of the negative effects identified could be achieved through the requirement for developments to contribute to sustainable transport links within the area. This would allow residents to undertake journeys by modes of transport which contribute to modal shift and help to minimise carbon emissions and air pollution in Bassetlaw. In particular, Policy 24: Strategic Infrastructure requires new developments to contribute to new transport improvements, including public transport and provision for cyclists and pedestrians.

Assumptions

- 5.70 It is assumed that the overall rate of deliverability of new housing in the District will not be affected by the requirement of this policy considering that it responds to the findings of the SHMA.

Uncertainties

- 5.71 None identified.

Alternatives

- 5.72 The reasonable alternative to Policy 7 is to allocate land for residential care homes in the District. The specific effects of this alternative on the SA objectives are largely unknown, given that they will be dependent upon the location of land which is to be allocated. If land was to be allocated it may remain vacant given that there is no known demand from the development industry or specialist providers for this type of development at this time.

Summary of SA findings for Strategic Spatial Policies (Policies 8 to 12)

- 5.73 Table 5.5 provides a summary of SA findings identified for the strategic spatial policies 8 to 12. The detailed matrices for each of the strategic spatial policies are presented in Appendix 6. These matrices describe mitigation, assumptions and uncertainties in relation to these policies, therefore these have not been repeated here. An overall summary of the likely effects of these policies is provided below. The summary of findings for the strategic policies is presented by SA objective below the table.
- 5.74 The strategic spatial policies are expected to have a range of effects in relation to the SA objectives. Significant positive effects have been identified in relation to SA objective 2: housing and SA objective 3: economy and skills, given that each policy sets out a level of housing to be delivered and is supportive of the delivery of employment land in the area to which the policy relates. Positive effects, including a number of significant positive effects, have been identified in relation to SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion for the strategic policies, as development at each location is to be guided by policy requirements, which include the delivery of various forms of social infrastructure.
- 5.75 Many of the areas covered by the strategic policies are in close proximity to potentially sensitive features in the District including biodiversity sites, areas of flood risk, Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs), heritage assets and Landscape Character Areas of varying sensitivities. The spatial context of these areas has been considered in combination with the requirements of each strategic policy which are expected to help mitigate any adverse effects and may potentially result in enhancements. As such a mix of effects has been identified in relation to the remaining SA objectives.

Table 5.5 Summary of SA findings for strategic policies

Strategic policy SA objective	Policy 8: Rural Bassetlaw	Policy 9: Workshop	Policy 10: Retford	Policy 11: Harworth and Bircotes	Policy 12: New Garden Villages
SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	+/--	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
SA2: Housing	++	++	++	++	++
SA3: Economy and skills	++	++	++	++	++
SA4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion	+	++	++	++	++
SA5: Health and Wellbeing	?	++/-	++/-	+	++

Strategic policy SA objective	Policy 8: Rural Bassetlaw	Policy 9: Worksop	Policy 10: Retford	Policy 11: Harworth and Bircotes	Policy 12: New Garden Villages
SA6: Transport	+/-	+	+	+	+
SA7: Land Use and Soils	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-
SA8: Water	+/-	-	-?	-	+/-
SA9: Flood Risk	+	0	+/-	0	+
SA10: Air Quality	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
SA11: Climate Change	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	++ /-
SA12: Resource Use and Waste	-?	-?	-?	-?	--?
SA13: Cultural Heritage	+?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?
SA14: Landscape and Townscape	+	+/-	+/-	++	+/-

SA objective 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- 5.76 All the strategic spatial policies are expected to result in a mixed positive and negative effect. The mixed effect is expected given that many of the spatial policy areas are within close proximity of a number of local, national and/or international biodiversity designations, to which development may result in adverse impacts in terms of habitat connectivity and species disturbance. The negative effect in relation to the strategic policy for Rural Bassetlaw is expected to be significant. As well as being in close proximity to a number of national and local nature conservation sites, the land covered by this policy is also in close proximity to the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Each policy sets out guidance regarding the introduction, enhancement and conservation of green infrastructure and open green spaces, which play a role in supporting the District's U V] h U h g ' U b X ' g d Y W] Y g ž ' f Y g i combined minor positive effect.

SA objective 2: Housing

- 5.77 All of the strategic spatial policies are expected to have significant positive effects in relation to housing. Each policy sets out housing targets for the spatial areas, which reflect the timescale of the local plan and will help to meet the overall housing need for the District.

SA objective 3: Economy and Skills

- 5.78 All of the strategic spatial policies are expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to this SA objective. This effect is expected given that each policy sets out employment land targets for each location and sets requirements that developers should meet in terms of infrastructure delivery. In addition, the policies are supportive of the introduction of economic development that would be well connected and provide high skill level employment, training and apprenticeship opportunities for local residents.

SA objective 4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion

- 5.79 The majority of the strategic spatial policies are expected to lead to a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 4. This effect is expected given that the policies set out criteria for the enhancement of existing key services as well as the introduction of new facilities at each location. In addition, the strategic spatial policies set out requirements for improved levels of access to local/town centres, where services and facilities are likely to be concentrated.
- 5.80 The strategic policy for Rural Bassetlaw is expected to have only a minor positive effect given that it encourages the retention and enhancement of existing services. The policy is, however, not directly supportive of the introduction of specific new services and facilities across rural Bassetlaw and does not require improved access to town centre locations.

SA objective 5: Health and Wellbeing

- 5.81 Four of the five strategic spatial policies are expected to have a positive effect (either alone or mixed) in relation to SA objective 5. The strategic policies for Retford and Worksop are expected to have a mixed overall effect (significant positive/minor negative) in relation to this SA objective. These locations provide access to a wide range of existing healthcare facilities and other facilities, which might encourage residents to partake of more active lifestyles. Furthermore the policies state that development must promote healthy lifestyles and encourage sustainable transport modes such as walking and cycling and set out that new development is to improve surrounding green spaces. However, both Retford and Worksop are surrounded by accessible countryside, which could be lost as a result of the development supported by either policy.
- 5.82 The strategic policy for New Garden Villages is expected to result in a significant positive effect alone in relation to this SA objective. This effect is likely given that the policy sets out the expectation that the new garden settlements will provide recreational spaces including parks, sports pitches, playing fields and allotments as well as healthcare facilities.
- 5.83 While the strategic policy for Harworth and Bircotes also seeks to promote healthy lifestyles and would support the delivery of development by settlements which provide access to a number of sports and recreational facilities, this area does not currently have good access to hospital facilities. Furthermore the policy does not require that the development supports the delivery of new healthcare facilities or open space which might otherwise support health improvements in the area. As such the positive effect expected for this policy in relation to SA objective 5 is likely to be minor.

SA objective 6: Transport

- 5.84 Four of the five strategic spatial policies are expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to transport. These policies set out that development must improve the accessibility and suitability of sustainable transport links across the development and wider area.
- 5.85 The policy for Rural Bassetlaw, however, is expected to have an overall mixed minor positive and minor negative effect in relation to this SA objective. This policy encourages the improvement of access to sustainable modes of transport where economic development proposals are to come forward. Furthermore it is expected that the support the policy provides in relation to the retention of rural services is likely to help reduce the need to travel for those at rural locations. However, it is also expected that the provision of development at more rural locations will have the general effect of resulting in a greater number of journeys by private car in Bassetlaw.

SA objective 7: Land Use and Soils

- 5.86 It is expected that three of the five strategic spatial policies will have an overall mixed minor positive and negative effect in relation to SA objective 7. The strategic policies for the New Garden Villages, Harworth and Bircotes and Rural Bassetlaw are expected to result in development at locations which are mostly greenfield land. These policies, however, state that opportunities for the redevelopment of brownfield are to be promoted.

Furthermore, the strategic policy for Harworth and Bircotes specifically supports the redevelopment of the former Harworth Colliery site.

- 5.87 The strategic policies for Retford and Worksop are expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 7. The policies support the maximisation of housing densities on brownfield land in particular. It is expected that this approach is likely to help minimise the need for the development of greenfield land in the District.

SA objective 8: Water

- 5.88 The majority of the strategic policies are expected to have a minor negative effect in relation to this SA objective given that each location addressed by the strategic policies is within a Source Protection Zone. While development is likely to be directed to areas outside of the Source Protection Zones of the District, the strategic spatial policies may support a level of development in and around Source Protection Zones, potentially resulting in adverse effects in terms of groundwater sources in the District.
- 5.89 An overall mixed positive and negative effect is expected in relation to the strategic policies for New Garden Villages and Rural Bassetlaw. While the locations in which these policies support development are within Source Protection Zones, both policies seek to support the incorporation of measures which will improve the management of surface water run-off and address issues relating to water quality.

SA objective 9: Flood Risk

- 5.90 A minor positive effect in relation to flood risk is expected in relation to three of the five strategic spatial policies. This effect is expected considering that these policies would require measures which could potentially reduce the flood risk in the area. These measures include the requirement for a Strategic Drainage Study and SuDS at new developments. The minor positive effect expected in relation to SA objective 9 for the strategic policy for Retford is expected to be combined with a minor negative effect. While this strategic policy requires that measures are introduced to alleviate flood risk at new development, the town centre is located within flood zone 3.
- 5.91 A negligible effect has been identified for this SA objective in relation to the strategic policies for the areas of Harworth and Bircotes and Worksop. These locations lie mostly outside of the zones of higher flood risk. In addition these strategic policies promote brownfield development which is unlikely to increase the potential flooding in the District.

SA objective 10: Air Quality

- 5.92 All of the strategic spatial policies are expected to have an overall mixed minor positive and negative effect in relation to SA objective 10. This effect is likely due to increased traffic associated with construction of development at each location and an increase in journeys by private car in the long term. It is expected that the increased number of private cars would contribute to an increase in the emission of air pollutants. All strategic spatial policies, however, also encourage improvements relating to connectivity and accessibility through sustainable transport which will help to promote modal shift in Bassetlaw.

SA objective 11: Climate Change

- 5.93 All the strategic spatial policies are expected to have a mixed positive and negative effect in relation to SA objective 11. The minor positive effect expected as part of the overall mixed effect is likely given that the strategic spatial policies require that developments should incorporate elements of high quality design which are resilient to climate change. This is to include measures such as flood management and insulation. It is likely however that the development supported by these strategic spatial policies would lead to increases in greenhouse gas emissions as a result of increased numbers of journeys by private vehicle, due to an increased number of residents.
- 5.94 The strategic policy for the New Garden Villages is expected to have a mixed significant positive and minor negative effect in relation to this SA objective. Development at the garden villages is to receive a proportion of heat and electricity required from renewable

and low carbon sources. Furthermore, the policy sets out that the approach to design and layout is to ensure that energy and water consumption are minimised and that the potential for flooding and overheating (increased temperatures associated with climate change) are mitigated. However, despite the policy setting out a requirement for delivering development in a manner which would reduce the need to travel by private vehicle at the new garden villages (i.e. by incorporating new services and facilities), residents are still likely to be required to travel longer distances on a more regular basis to access the wide range of provisions at nearby larger settlements.

SA objective 12: Resource Use and Waste

- 5.95 Only the strategic policy for the New Garden Villages is expected to have a significant negative effect in relation to SA objective 12 given that the site is within a MSA. As such development at this location may result in sterilisation or loss of access to finite mineral resources in the District.
- 5.96 Minor negative effects have been identified in relation to the strategic policies for Rural Bassetlaw, Retford, Worksop and Harworth and Bircotes given that the new development supported at each location has the potential to adversely affect MSAs in the surrounding areas. Uncertainty is attached to the negative effect identified given that effects on the mineral resource present will be dependent on the exact location of development.

SA objective 13: Cultural Heritage

- 5.97 Four of the five strategic spatial policies (Harworth and Bircotes, Rural Bassetlaw, Retford and Worksop) are expected to have a mixed minor positive and minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 13. These policies require that developments must protect local visual amenity and conserve and enhance local heritage. The policy wording is expected to help ensure the safeguarding and enhancement of heritage assets in the District. These locations however either contain or are located in close proximity to a high number of potentially sensitive heritage assets. As such the minor positive effect is likely to be combined with a minor negative effect given that the new development supported has the potential to affect the significance of these heritage assets or that of their settings.
- 5.98 The strategic policy for Rural Bassetlaw is expected to have a minor positive uncertain effect in relation to this SA objective. The majority of the heritage assets in the District are concentrated within the more developed locations. As such, supporting development at rural locations could potentially avoid the most adverse impacts on the historic environment in Bassetlaw. Furthermore the policy states that development sites should conserve and enhance local heritage. All effects identified in relation to the historic environment are uncertain as they will depend on the specific design of new development that comes forward.

SA objective 14: Landscape and Townscape

- 5.99 A mixed effect is expected for three of the five strategic spatial policies. The policy text requires that local character is protected and seeks to ensure the enhancement of town WY b h f Y g D j j h U h m U b t e d t h a t t h i s a p p r o a c h w i l l h e l p t o i m p r o v e d Y landscape and townscape in the District. However, the scale of the development proposed at the New Garden Villages, Retford and Worksop, along with the lack of certainty in terms of the precise location of this new development means that adverse impacts could occur. As such a minor negative effect is expected in combination with the minor positive effect for these three strategic spatial policies.
- 5.100 Only the strategic policy for Harworth and Bircotes is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to this SA objective. This effect is expected given that the policy sets out guidance to ensure that new development will enhance and conserve local character. Furthermore the redevelopment of the former colliery site is expected to positively enhance the area in terms of the visual impact of this currently disused site.
- 5.101 The strategic policy for Rural Bassetlaw is expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to this SA objective. This policy requires that the scale of development is in keeping with the form of the existing settlement and will not adversely harm its character

and appearance. Furthermore the policy sets out a requirement that new development should be considerate of the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside and farmland.

Reasonable Alternative Options

- 5.102 Housing delivery by Village Section in Chapter 4 presents the assessment of different levels of growth for each of the strands of the spatial strategy. These options are relevant to all strategic spatial policies.
- 5.103 Additional alternative approaches were identified with regards to Policy 8, as set out below.

Alternative: Make the housing requirement 5% and the cap 10%

- 5.104 A lower growth target will reduce the requirement to 5% and would deliver fewer new homes than the current Core Strategy policy approach (880 over 17 years, equating to 52 dwellings per annum). This is unlikely to provide the critical mass necessary to support local services and would therefore have similar effects to alternative 1b (Rural Bassetlaw: Deliver fewer homes) presented in Chapter 4. In particular, negative effects would be expected for SA objectives 3: economy and skills, 4: regeneration and social inclusion and 5: health and wellbeing.

Alternative: Make 20% the target rather than the cap and keep the cap 20%

- 5.105 A higher growth option would deliver 3,281 dwellings if all settlements met the 20% cap and would result in disproportionate growth across the District. This option would have similar effects to alternative 1c (Rural Bassetlaw: Deliver more homes) presented in Chapter 4. The greater scale of development under this option would likely lead to greater land take and urbanisation in rural areas, resulting in negative effects on many of the environmental objectives.

SA findings for Thematic Policies (Policies 13 to 24)

- 5.106 Mostly negligible and positive effects are expected in relation to the SA objectives for the thematic policies given their narrow focus on particular themes (e.g. energy efficiency, flood risk) and the nature of the policies which is to provide safeguarding principles and guide development in the District. Similarly to the effects identified for the vision and strategic objectives the most significant positive effects have been identified where the policy text directly seeks to address topics which are covered by a given SA objective.
- 5.107 The thematic policies are not expected to have negative effects in relation to the SA objectives for the most part. Notable exceptions to this are the thematic policies which seek to address energy efficiency (Policy 13), the historic environment (Policy 21), community services and facilities (Policy 23), biodiversity and geodiversity (Policy 19) and landscape (Policy 17). A minor negative effect has been recorded for these policies in relation to SA objective 2: housing. The requirements set out in these policies may result in viability issues emerging with regards the delivery of certain housing schemes in the District or may result in certain parts of the District being identified as unsuitable for the delivery of new homes. The negative effects identified are uncertain dependent upon how these policies are implemented.
- 5.108 The potential sustainability effects of Policies 13 to 24 are set out in Table 5.6 below.

Table 5.6 Summary of SA findings for Policies 13 to 24

SA Objective	Policy 13	Policy 14	Policy 15	Policy 16	Policy 17	Policy 18	Policy 19	Policy 20	Policy 21	Policy 22	Policy 23	Policy 24
1. Biodiversity	0	+?	+	+	0	++	++	+	0	0	0	++
2. Housing	?	0	0	0	-?	0	-?	0	-?	+	-?	0
3. Economy and skills	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	++
4. Regeneration and social inclusion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++?	++
5. Health and wellbeing	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	++	0	+	++	++
6. Transport	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	++
7. Land use and soils	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
8. Water	0	0	+?	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Flood risk	0	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+
10. Air quality	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	+	+
11. Climate change	++	++	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	+
12. Resource use and waste	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
13. Cultural heritage	0	+?	0	0	+	0	0	0	++?	+	0	0
14. Landscape and townscape	0	+?	+	0	++	+	+	+	+	++	0	+

Policy 13: Energy Efficiency

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.109 Policy 13 is expected to have negligible effects on the majority of the SA objectives. However, significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 11: climate change and SA objective 12: resource use and waste. This is because the policy directs seeks to address these issues, as it seeks to promote energy efficiency and reduce CO₂ emissions. The policy also promotes the use of sustainably sourced materials and the minimisation of waste in the District.
- 5.110 A minor positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 7: land use and soils as the supporting text of the policy highlights that the efficient use of natural resources is to be achieved partly through the re-use of brownfield land.
- 5.111 It is unknown whether the policy will affect viability of housing provision; therefore an uncertain effect has been recorded in relation to SA objective 2: housing.

Mitigation

- 5.112 Site specific housing allocations and policies to support development at these sites should consider what energy efficiency measures are achievable at a given location.

Assumptions

- 5.113 None identified.

Uncertainties

- 5.114 While it is envisaged that new developments in the District can be achieved with consideration for a more sustainable approach to construction, it is unknown whether the policy will affect viability of housing provision. As such the effect of the policy on the rate of housing delivery in the District is uncertain.

Alternatives

- 5.115 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9.

Policy 14: Renewable and low carbon energy

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.116 Policy 14 will have mainly negligible effects on the SA objectives. A minor positive effect is considered likely in relation to SA objective 6: transport as the policy will, through provision of electric charging points, support and facilitate more sustainable transport in the District. This will also have positive effects on SA objective 10: air quality given that this policy will help to reduce dependency on vehicles which are powered by fossil fuels. The policy is likely to have significant positive effects on SA objective 11: climate change as it supports low carbon and renewable energy schemes, and electric vehicle charging points, which will help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Bassetlaw.
- 5.117 The policy text and supporting text state that planning decisions as well as the decommissioning of infrastructure of this type and associated site restoration should be considerate of the potential impacts on key views and vistas, heritage assets and other environmental assets. As such minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 1: biodiversity, SA objective 13: cultural heritage and SA objective 14: landscape and townscape.

Mitigation

- 5.118 Not applicable as only positive effects have been identified.

Assumptions

- 5.119 None identified.

Uncertainties

- 5.120 The policy and supporting text requires that planning decisions and subsequent decommissioning and site restoration processes are considerate of key views and vistas, heritage assets and other environmental assets. The mitigation of all potential adverse effect relating to these issues will

partly be dependent upon how much weight this requirement of the policy is given as part of decision making process. Effects on SA objective 1: biodiversity , SA objective 13: cultural heritage and SA objective 14: landscape and townscape will also be dependent upon the precise location and design of new schemes which come forward. Uncertainty is therefore attached to the minor positive effects recorded for these SA objectives.

Alternatives

5.121 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9 .

Policy 15: Flood risk

Likely sustainability effects

5.122 A mixture of mostly minor positive and negligible effects is expected in relation to Policy 15. The policy is expected to have a significant positive effect on SA objective 9: flood risk as it requires that certain developments are supported by a Flood Risk Assessment, which must demonstrate that development will be safe and will not increase flood risk on site or elsewhere, and where possible will reduce flood risk overall, maximising opportunities for flood mitigation schemes. The policy also supports the safeguarding of land required to manage flood risk, as well as the incorporation of SuDS.

5.123 The policy is likely to have minor positive effects on SA objective 1: biodiversity , SA objective 5: health and wellbeing , SA objective 8: water, SA objective 10: air quality and SA objective 11: climate change . These effects are expected given that the policy supports the creation of green infrastructure, which may be used to the benefit of habitat provision and encouraging healthier lifestyle choices in the District. The provision of green infrastructure is also likely to benefit the wellbeing of residents, both in terms of providing opportunities for recreation and improving mental wellbeing by creating a more attractive environment. The policy also helps to reduce the risk of adverse health impacts associated with flooding and poor air quality. Green infrastructure also has the potential to mitigate impacts of climate change and air pollution as vegetation absorbs carbon dioxide and air pollutants. A positive effect is also likely in relation to SA objective 8: water as SuDS may help to improve water quality.

5.124 The support the policy provides in relation to the incorporation of green infrastructure means that further minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape . Green infrastructure is expected to benefit landscape character and general visual amenity of the District.

Mitigation

5.125 Not applicable as only positive effects have been identified.

Assumptions

5.126 None identified.

Uncertainties

5.127 The minor positive effect expected in relation to SA objective 8: water is uncertain as the potential impact on water quality and resources will be dependent on the type and design of SuDS that are incorporated at new developments.

Alternatives

5.128 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9 .

Policy 16: Water quality and efficiency

Likely sustainability effects

5.129 Policy 16 is likely to have a significant positive effect on SA objective 8: water . The significant positive effect in relation to water quality and resources is expected because the policy directly addresses this objective, requiring that water efficiency is maximised and water quality is maintained at new developments. A minor positive effect on SA objective 1: biodiversity is also

expected, as the policy requires that new development is not permitted where drainage of surface water could adversely affect areas important for biodiversity.

Mitigation

5.130 Not applicable as only positive effects have been identified.

Assumptions

5.131 None identified.

Uncertainties

5.132 None identified.

Alternatives

5.133 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9.

Policy 17: Landscape Character

Likely sustainability effects

5.134 The policy is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 12: landscape and townscape given that it directly seeks to protect the District from unacceptable impact on landscape character, visual amenity and sensitivity. The policy addresses the conservation of local landscape character by responding to recommendations set out in the relevant Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone, including appropriate mitigation measures.

5.135 The protection of landscape character and visual amenity would be to the benefit of the established character in the District. As such it is expected that the policy would also help to protect the setting of heritage assets in Bassetlaw. A minor positive effect is therefore expected in relation to SA objective 13: cultural heritage.

5.136 A minor negative effect is expected in relation to SA objective 2: housing. This negative effect is expected given that the policy requirements may restrict the delivery of new housing developments in the certain parts of the District, particularly where specific landscape sensitivities have been identified. The negative effect is uncertain given that any effect will be partly dependent upon how stringently this policy is enforced.

5.137 Due to the narrow focus of this policy, a negligible effect has been recorded in relation to the remaining SA objectives.

Mitigation

5.138 Mitigation relating to the adverse effect identified for SA objective 2: housing might be achieved through the allocation of an appropriate number of housing sites as to meet the housing requirement over the plan period. These sites should be selected with consideration for potential effects on landscape character and setting out areas which are potentially less constrained in these terms. Specific mitigation in relation to sites allocated for development might also be included in the site specific policy text where particular landscape sensitivity issues have been identified.

Assumptions

5.139 None identified.

Uncertainties

5.140 An uncertain effect has been identified for SA objective 2: Housing in relation to this policy. The policy requirement directly seeks to protect and conserve the landscape of the District and may restrict the delivery of new housing. However, this is an uncertain effect which will require more specific information.

Alternatives

5.141 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9.

Policy 18: Green Infrastructure

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.142 The only significant positive effect identified for this policy is in relation to SA objective 1: biodiversity . The policy states that where appropriate, development proposals should take advantage of opportunities to enhance existing or provide new green infrastructure. This approach is expected to help ensure new habitats are provided in the District as well as the protection and enhanced connectivity of existing habitats. In order to sustainably integrate new green infrastructure, the policy states that all major developments should demonstrate consideration for making connections to the existing green infrastructure network through identified nodes and corridors. Furthermore, the policy supports the protection and enhancement of biodiversity across local authorities and boundaries. This protection of green infrastructure is likely to help protect agricultural land from development and therefore a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 7: land use and soils .
- 5.143 In addition, the policy is expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 5: health and wellbeing , and SA objective 14: landscape and townscape . These effects are expected considering that the policy is supportive of the provision of on-site open space or landscaping to mitigate the impact of development where it can demonstrate multiple benefits for people and wildlife. It is expected that landscaping delivered to mitigate the impacts of a development will help to ensure the protection and enhancement of landscape character. Furthermore the provision of open green space may help to encourage residents to partake of healthier lifestyles. Incorporating areas of open space may also have wellbeing benefits for residents by providing opportunities for physical activity.
- 5.144 Green infrastructure in the form of open greenspace and vegetation can also act as carbon sinks and help to benefit air quality. Furthermore the incorporation of green infrastructure can have additional benefits in terms of climate change mitigation, such as allowing for the safe infiltration of surface water. As a result minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 9: flood risk , SA objective 10: air quality and SA objective 11: climate change .
- 5.145 Due to the relatively narrow focus of this policy negligible effects are expected in relation to the remaining SA objectives.

Mitigation

- 5.146 Not applicable as only positive effects have been identified.

Assumptions

- 5.147 None identified.

Uncertainties

- 5.148 None identified.

Alternatives

- 5.149 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9 .

Policy 19: Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.150 The policy is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 1: biodiversity . The policy requires that new developments must conserve and where possible restore and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity. Furthermore, if development is likely to result in the loss, degradation or harm to any species or habitats of biodiversity/geodiversity interest it is not to be supported.
- 5.151 The policy is also expected to result in minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 5: health and wellbeing and SA objective 7: land use and soils . The conservation of biodiversity and geodiversity is likely to help to protect greenfield land, including areas of best and most versatile agricultural land in Bassetlaw. Furthermore, conserving and enhancing biodiversity will ensure

that green space can be enjoyed by residents which will likely promote improvements in terms of health and physical and mental wellbeing.

- 5.152 Policy 19 would provide protection to habitat areas which support additional benefits in terms of surface water infiltration, as well as contributing to landscape character. Minor positive effects have therefore been recorded in relation to SA objective 9: flood risk and SA objective 14: landscape and townscape.
- 5.153 The protection of areas of high value for biodiversity is also likely to be of benefit in terms of mitigating the effects of air pollution and climate change in the District. Green spaces including areas of vegetation and mature trees can play a role as carbon sinks and act to improve air quality. As such minor positive effects have been recorded in relation to SA objective 10: air quality and SA objective 11: climate change.
- 5.154 A minor negative effect is expected in relation to SA objective 2: housing. This negative effect is expected given that the policy requirements may restrict the delivery of new housing developments in certain parts of the District, particularly within or in close proximity to areas of particular importance to biodiversity and geodiversity. The negative effect is uncertain given that any effect will be partly dependent upon how stringently this policy is enforced.

Mitigation

- 5.155 It is expected that the District has land supply available to enable housing to be provided in a manner as to avoid significant adverse effects on biodiversity. Mitigation relating to the adverse effect identified for SA objective 2: housing might be achieved through the allocation of an appropriate number of housing sites to meet the housing requirement over the plan period. These sites should be selected with consideration for potential effects on the biodiversity and geodiversity as well as other sensitivities in the District. Site specific policy requirements may be appropriate to avoid adverse effects occurring in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity designations in the District.

Assumptions

- 5.156 None identified.

Uncertainties

- 5.157 An uncertain negative effect has been identified for SA objective 2: Housing in relation to this policy. As the policy requirement to protect biodiversity and geodiversity may restrict the delivery of new housing within the District. However, this is uncertain until further information about site allocations can be provided.

Alternatives

- 5.158 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9.

Policy 20: Open Space

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.159 The only significant positive effect identified for this policy is in relation to SA objective 5: health and wellbeing. The primary focus of this policy is to provide new and enhance existing open spaces within the District. As such the policy will help to ensure the longevity and viability of open spaces and recreation facilities and therefore will be of benefit in terms of the health and wellbeing of residents in the District.
- 5.160 Furthermore, open spaces that are greenspaces have the potential to act as habitats and improve habitat connectivity in Bassetlaw, as well mitigating the impacts of climate change including flood risk. As such minor positive effects have been identified in relation to SA objective 1: biodiversity, SA objective 9: flood risk and SA objective 11: climate change. As well as potentially acting as a carbon sink greenspaces which incorporate vegetation and mature trees can potentially play a role in terms of reducing the adverse effects of air pollution. A minor positive effect has therefore been identified in relation to SA objective 10: air quality.

5.161 It is furthermore expected that the protection and enhancement of open spaces in the District would help conserve and improve the visual amenity and the existing character of Bassetlaw. A minor positive effect has therefore been recorded in relation to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape .

5.162 As this policy is relatively narrow in its focus, negligible effects are expected in relation to the remaining SA objectives.

Mitigation

5.163 Not applicable as only positive effects have been identified.

Assumptions

5.164 None identified.

Uncertainties

5.165 None identified.

Alternatives

5.166 F Y U g c b U V ` Y ` U ` h Y f b U h] j Y g ` \ U j Y ` V Y Y b `] X Y b h] Z] Y X ` U b X ` U g g Y g g Y . Chapter 4.

Policy 21: Heritage

Likely sustainability effects

5.167 Policy 21 is expected to have negligible effects in relation to the majority of SA objectives. The only significant positive effect identified for Policy 21 is in relation to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and specifically SA objective 13: cultural heritage . H \ Y ` d f] a U f m ` Z c W i g ` c Z ` h \] g ` d c `] W m `] g ` h c ` W c b g Y f j Y ` U b X ` Y b \ U I settings. This is to be achieved by understanding the significance of heritage assets through Heritage Statements and ensuring there is a weighted approach to decision making regarding developments which have a relationship with heritage assets.

5.168 Policy 20 restricts development that is likely to cause harm to heritage assets, however in exceptional circumstances the policy sets out a need for convincing justifications for any development that will cause harm to a heritage asset. A degree of uncertainty is therefore attached to the significant positive effect recorded as effects will not be entirely clear until mitigation measures have been secured.

5.169 This policy aims to conserve and enhance the historic environment which is likely to benefit of townscapes in the District and is likely to result in beneficial effects in terms of local distinctiveness. A minor positive effect is therefore expected in relation to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape . The policy gives particular consideration for the protection of historic shopfronts and seeks to ensure that new shopfronts are designed to fit the historic environment. This is likely to have indirect minor positive effects on the economy, by improving local visual amenity and attractiveness to investors (SA objective 3: economy and skills).

5.170 A minor negative effect is expected in relation to SA objective 2: housing . This negative effect is expected given that the policy requirements may restrict the extension of existing properties and the delivery of new housing developments in the District, particularly within or in close proximity to Conservation Areas and other heritage assets. The negative effect is uncertain given that any effect will be partly dependent upon how stringently this policy is enforced.

Mitigation

5.171 Mitigation of negative effects against SA objective 2 might be achieved through the allocation of an appropriate number of housing sites as to meet the housing requirement over the plan period. These sites should be selected with consideration for potential effects on the historic environment as well as other sensitive features in the District.

Assumptions

5.172 None identified

Uncertainties

5.173 There is a degree of uncertainty regarding the significant positive effects on SA objective 13, as these effects depend on mitigation measures that would take place in order to conserve cultural heritage. Furthermore, there is potential that the protection of cultural assets could impact the housing delivery targets, particularly in the conservation areas in the District. As such the effect of the policy on the rate of housing delivery in the District is uncertain.

Alternatives

5.174 Reasonable alternatives have been identified in Chapter 4.

Policy 22: Design

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.175 The policy seeks to achieve good design in the District and as such new development should complement and enhance the character of the built and natural environment. A significant effect is therefore expected in relation to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape. Given that this approach should help to protect the significance of heritage assets and their respective settings a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 13: cultural heritage.
- 5.176 The policy also aims to integrate new developments with existing transport, green infrastructure and the public realm, and is therefore expected to have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 5: health and wellbeing and SA objective 6: transport. The integration of new development within areas of greenspace is likely to help encourage exercise which has benefits in terms of both physical and mental health. Connecting development to existing transport networks encourages the site to be accessible and may help to reduce the need for further infrastructure provision in the District, dependent upon existing capacities. Furthermore, the policy states that design must be inclusive and accessible to all by incorporating street design to reflect transport user hierarchy and integrate well designed vehicle and cycle parking facilities. This requirement should help to provide ease of movement and access for all users and as such a minor positive effect is likely in relation to SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion.
- 5.177 In addition, this policy sets out that new development should explore opportunities for the incorporation of environmentally sustainable materials and seek to maximise solar gain by optimising building orientation. A minor positive is therefore expected in relation to SA objective 11: climate change and SA objective 12: resource use and waste.
- 5.178 Part of the aim of incorporating a policy that addresses design standards in the District is to help encourage qualitative improvement to the existing range of homes, including by ensuring that the nationally described space standard for new homes is met or exceeded. As such it is expected that this policy would also have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 2: housing.

Mitigation

5.179 Not applicable as only positive effects identified.

Assumptions

5.180 It is assumed that all components of section 1 in the policy (A-L) will be implemented, to result in the above effects.

Uncertainties

5.181 None identified.

Alternatives

5.182 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9.

Policy 23: Community Services and Facilities

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.183 Policy 23 places potential financial constraints on new developments in the District. New developments will be required to make an appropriate contribution to meet local needs where additional demand on essential services or facilities is created. This requirement may raise viability issues in terms of the delivery of new housing in the District and therefore a minor negative effect is expected with regards to SA objective 2: housing . Any adverse impact will be dependent upon how onerous the requirements of the policy are in relation to specific development proposals in the District. This is unknown at this stage meaning that an element of uncertainty is attached to the minor negative effect identified.
- 5.184 The primary focus of this policy is to ensure that where new development is provided local needs are met in relation to key services and facilities, as such significant positive effects are expected for both SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion and SA objective 5: health and wellbeing . The policy states that services and facilities include, but are not limited to schools, convenience retail, healthcare facilities, post offices, sports facilities and outdoor green space such as recreational grounds and sports fields.
- 5.185 This policy requires that new development creates new or contributes towards improving existing facilities and services to meet local needs where new demand is created. This will have significant positive effects in terms of regeneration and social inclusion, as services must be accessible to all, including those with disabilities, and should be operational without detriment to local residents.
- 5.186 Furthermore, this policy aims to encourage development that prioritises and promotes access to services by walking, cycling and public transport and therefore a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 6: transport . The support the policy provides in terms of alternative modes of transport is expected to have minor positive effects on SA objective 10: air quality and SA objective 11: climate change . In addition, by improving access to local services the policy may help to improve the vitality and viability of local centres in the District to the benefit of the local economy. As such a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 3: economy and skills .

Mitigation

- 5.187 The negative effect identified in relation to SA objective 2: housing , could be mitigated by including minimum requirements that are known to be viable in site -specific policies, whilst encouraging developers to provide in excess of these, in line with Policy 23.

Assumptions

- 5.188 It is assumed that development within rural areas will require new community facilities to be built. It is assumed that many community facilities will be in local centres, rather than isolated locations.

Uncertainties

- 5.189 Uncertainties relate to the potential financial restraints this policy could place on developers, which may affect viability of developments. In addition, alongside additional housing provision, there could be increased demand on services. It is uncertain the exact expectations of this policy as to where new services will be located and which existing services will expect enhancements.

Alternatives

- 5.190 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9 .

Policy 24: Strategic Infrastructure

Likely sustainability effects

- 5.191 The policy sets out the requirement for the funding of infrastructure necessary to support new development in the District through developer contributions. This includes the delivery of community facilities, transport infrastructure enhancements (such as highways, public transport and provision for cyclists and pedestrians) and education and health facilities. The policy also requires that habitat mitigation is provided and maintained. Furthermore, existing infrastructure

such as community facilities are to be safeguarded unless they no longer meet an identified need or an alternative provision can be made elsewhere. As such significant positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 1: biodiversity, SA objective 4: regeneration and social inclusion, SA objective 5: health and wellbeing and SA objective 6: transport. An additional significant positive effect is also expected in relation to SA objective 3: economy and skills, given that the policy requires developer contributions which would help to secure strategic infrastructure improvements in the District and will help to make the area more attractive to investors.

5.192 This policy will also have minor positive effects on SA objective 9: flood risk as infrastructure contributions should include drainage and surface water management, including the introduction of SuDS and flood defences where appropriate. These requirements are expected to positively contribute to the alleviation of flood risk in Bassetlaw.

5.193 This policy aims to encourage development that enhances sustainable transport provision, which is likely to benefit local air quality, as well as reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Minor positive effects have therefore been identified in relation SA objective 10: air quality and SA objective 11: climate change.

5.194 The delivery of new infrastructure in the District supported by developer contributions is to include green infrastructure. It is expected that support for the provision of green infrastructure will not only help to mitigate flood risk and be of benefit in terms of habitat provision and connectivity but will also help to protect and enhance the established character (including landscape character) of Bassetlaw. A minor positive effect is therefore expected in relation to SA objective 14: landscape and townscape.

Mitigation

5.195 Not applicable as only positive effects have been identified for this policy assessment.

Assumptions

5.196 It is assumed that every section of this policy is applied in order to achieve these effects. Certain developments may only be required to meet some criteria of the policy and therefore are likely to have varying effects.

5.197 While the requirement for developer contributions through CIL and / or planning obligation might affect the viability of new development proposals in the District, the drafting of the policy is considerate of this issue. As such it is not expected that viability issues which could otherwise adversely affect housing delivery rates and the completion of other development schemes in the District would emerge.

Uncertainties

5.198 None identified.

Alternatives

5.199 No reasonable alternative options have been identified, as explained in Appendix 9.

6 Cumulative Effects of the Draft Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan

- 6.1 This chapter presents the expected cumulative effects of the Draft Plan Consultation Part 1: Strategic Plan (January 2019). Table 6.1 below presents a summary of all of the potential sustainability effects identified for the policies in the Draft Plan.
- 6.2 This enables an assessment to be made of the likely significant effects of the Draft Plan in relation to each of the SA objectives, i.e. an assessment of cumulative effects as required by the SEA Regulations. This includes the two proposed strategic sites for development which are set out Policy 12, which guides development at the New Garden Village s.

Table 6.1 Summary of SA findings for all of the policies and sites in Draft Plan

	SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	SA2: Housing	SA3: Economy and skills	SA4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion	SA5: Health and Wellbeing	SA6: Transport	SA7: Land Use and Soils	SA8: Water	SA9: Flood Risk	SA10: Air Quality	SA11: Climate Change	SA12: Resource Use and Waste	SA13: Cultural Heritage	SA14: Landscape and Townscape
<i>Vision and Strategic Objectives</i>														
Local Plan Vision	0	0	+?	+?	+?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S01	0	+?	0	+?	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+?
S02	-?	++	0	0	+	0	+/-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-?
S03	-?	++	++	+?	+?	0	+/-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-?
S04	0	0	++	0	0	+?	+/-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S05	++	0	0	0	+	0	++?	0	0	0	+	0	++	++
S06	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
S07	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++
S08	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	++	+	++	0	0	0
S09	0	0	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
S010	++	0	++	++	++	++	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+
<i>Strategic Policies</i>														
Policy 1 The Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy	+/-?	++	++	++	++/-?	++/-	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-?	+/-?
Policy 2 Housing and Economic Growth	+/-?	++	++	++	++/-?	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+/-	--	+/-?	+/-?
Policy 3 Affordable housing	0	++	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 4 Housing mix	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 5 Self and Custom Build Housing	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 6 Specialist Housing	0	++	0	+	+	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0
Policy 7 Residential Care Homes	0	++	0	+	+	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0

	SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	SA2: Housing	SA3: Economy and skills	SA4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion	SA5: Health and Wellbeing	SA6: Transport	SA7: Land Use and Soils	SA8: Water	SA9: Flood Risk	SA10: Air Quality	SA11: Climate Change	SA12: Resource Use and Waste	SA13: Cultural Heritage	SA14: Landscape and Townscape
Policy 8 Rural Bassetlaw	+/-	++	++	+	?	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	-?	+?	+
Policy 9 Worksop	+/-	++	++	++	++/-	+	+	-	0	+/-	+/-	-?	+/-?	+/-
Policy 10 Retford	+/-	++	++	++	++/-	+	+	-?	+/-	+/-	+/-	-?	+/-?	+/-
Policy 11 Harworth and Bircotes	+/-	++	++	++	+	+	+/-	-	0	+/-	+/-	-?	+/-?	++
Policy 12 New Garden Villages	+/-	++	++	++	++	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	++/-	--?	+/-?	+/-
<i>Thematic Policies</i>														
Policy 13 Energy Efficiency	0	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	++	++	0	0
Policy 14 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy	+/?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	++	0	+/?	+/?
Policy 15 Flood Risk	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	+?	++	+	+	0	0	+
Policy 16 Water Quality and Efficiency	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 17 Landscape Character	+	-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++
Policy 18 Green Infrastructure	++	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	+
Policy 19 Biodiversity and Geodiversity	++	-?	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	+
Policy 20 Open Space	+	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	+
Policy 21 Heritage	0	-?	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	+
Policy 22 Design	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	++
Policy 23 Community Services and Facilities	0	-?	+	++	++	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0

	SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	SA2: Housing	SA3: Economy and skills	SA4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion	SA5: Health and Wellbeing	SA6: Transport	SA7: Land Use and Soils	SA8: Water	SA9: Flood Risk	SA10: Air Quality	SA11: Climate Change	SA12: Resource Use and Waste	SA13: Cultural Heritage	SA14: Landscape and Townscape
Policy 24 Strategic Infrastructure	++	0	++	++	++	++	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	+

