

**Appendix 3: Local Plan Part 2 – Sustainability  
Appraisal Report Executive Summary  
and Summary of Draft Policies**

# **A. Sustainability Appraisal Report: Executive Summary**

## **Introduction**

- 1.1 This Non-Technical Summary relates to the Sustainability Appraisal of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies. The Local Plan Part 2 is the second part of the Local Plan. This identifies non-strategic allocations and designations in the Borough and sets out more detailed policies (sitting below the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy's more strategic level policies) for use in the determination of planning applications.
- 1.2 Plans and strategies such as the Local Plan Part 2 are subject to a process called Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which assesses the likely effects of a plan on social, economic and environmental issues. This Non-Technical Summary relates to the full SA Report for the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LAPP) Publication Draft.
- 1.3 The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy was adopted in October 2014. A separate Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken for that document.

## **Sustainability Appraisal**

- 1.4 The Borough Council is required by law to carry out Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Local Plan Part 2. The Government recommends that these two legal requirements are met through one integrated process, referred to as Sustainability Appraisal (or SA).
- 1.5 The purpose of SA is to promote sustainable development through the better integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans. It should be viewed as an integral part of good plan making, involving ongoing iterations to identify and report on the likely social, economic and environmental effects of the plan and the extent to which sustainable development is expected to be achieved through its implementation.
- 1.6 This Non-Technical Summary relates to the full SA Report for the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Draft (April 2018). The SA is being undertaken in stages alongside the preparation of the Local Plan in order to provide sustainability guidance as the plan is developed.

**Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on scope**

- 1.7 The SA process began in January 2016 with the production of a Scoping Report for Local Plan Part 2, which was produced in-house by the Borough Council. The Scoping Report determined what the SA should cover by reviewing a wide range of relevant policy documents (including international, national and local policies) and by examining data to help identify what the key sustainability issues are in Rushcliffe as well as likely future trends.
- 1.8 The SA Scoping Report was published in January 2016 for a six week consultation period with the three statutory consultation bodies for England (the Environment Agency, Heritage England and Natural England) and other interested parties. **Appendix A** of the full SA Report lists the comments that were received during the consultation and describes how these comments have been addressed.
- 1.9 A critical part of the SA Scoping Report is production of sustainability objectives and a SA Framework for assessing policies and site options. The original SA Framework consulted on as part of the Scoping Report was amended as a result of the comments received during this consultation and this revised Framework is included as **Table 1** of this Non-Technical Summary below. This Framework now includes 15 objectives and associated sub-questions.

**Table 1 Revised SA Framework**

SA objectives	Decision making criteria	Site specific questions
<p><b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Rushcliffe</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?</li> <li>• Will it reduce homelessness?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the site allocated for housing?</li> <li>• Is the site allocated for the type of housing needed in the area?</li> <li>• Will the site include provision for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople?</li> <li>• Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable?)</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Health</b> To improve health and reduce health inequalities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it reduce health inequalities?</li> <li>• Will it improve access to health facilities?</li> <li>• Will it improve the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the site within 10 minutes public transport time or 30 minutes walking time of a health facility?</li> </ul>

SA objectives	Decision making criteria	Site specific questions
	<p>opportunities for recreational physical activity?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the development result in a loss of accessible GI (parks, open spaces, playing fields, allotments, watercourses)?</li> <li>• Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Heritage</b> To conserve the Borough's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it conserve and/ or enhance, designated heritage assets and/ or the historic environment?</li> <li>• Will it respect, maintain and strengthen local character and distinctiveness?</li> <li>• Will it improve access to historic sites and /or enhance understanding of the Borough's cultural assets?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the development harm the significance of an individual or multiple heritage assets (including their setting)?</li> <li>• Is there a cumulative effect on heritage assets?</li> <li>• Will the development enhance or better reveal the significance of the heritage asset?</li> <li>• Where the development will cause harm, are there any methods of mitigation that can avoid adverse effects or overcome the negative effects, or even achieve positive effects?</li> <li>• Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</li> <li>• Will it lead to the adaptive re-use of a heritage asset?</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Crime</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime in Rushcliffe</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?</li> <li>• Will it contribute to a safe secure built environment?</li> </ul>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><b>5. Social</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital across Rushcliffe</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it protect and enhance existing cultural assets?</li> <li>• Will it improve access to and resident's</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the development result in the loss of a community facility?</li> <li>• Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan</li> </ul>

SA objectives	Decision making criteria	Site specific questions
	<p>satisfaction with community facilities and services?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase the number of facilities, e.g. shops, community centres, etc</li> <li>• Will it encourage the vitality of the local centre/village centre/town centre?</li> </ul>	<p>policies (if applicable)?</p>
<p><b>6. Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green Infrastructure across Rushcliffe</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?</li> <li>• Will it provide new green space?</li> <li>• Will it improve green infrastructure networks?</li> <li>• Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?</li> <li>• Will it improve the quality of existing open space?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the development result in a loss of all or part of a designated site of nature conservation interest?</li> <li>• Is the site adjacent to a designated site of nature conservation interest?</li> <li>• Will the development involve the loss of existing habitats or trees/hedgerows/woodland?</li> <li>• Will the site include the provision on-site or off-site open space?</li> <li>• Will the development involve the loss of existing open space?</li> <li>• Will the development improve the underused or undervalued open space?</li> <li>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</li> </ul>
<p><b>7. Landscape</b> To protect and enhance the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environmental and archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of Rushcliffe.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it maintain and / or enhance the local distinctiveness of the townscape or settlement character?</li> <li>• Will it preserve an historic landscape?</li> <li>• Does it respect identified landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the development conserve the features and characteristics of the landscape in the present form?</li> <li>• Will the development enhance the features and characteristics of the landscape?</li> </ul>

SA objectives	Decision making criteria	Site specific questions
	character? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between the landscape and the historic environment?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the development restore the features and characteristics of the landscape?</li> <li>• Will the development create a new landscape character? Are there any appropriate methods of landscape mitigation which can be incorporated into the development to overcome or reduce harm to landscape character?</li> <li>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</li> </ul>
<b>8. Natural resources</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including water, air quality, soils and minerals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it improve water quality?</li> <li>• Will it improve air quality?</li> <li>• Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?</li> <li>• Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques?</li> <li>• Will it cause a deterioration of WFD status or potential of onsite watercourses or improve this?</li> <li>• Will it prevent the loss of high quality soils to development?</li> <li>• Will it help promote water efficiency?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the site cause any harm to the water environment?</li> <li>• Will the site cause additional harm to an AQMA?</li> <li>• Is the site on high grade agricultural land?</li> <li>• Is the site a brownfield site?</li> <li>• Will the site help reduce water consumption?</li> <li>• Will it deteriorate river habitat in-stream and the riparian zone adjacent floodplain habitats?"</li> <li>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</li> </ul>
<b>9. Flooding</b> To minimise the risk of flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it mitigate flood risk?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the site within EA flood zone 2 or 3?</li> <li>• Is the site adjacent to EA flood zone 2 or 3?</li> </ul>
<b>10. Waste</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it reduce household</li> </ul>	n/a

SA objectives	Decision making criteria	Site specific questions
<p>To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials</p>	<p>and commercial waste per head?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase waste recovery and recycling per head?</li> <li>• Will it reduce hazardous waste?</li> <li>• Will it reduce waste in the construction industry?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>11. Energy</b> To minimise waste and increase the re-use and do develop the area's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it improve energy efficiency of new buildings?</li> <li>• Will it support the generation and use of renewable energies?</li> <li>• Will it support the development of community energy systems?</li> <li>• Will it ensure that buildings are able to deal with future changes in climate?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the development include provision of renewable technology?</li> <li>• Is the development for a specific renewable energy project?</li> <li>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</li> </ul>
<p><b>12. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to ensure that all journeys are undertaken by the most sustainable mode available</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it use and enhance existing transport infrastructure?</li> <li>• Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment?</li> <li>• Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternative modes of transport?</li> <li>• Will it increase accessibility to services and facilities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the site accessible by public transport?</li> <li>• Is the site located within the main urban area?</li> <li>• Is the site within 30 minutes public transport time of community facilities, schools, retail centres and employment areas?</li> <li>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</li> </ul>
<p><b>13. Employment</b> To create high quality employment opportunities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs?</li> <li>• Will it reduce unemployment?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the site allocated for mixed use employment/retail?</li> <li>• Will the development provide jobs for</li> </ul>

SA objectives	Decision making criteria	Site specific questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase average income levels?</li> <li>• Will it improve rural productivity in terms of employment opportunities?</li> </ul>	<p>unemployed people?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the development involve the loss of employment land?</li> <li>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</li> </ul>
<p><b>14. Innovation</b> To develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase levels of qualification?</li> <li>• Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors?</li> <li>• Will it encourage graduates to live and work within the plan areas?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the proposal involve new high quality employment opportunities? E.g. centres of excellence?</li> <li>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</li> </ul>
<p><b>15. Economic structure</b> To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses?</li> <li>• Will it improve the diversity of jobs available?</li> <li>• Will it provide the required infrastructure?</li> <li>• Will it provide business/university clusters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the site allocated for employment or mixed use?</li> <li>• Is the site allocated for mixed educational/employment?</li> <li>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</li> </ul>

## Method and Sustainability Appraisal Framework

1.10 The review of relevant plans, policies and programmes and the collation of baseline data helped to identify key sustainability issues for Rushcliffe Borough, as described above. These key sustainability issues fed into the identification of a set of SA objectives which are the main tool used at each stage of the SA for assessing the likely effects of the options and draft policies in the Local Plan. The SA framework is presented in **Table 1** of this Non Technical Summary.



## *Use of the SA Framework*

1.11 Within the assessment matrices showing the potential sustainability effects of the Local Plan policies, symbols and colour-coding have been used against each SA objective to show whether an effect is likely to be positive or negative, minor or significant, or uncertain as follows:

Significant positive	++
Minor positive	+
Neutral/Not relevant	0
Minor negative	-
Significant negative	--
Uncertain/unknown	?

1.12 The potential effects of the plan need to be determined and their significance assessed, which requires a series of judgments to be made. Attempts have been made 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 the policy in question on an SA objective 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 SA objective.

### **Stage B: Developing and refining alternatives and their effects**

1.13 Developing options for a plan is an iterative process which usually involves a number of consultations with stakeholders and the public. The SA process can help to identify where there may be other 'reasonable alternatives' to the options being considered for the policies and site allocations to be included in a plan. The reasonable alternative options that have been considered for the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 have included alternative policy approaches as well as potential sites for new housing development, as described below. The following commentary is structured to look firstly at housing options, and then development management policy options.

### ***SA of the spatial strategy***

1.14 Policy 3 of the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (Spatial Strategy) sets out the spatial hierarchy for future development in the Borough. This set out strategic allocations and also minimum housing figures for several of the key settlements

(East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington). The Core Strategy did not include allocations at the key settlements but instead deferred this to Local Plan Part 2. The two other key settlements of Bingham and Cotgrave did not have minimum housing targets in the Core Strategy as both had strategic allocations adjacent to the settlement (former Cotgrave Colliery and Land north of Bingham).

- 1.15 Adhering to the spatial strategy established under Local Plan Part 1, the Issues and Options for Local Plan Part 2 proposed that allocations should be included at the edge of the 'key settlements' of East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington. The Issues and Options was consulted on between January and March 2016.
- 1.16 In addition to the four key settlements identified above, the Issues and Options also presented **4 additional site options** within the main urban area of West Bridgford.
- 1.17 In total, views were asked for **8 sites** at East Leake (all of which had planning permission), **3 sites** at Keyworth (the three sites included in the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan), **10 sites** at Radcliffe on Trent (available options that had been put forward through the SHLAA), **10 sites** at Ruddington (again, available options that had been put forward through the SHLAA).
- 1.18 Following on from this Issues and Options consultation and after considering the responses received, it became clear that it would be necessary for Local Plan Part 2 to allocate more housing land than previously envisaged (due to an absence of a five year land supply and the envisaged delays over the plan period with the Core Strategy's Strategic Allocations).
- 1.19 It was consequently considered appropriate for plan preparation to be supported by an additional round of public consultation for the Local Plan Part 2 and for the Green Belt Review. This was to supplement the comments already received in response to the Issues and Options consultation and to also provide the opportunity for comments to be made in respect of the suitability of a number of newly identified options for housing development. The consultation was solely focussed on housing – no other issues were consulted on. The consultation expanded on the Issues and Options by asking for views on housing sites on the edge of Cotgrave, Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham, Sutton Bonington and Tollerton and also on any additional sites that had been submitted in Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington.
- 1.20 The 'Further Options' was published in February 2017 and consulted on for six weeks.
- 1.21 Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham, Sutton Bonington and Tollerton are all settlements with a basic level of facilities and accessibility. They are referred

to in the SA report as the 'third tier' settlements. There are six 'third tier' settlements in total in the Borough (Aslockton, Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham, Sutton Bonington and Tollerton). Aslockton was not consulted on as planning permission had already been granted for 75 homes at the site to the south of Abbey Lane.

- 1.22 In total, **107 sites** have been assessed as potential housing options. An interim SA Report ("Housing Options Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report" dated September 2017) was consulted on alongside the Preferred Housing Sites consultation which assessed these options. The appraisals are included in the full SA Report in **Appendix D**.
- 1.23 The Interim Housing Options SA also looked at overall scale of development at each settlement. The options for housing scale are summarised in **Table 2** with the full appraisals included in **Appendix C** of the full SA report.
- 1.24 **Section 8** of the full SA Report summarises the realistic option appraisals undertaken and the reasons for rejecting and selecting options.

**Table 2 Options appraised for the spatial strategy of Local Plan Part 2**

<b>Overall strategy</b>		Option 1: Increased growth at the key settlements in excess of the minimum targets identified in the Core Strategy, no additional development at the third tier settlements								
		Option 2: Increased growth at the third tier of settlements with the same level of growth at key settlements as proposed under Core Strategy								
		Option 3: Increased development distributed between the key settlements and third tier of settlements.								
		Option 4: The 'do nothing' approach. (i.e. growth at the scale proposed under the Core Strategy (1,100 homes) and concentrated purely on the key settlements)								
		No growth	Low growth (c. 50 dwellings)	Medium growth (c.100 dwellings)	High growth (c. 200 dwellings)	25% increase in Core Strategy minimum targets	50% increase in Core Strategy minimum targets	100% increase in Core Strategy minimum targets	125% increase in Core Strategy minimum targets	
<b>Settlements</b>	'Third tier' settlements	Aslockton	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Cropwell Bishop	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		East Bridgford	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Gotham	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Sutton Bonington	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		Tollerton	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Key Settlements	Cotgrave	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Keyworth	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Radcliffe on Trent	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Ruddington	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a	✓	✓	✓	✓

### ***SA of the development management options***

1.25 A number of development management topics for Local Plan Part 2 to address were included in the Issues and Options consultation. The options assessed are included in **Appendix B** of the full SA Report and are summarised in **Section 9** of the SA report.

### ***Publication draft policies***

1.26 The Publication draft policies are summarised in **Section 10** and **Section 11** of the full SA Report. **Section 10** examines the allocation policies and **Section 11** summarises the development management policies. The full appraisals for all of the policies are contained within **Appendix E** of the full SA Report.

1.27 The Publication draft policies are summarised in **Table 3** of this Non-Technical Summary. The section below summaries how the policies perform against the 15 SA objectives.

**Objective 1: Housing** - To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Rushcliffe

1.28 The Local Plan Part 2 allocates sites for around 3,000 homes up to 2028. This will help meet the objectively assessed housing need for the Borough. A range of affordable housing levels will be sought on sites, from 10% up to 30%, in accordance with Core Strategy Policy 8. The development management policies on Housing Standards, Self and Custom Build and Specialist Residential Accommodation are also considered to contribute to ensuring the housing stock meets the needs of the local population.

1.29 The spatial strategy is focussed on larger rural settlements, and those settlements with a basic range of services, facilities and accessibility. This will help ensure rural settlements can develop and help sustain those facilities.

1.30 Overall, a cumulative **significant positive** effect is likely in relation to housing.

**Objective 2: Health** - To improve health and reduce health inequalities

1.31 The Local Plan Part 2 proposes improvements to the walking and cycling network through the site allocation policies which will help to improve levels of day-to-day activity, benefitting health. Increased walking and cycling may also be facilitated by the focus of development on the Key Settlements where journey times to access services and facilities are likely to be shorter. The majority of employment opportunities will be in larger centres such as Nottingham and Loughborough however, and the relative distance of the rural

settlements from these centres would not encourage walking and cycling as a commuting method.

- 1.32 Focusing new retail development on existing centres include West Bridgford and the larger key settlements is considered to encourage opportunities for walking and cycling.
- 1.33 The health benefits for the smaller rural settlement in terms of walking and cycling are not as great in terms of accessing services and facilities given the more limited provision in those settlements, however, access to the wider countryside through public rights of way would be more readily available. A negative impact on health for the regeneration sites at Flintham and Bunny Brickworks was also identified, given the relatively isolated location of the sites and the consequent dis-incentives for walking and cycling.
- 1.34 The provision of improved Green Infrastructure and Open Space through policies 32, 33, 34 and 35 in particular will also encourage people to engage in more active recreation.
- 1.35 While the population growth that will result from the residential development proposed through the Local Plan could put pressure on healthcare facilities such as existing GP surgeries, provision is made through the Plan for improvements to infrastructure to support the new development. While healthcare infrastructure is not always referred to specifically, this is taken to be included within community facilities.
- 1.36 Other policies are designed to improve the general health of the population such as policy 41 (Air Quality).
- 1.37 Overall, a cumulative **mixed (minor positive and minor negative)** impact is likely in relation to health.

**Objective 3: Heritage** - To conserve the Borough's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.

- 1.38 The appraisals have identified that several of the housing allocations could adversely affect heritage assets and their settings. However, most are considered to have a neutral impact.
- 1.39 In addition, Policy 28 (Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets) and Policy 29 (Development affecting Archaeological Sites) are designed to ensure new development makes a positive contribution to local character and respects existing heritage assets.
- 1.40 Overall, a cumulative **mixed (minor positive and minor negative)** impact is likely in relation to heritage.

**Objective 4: Crime** - To improve community safety; reduce crime and the fear of crime in Rushcliffe

1.41 Most of the policies in the Local Plan will not have a direct effect on this objective.

1.42 The only significant impact identified is in relation to the redevelopment of the Former Islamic Institute in Flintham which has recently attracted anti-social behaviour, trespassing and criminal damage and is considered to be in a dangerous state.

1.43 Overall, a cumulative **minor positive impact** is identified.

**Objective 5: Social** - To promote and support the development and growth of social capital across Rushcliffe

1.44 Appraisals for the site policies have considered that a level of new development will help to sustain existing social facilities in centres.

1.45 Improved social cohesion is also considered to result from the Green Infrastructure and Open Space policies, acknowledging that improved Green Infrastructure and public accessibility to such assets can result from the number of social clubs and sports facilities that utilise them.

1.46 Overall, a cumulative **minor positive** impact is identified.

**Objective 6: Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure** - To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green Infrastructure across Rushcliffe

1.47 The proposed allocations could affect biodiversity, particularly because a lot of the development is proposed on greenfield sites. Minor negative impacts are highlighted for the majority of sites. The loss of large areas of greenfield land could result in the loss of valuable habitats and disturbance to species particularly through the construction phase.

1.48 Mitigation of loss of habitats of value is provided through other policies, specifically Policy 36 (Designated Nature Conservation Sites), Policy 37 (Trees and Woodlands) and Policy 38 (Non Designated Biodiversity Assets and the Wider Ecological Network). Other significant positive impacts are identified for the Green Infrastructure policies Policy 34 (Green Infrastructure and Open Space Assets) and Policy 35 (Green Infrastructure Network and Urban Fringe).

1.49 Overall a cumulative **minor negative impact** is identified, acknowledging the risk for habitat and species fragmentation due the relatively dispersed spread of development across a number of sites.

**Objective 7: Landscape** - To protect and enhance the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environmental and archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of Rushcliffe

1.50 As with Objective 6, there is an identified negative cumulative impact on the landscape due to the required loss of greenfield sites across a relatively wide area.

1.51 The Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study did not identify any of the sites as of high landscape value however.

1.52 Other measures in the plan, such as policies seeking to enhance green infrastructure, will help to improve the overall setting of new development within the landscape.

1.53 The policy restricting development on Site Within the Countryside (Policy 22) are designed to ensure that proposals with an adverse impact on landscape can be refused.

1.54 Overall a cumulative **minor negative** effect is identified in relation to the landscape.

**Objective 8: Natural resources** - To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including water, air quality, soils and minerals

1.55 Although there are several policies in the plan that will help to manage natural resources (e.g. Policy 12 Housing Standards in relation to water efficiency), the ultimate aim of allocating sites for housing and employment will inevitably have a negative impact on the objective through consumption of raw materials. Significant adverse impacts have also been identified for sites that would involve the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land.

1.56 Those sites that involve the re-use of PDL are considered to have a more positive impact on this objective; however, the vast majority of sites identified are greenfield.

1.57 Overall a cumulative **significant negative** effect is likely in relation to the Natural Resources objective.



**Objective 9: Flooding** - To minimise the risk of flooding

1.58 The allocation of large areas of greenfield land could reduce the extent of permeable surfaces available for infiltration and therefore increase flood risk, particularly because some of the site allocations include areas of higher flood risk (although it is possible that built development could be avoided in those areas). However, the Local Plan encourages the use of SuDS and the development of buildings that are adaptable to the impacts of climate change including flooding, and some of the site allocations policies require flood mitigation measures to be incorporated into the developments. The Local Plan also directs most new development to areas of lower flood risk. Measures seeking to protect and enhance the green infrastructure network will also be of benefit to flood risk management.

1.59 Overall, a cumulative **mixed (minor positive and minor negative)** effect is likely in relation to flooding.

**Objective 10: Waste** - To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials

1.60 The significant level of development proposed in the plan is likely to produce a cumulative negative impact against this objective as there will be an inevitable increase in waste generation.

1.61 Overall, a cumulative **minor negative** effect is likely in relation to waste.

**Objective 11: Energy** - To minimise waste and increase the re-use and do develop the area's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources

1.62 The Local Plan Part 2 has a specific policy in relation to Renewable Energy (Policy 16). This policy encourages renewable developments on a criteria based policy. The identification of potential suitable areas for wind technology is also identified as a positive benefit.

1.63 In relation to sites, the construction and occupation will inevitably lead to an increased use of energy.

1.64 Overall, cumulative **minor negative** effect is likely in relation to energy.

**Objective 12: Transport** - To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to ensure that all journeys are undertaken by the most sustainable mode available

- 1.65 In relation to housing and employment sites, the majority are concentrated in Key Settlements which have good public transport opportunities with more frequent and reliable connections to the larger centres of Nottingham and Loughborough for employment. This will encourage greater public transport usage. There are however sites also identified which do not have as frequent and reliable public transport opportunities (e.g. Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Sutton Bonington). These are identified as having a negative impact.
- 1.66 In addition, the regeneration sites at Flintham and Bunny are located some distance from key services and facilities so have also had an identified negative impact.
- 1.67 Overall, there is considered to be a cumulative **minor negative impact** on this objective.

**Objective 13: Employment** - To create high quality employment opportunities

- 1.68 The plan includes new employment allocations and proposes retention of older employment allocations through Policy 15. There are six sites in total that are proposed for an element of employment use (either mixed use or solely employment allocations). These therefore have a positive benefit on the employment objective it will improve employability options in the more rural part of the Borough where Local Plan Part 2 is providing new housing. This is considered to help sustainability of the housing allocations by potentially reducing commuting distances.
- 1.69 Overall, there is considered to be a cumulative **minor positive** impact on this objective. It was not considered significant due to the relatively low level of new employment development proposed.

**Objective 14: Innovation** - To develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation

- 1.70 Most of the policies in the Local Plan will not have a direct effect on this objective. There is therefore considered to be a cumulative **neutral impact** on this objective.

**Objective 15: Economic Structure** - To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies

- 1.71 As with the employment objective, the proposed mixed use and employment allocations are considered beneficial in terms of providing employment land in the more rural parts of the Borough (adjacent to key settlements and at regeneration sites).

Overall, there is considered to be a cumulative **minor positive** impact on this objective. It was not considered significant due to the relatively low level of new employment development proposed.

**Table 3 Cumulative impact of the Publication Draft policies (April 2018)**

	1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Biodiversity and GI	7. Landscape	8. Natural resources	9. Flooding	10. Waste	11. Energy	12. Transport	13. Employment	14. Innovation	15. Economic structure
Site allocation policies															
Policy 2.1 Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park, Cotgrave	++	+	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 2.2 Land south of Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave	++	0	0	0	+	-	0	-	0	-	-	+	-	0	-
Policy 3.1 Land north of Rempstone Road, East Leake	++	0	0	0	+	-	-	!	0	-	-	-	0	0	0
Policy 4.1 Land off Nicker Hill, Keyworth	++	+	0	0	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 4.2 Land between Platt Lane and Station Road, Keyworth	++	+	-	0	+	0	0	!	-	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 4.3 Land south of Debdale Lane, Keyworth	++	+	0	0	+	-	0	!	-	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 4.4 Hillside Farm, Keyworth	+	0	0	0	+	-	-	!	-	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 5.1 Land north of Nottingham Road, Radcliffe on Trent	++	+	0	0	+	-	0	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
Policy 5.2 Land adjacent Grooms Cottage, Radcliffe on Trent	+	0	0	0	+	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0
Policy 5.3 Land off Shelford Road, Radcliffe on Trent	++	+	-	0	+	-	0	!	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
Policy 5.4 Land north of Grantham Road, Radcliffe on Trent	++	-	0	0	+	-	0	!	-	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 5.5 72, Main Road, Radcliffe on Trent	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 5.6 The Paddocks, Radcliffe on Trent	+	0	0	0	+	-	0	-	-	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 6.1 Land west of Pasture Lane, Ruddington	++	+	0	0	+	-	0	-	!	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 6.2 Land south of Flawforth Lane, Ruddington	+	0	-	0	+	-	0	-	-	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 6.3 Land opposite Mere Way, Ruddington	++	+	-	0	+	-	0	-	-	-	-	+	0	0	0
Policy 7 Land east of Church Street, Cropwell Bishop	+	0	0	0	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0

	1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Biodiversity and GI	7. Landscape	8. Natural resources	9. Flooding	10. Waste	11. Energy	12. Transport	13. Employment	14. Innovation	15. Economic structure
Policy 8.1 Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford	+	0	-	0	+	-	0	!	0	-	-	-	0	0	0
Policy 8.2 Land south of Butt Lane, East Bridgford	+	0	-	0	+	-	0	!	0	-	-	-	0	0	0
Policy 9 Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards, Gotham	+	0	0	0	+	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0
Policy 10 Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington	+	0	0	0	+	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0
Development management policies															
Policy 1 Development Requirements	0	0	+	+	0	+	-	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	0
Policy 11 Housing Development on Unallocated Sites within Settlements	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0
Policy 12 Housing Standards	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 13 Self Build and Custom Housing Provision	+	0	0/?	0	0	0/?	+/?	0/?	0	0	0/?	0/?	0	0	0
Policy 14 Specialist Residential Accommodation	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0
Policy 15 Employment Development	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	-/?	-	++	0/?	+/?
Policy 16 Renewable Energy	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	++	0	0	0	0
Policy 17 Managing Flood Risk	0	0	0	0	0	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 18 Surface Water Management	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 19 Development affecting Watercourses	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 20 Managing Water Quality	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 21 Green Belt	+	-/?	0	0	0	-/?	-/?	-/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 22 Development within the Countryside	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Policy 23 Redevelopment of Bunny Brickworks	+	-	0	0	-	0	0	+	0	-/?	0	-	+	0	0
Policy 24 Redevelopment of former Islamic Institute, Flintham	+	-	0	++	+	0	0	+	0	-	-	-	0	0	0
Policy 25 Development within District Centres and	0	++	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+

	1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Biodiversity and GI	7. Landscape	8. Natural resources	9. Flooding	10. Waste	11. Energy	12. Transport	13. Employment	14. Innovation	15. Economic structure
Local Centres															
Policy 26 Development within Centres of Neighbourhood Importance	0	++	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0
Policy 27 Main Town Centre Uses Outside District Centres of Local Centres	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0
Policy 28 Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets	0/?	0/?	++	0	0/?	+/?	+/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 29 Development affecting Archaeological Sites	0	0	++	0	0	0/?	0/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 30 Protection of Community Facilities	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0
Policy 31 Sustainable Tourism and Leisure	0	+	++	0	+/?	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0
Policy 32 Recreational Open Space	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 33 Local Green Space	-	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
Policy 34 Green Infrastructure and Open Space Assets	0	++	+	0	++	++	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 35 Green Infrastructure Network and Urban Fringe	0	++	+	0	++	++	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 36 Designated Nature Conservation Sites	0	+	+	0	+	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 37 Trees and Woodlands	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	0
Policy 38 Non-Designated Biodiversity Assets and the Wider Ecological Network	0	+	+	0	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 39 Health Impacts of Development	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy 40 Pollution and Land Contamination	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Policy 41 Air Quality	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Policy 42 Safeguarding Minerals	0/?	0	0	0	0	+	+	++	0	0	0	0	0/?	0	0
Policy 43 Planning Obligations Threshold	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0

### **SA Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report**

1.72 The full SA report and this Non-Technical Summary describe the process that has been undertaken to date in carrying out the SA of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2. They set out the findings of the appraisal of options and policies, 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). The reasons for selecting or rejecting options during the preparation of the Local Plan are also described.

### **SA Stage D: Consultation on the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 and the SA Report**

1.73 Rushcliffe Borough Council will be inviting comments on the Publication Draft version of the Local Plan Part 2 and the full SA Report which this Non-Technical Summary relates to. Both documents will be published on the Council's website for consultation in due course.

### **SA Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2**

1.74 Proposals for monitoring the sustainability effects of the Local Plan are set out in **Section 12** of the full SA report.

### **Baseline Information and Key Sustainability Issues**

1.75 In line with the requirements of the SEA Regulations, consideration has been given to the current state of the environment in Rushcliffe Borough. Detailed baseline information for the Borough is presented in **Appendix A** of the full SA Report. As well as environmental issues, the baseline information includes a description of social and economic issues in the Borough.

1.76 **Section 4** of the full SA Report describes the social, economic and environmental characteristics of the Borough. **Table 3** below sets out the key sustainability issues for the Borough and, in line with the requirements of the SEA Regulations, consideration is also given to the likely evolution of the environment in the Borough if the Local Plan were not to be implemented.

**Table 4 – Key sustainability issues affecting the Borough and likely evolution without implementation of the plan**

Issue	Likely evolution without implementation of the plan
A high degree of new housing required in the Borough in line with housing target contained in Local Plan Part 1	Without Local Plan Part 2 including further allocations, there would be a higher risk of speculative planning applications being permitted in less sustainable locations. Planned allocations at the more sustainable locations would ensure a more sustainable pattern of development and that development occurs where there are services and facilities in place.
Some of the rural settlements within the Borough are very isolated and suffer from poor transport links.	As above, including in Local Plan Part 2 allocations in the more sustainable settlements will help ensure those more isolated areas to do not have large scale housing development in those more isolated areas.
Older than average age profile and an ageing population	The average age of the population at the end of the plan period will be an ageing population, and this will likely not be significantly altered by planning for new housing. Development of new housing and employment opportunities through Local Plan Part 2 will encourage younger people to remain in the Borough, or encourage young families to migrate into the Borough. The NPPF requires that local authorities plan for housing for a variety of different types of people including older people and those with young families. This is to be achieved through the Local Plan and the provision of facilities such as appropriate housing which will not only cater for older people but also families with younger children will help to encourage the development of a more balanced population in terms of age. Without the implementation of the new Local Plan this issue would therefore be less well addressed.
House prices are high within the Borough and there is a significant need for affordable housing provision.	The need for affordable housing would increase as house prices are expected to rise. Affordable housing and the right type of housing may not be delivered in the most appropriate locations where there is the most need. The NPPF requires that policy is set to meet affordable housing on site and as such the implementation of a new Local Plan would be required to achieve this aim. Without allocating further housing in Local Plan Part 2, the market will stifle and artificially inflate house prices further.
Localised areas of relatively high deprivation within Rushcliffe in Keyworth, Cotgrave and Bingham.	The provision of employment and housing with improved linkages to existing communities alongside improvements to facilities and the local environment can help to address deprivation. With no Local Plan Part 2, these improvements may not occur.
The proportion of Rushcliffe's workforce employed in the service	Without Local Plan Part 2, no further employment allocations will be made, this will not encourage diversification of the employment sector and would not



<b>Issue</b>	<b>Likely evolution without implementation of the plan</b>
sector is large – proportionally higher than the regional and national averages	encourage development of other employment uses.
There are areas of flood risk in the Borough	The NPPF supports development which is not within areas of high flood risk and does not increase flood risk elsewhere. A sequential and exception test is to be applied when approaching the location of development through the Local Plan in relation to areas of flood risk. Development would be less controlled in relation to flood risk therefore if the Local Plan was not adopted and given that there are areas of high flood risk in the Borough this could potentially lead development being located within these areas, increasing flood risk in other areas.
There are a large number of sites which are important in terms of biodiversity which should be conserved and enhanced where possible.	No further policy to protect sites at risk or encourage improvements to biodiversity. Local Plan Part 2 will encourage further complementary policy on Green Infrastructure, identifying locally important networks which will also have a positive benefit for biodiversity.
Rushcliffe now has two air quality management areas all of which have been declared due to traffic pollution and in particular due to excessive levels of the annual Nitrogen Dioxide above the air quality objective (AQO) level in certain areas.	Further guidance provided in Local Plan Part 2 in relation to air quality. Although Local Plan Part 2 may not directly influence air pollution, further guidance on how new development should address this will be included in the plan.
There is a need to improve energy efficiency and reduce contributions to climate change.	Ensuring that allocations are made in accordance with a spatial hierarchy which establishes the more sustainable settlements and areas adjacent to the main urban area for development. i.e. those areas which will have less dependence on the car and greater opportunities for public transport. Without Local Plan Part 2, further development could be permitted in less sustainable locations. Local Plan Part 2 can also include further policy on appropriate renewable energy technologies. Without the implementation of the Local Plan development for renewable energy schemes is more likely to be proposed in a less coordinate manner and may potentially be in areas which are less suitable for this type of development in sustainability terms. This is particularly likely considering the NPPF’s requirement for all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Likely evolution without implementation of the plan</b>
<p>There is a need to conserve and enhance Rushcliffe's distinctive character and contribute towards creating a sense of place within new developments</p>	<p>The NPPF requires that in determining planning applications, applicants are aware of heritage assets affected by development. However without allocating specific sites for housing, employment and other types of development in the Borough development is more likely to be proposed in areas which may affect the setting of heritage assets, which could influence sense of place.</p>

## **B. Sustainability Appraisal: Summary of Draft Policies**

1. Each of the draft policies have been appraised against 15 criteria (as shown in **Table 1** above).
2. **Tables 5** and **Tables 6** show the key findings of the appraisal process on the draft policies, and where amendments to the draft policies have been suggested.

**Table 5: SA summary of draft policies and recommended amendments to policy (Development Management Policies)**

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
Policy 1: Development Requirements	No significant impacts identified. Positive impact on the majority of the objectives. The criteria listed in the policy designed to consider environmental impacts of development so a positive impact on those objectives. No significant impact on economic objectives.	<u>Landscape objective:</u> Include impact on landscape character in the criteria of the policy	Yes
Policy 11: Housing Development on Unallocated Sites within Settlements	No significant impacts identified. Minor positive impacts highlighted for Heritage and Landscape as policy criteria includes consideration of impact of proposal on historic features, local character and impact on landscape.	None	N/A
Policy 12: Housing Standards	Significant positive impact on Health objective as provision of accessible housing of the standards proposed will help people with mobility issues and the elderly. Significant positive impact on the natural resources objective as policy requires more stringent water efficiency standards, thereby helping to conserve a natural resource.	None	N/A
Policy 13: Self Build and Custom Housing Provision	No significant impacts identified.	<u>Natural Resources objective:</u> Amend justification text to encourage eco-friendly design and construction as this type of development	Yes

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
		offers greater opportunities for this.	
Policy 14: Specialist Residential Accommodation	No significant impacts identified. Minor positive impacts on Housing and Health as it will help promote a more diverse mix of housing which meets the needs of the local population. Policy wording considers impact on existing health facilities	None	N/A
Policy 15: Employment Development	Significant positive impacts on the economic objectives, including employment. Will encourage employment opportunities in the rural areas complementing planned housing growth. Minor negative impact on Biodiversity and GI as will result in a loss of greenfield sites at Keyworth and Radcliffe. Minor negative impacts also identified in relation to transport and natural resources as two of the sites are in more isolated locations (Bunny Brickworks and Hollygate Lane) which wouldn't encourage public transport use.	None	N/A
Policy 16: Renewable Energy	Significant positive impacts on environmental objectives of Natural Resources and energy as policy identifies potentially suitable areas for wind turbines which would offer more certainty to developers . Policy also encourages development of other renewable technologies (where they are compatible with other objectives)	<u>Natural Resources objective</u> : Include Agricultural Land Value as one of the factors to consider when assessing proposals for renewable schemes.	Yes

<b>Draft Policy</b>	<b>Key Sustainability Appraisal findings</b>	<b>Recommended changes to policy</b>	<b>Change incorporated in the draft plan</b>
Policy 17: Managing Flood Risk	Significant positive benefits identified for Biodiversity and GI as policy includes a sub section on biodiversity. Policy seeks to promote the creation of new areas for habitats and species and to reconnect sites to the flood plain. Positive impact on Flooding objective as primary purpose of policy is to manage the risk of flooding.	None	N/A
Policy 18: Surface Water Management	No significant impacts identified. Minor positive impacts on the environmental objectives and also health as well designed SuDS can form part of the GI network and encourage more active lifestyles through walking . Positive impact on water quality, biodiversity (improved wetland habitats)	None	N/A
Policy 19: Development affecting Watercourses	No significant impacts identified. Positive impacts on environmental objectives – key part of the policy is encouraging restoring natural features of watercourses. Therefore positive impact on Natural Resources, Biodiversity and GI and Flooding objectives.	None	N/A
Policy 20: Managing Water Quality	No significant impacts identified. Positive impacts on some of the environmental objectives as policy designed to protect water quality, which would require reduced pollutants. Improved water quality in rivers, streams and other water bodies would be of positive benefits to wider ecological network	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	through improved conditions for habitats.		
Policy 22: Development within the Countryside	No significant impacts identified. Minor positive impacts on the environmental objectives as the policy is designed to protect sites outside of settlements (i.e. greenfield sites) from development. Policy wording refers to the need to protect sites with ecological value. Overall thrust of policy designed to prevent isolated development in the countryside which would potentially have a negative impact on landscape character.	None	N/A
Policy 23: Redevelopment of Bunny Brickworks	No significant impacts identified. Due to the relatively isolated location of the site, minor negative impacts highlighted for the Transport objective as there would be greater use of the motor car instead of walking, cycling, public transport due to the distance to key facilities and relatively infrequent bus service. There are positives identified for the re-use of previously developed land on the Natural Resources objective however.	None	N/A
Policy 24: Redevelopment of former Islamic Institute, Flintham	Significant positive impact identified on the Natural Resources objective as development would involve the reuse of PDL, which represents an efficient use of land. Minor negative on the Transport objective as the village does not benefit from a wide range of services and does not have a frequent bus	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	service and is some distance from a major centre so public transport use and walking cycling would not be incentivised.		
Policy 25: Development within District and Local Centres	Significant positive impact on the Health objective identified as the policy seeks to limit the % of hot food takeaways which will help encourage healthier lifestyles (obesity). Minor positive impacts identified for the Social objective as policy designed to encourage vibrant centres with a range of uses, both retail and non retail, which could therefore include proposals for community uses.	None	N/A
Policy 26: Development within the Centres of Neighbourhood Importance	Similar impacts identified as for Development within District and Local Centres.	None	N/A
Policy 27: Main Town Centre Uses Outside District Centres or Local Centres	No significant impacts identified. Positive impact on Transport objective as policy designed to concentrate main town centre uses in areas that have better public transport accessibility and located in more sustainable locations.	None	N/A
Policy 28: Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets	Significant positive impact on Heritage objective as policy designed to conserve and enhance the historic environment.	None	N/A
Policy 29: Development affecting Archaeological Sites	Significant positive impact on Heritage objective as the purpose of the policy is to protect sites of known or potential archaeological interest.	None	N/A



Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
Policy 30: Protection of Community Facilities	No significant impacts identified. Positive impact on the social objectives as policy designed to protect community facilities. Protecting these helps retain social cohesiveness.	None	N/A
Policy 31: Sustainable Tourism and Leisure	Significant positive impact on Heritage objective as policy supports restoration of Grantham Canal and includes policy wording to protect Transport Heritage Centre and Great Central Railway. Minor positive impacts on the environmental objectives as the policy also designed to protect identified GI features that form part of recreational routes.	None	N/A
Policy 32: Recreational Open Space	No significant impacts identified. Minor positive impacts identified on the environmental objectives and the Health objective as provision or improvement of recreational facilities will encourage healthier lifestyles by improving opportunities for recreational physical activity.	None	N/A
Policy 33: Local Green Space	No significant impacts identified. Minor negative impacts on housing and employment as designation will prevent development on these sites. Minor positive impacts identified on Health and Heritage objectives (as some are designated for their historic features) and other environmental objectives as the policy will preserve sites as greenfields.	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
Policy 34: Green Infrastructure and Open Space Assets	Significant positive impacts on the Health, Social, Biodiversity & GI objectives as the policy designed to protect GI from development. Social and community benefits from protecting type of facilities named in the policy as these are used by for example, community allotment groups, sports and recreation groups. Policy designed to protect and promote enhancement of GI – this will protect features with ecological value.	None	N/A
Policy 35: Green Infrastructure Network and Urban Fringe	Policy requires new developments within the urban fringe to incorporate accessible infrastructure that provides recreational opportunities, wildlife benefits and enables pedestrian and cycle access to the countryside – thereby having a positive impact on the Health objective and Biodiversity objective.	None	N/A
Policy 36: Designated Nature Conservation Sites	Significant positive impact on the Biodiversity and GI objectives as policy designed to protect these features by giving further policy on how proposals should address ecological issues and incorporate protection of designated sites.	None	N/A
Policy 37: Trees and Woodlands	No significant impacts identified. Minor positive impact on Heritage (reference included in policy to protection of ageing and veteran trees) and Biodiversity, Green Infrastructure and Landscape objectives.	None	N/A
Policy 38:	Significant positive benefits on the Biodiversity	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
Non-Designated Biodiversity Assets and The Wider Ecological Network	and Green Infrastructure objective as policy gives further requirements for proposals to include measures to improve important habitats that aren't designated but still of ecological value. Policy requires developments to achieve a net gain in biodiversity and also incorporate elements of biodiversity in the schemes. Policy refers to the Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report which gives further clarity on what are the priority habitats and focal areas.		
Policy 39: Health Impacts of Development	No significant impacts identified. Minor positive impact on the Health objective – not considered significant as policy in itself will not improve the health of the Borough.	None	N/A
Policy 40: Pollution and Land Contamination	Significant positive impacts identified on the Natural Resources objective as policy seeks to ensure proposed development doesn't lead to an unacceptable level of pollution or be jeopardize health though building on contaminated sites. Noise pollution, air pollution and light pollution all cited in the policy which should ensure impact on these is considered through appropriate schemes of mitigation. Minor positive impact on Health objective	None	N/A
Policy 41: Air Quality	Policy has a significant positive benefit on the Health objective and Natural Resources objective.		

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
Policy 42: Safeguarding Minerals	Significant policy benefit on Natural Resources as policy is designed to protect areas that are rich in minerals. Minor negative on housing and employment as this may prevent certain sites coming forward for housing or employment uses.		
Policy 43: Planning Obligations Threshold	No significant impacts identified. Minor positive impacts on those objectives related to the type of infrastructure required by the policy.	<u>Biodiversity and GI objective</u>  Include in policy text more description on what is meant by 'biodiversity improvements'	Yes

**Table 6: SA summary of draft policies and recommended amendments to policy (Allocated Sites)**

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
<b>Cotgrave</b>			
<p>Policy 2.1 Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park, Cotgrave</p>	<p>Development of this site will provide a major positive for the Housing objective as around 170 houses will be built, 10% of which will be affordable. The site has good linkages to the adjacent Cotgrave Country Park and Grantham Canal which provide opportunities to address the Health objective. The site provides good opportunities to access local shops, facilities and public transport, therefore reducing private car use.</p> <p>Negative impacts on environmental objectives due to inevitable increases in the production of waste, energy consumption, and use of natural resources. Minor negative on the Biodiversity and GI objective due to the potential loss of priority habitats.</p>	None	N/A
<p>Policy 2.2 Land south of Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave</p>	<p>Development of this site will provide a major positive for the Housing objective as around 180 houses will be built, 10% of which will be affordable. The subsequent increase in population would help sustain the settlement's services and facilities. The allocation of this site therefore supports SA housing and social objectives.</p> <p>Negative impacts on environmental objectives due to inevitable increases in the production of</p>	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	waste, energy consumption, and use of natural resources. Minor negative on the Biodiversity and GI objective due to the potential loss of priority habitats.		
<b>East Leake</b>			
Policy 3.1 Land north of Rempstone Road, East Leake	Development will have a major positive for the Housing objective by providing around 120 dwellings with 20% of the dwellings (up to 24) for affordable housing. Significant negative impact on the Natural Resources objective due to loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. Minor negative on the Biodiversity and GI objective due to the potential loss of priority habitats. Minor negative identified on the Transport objective due to the site being some distance from the village centre (1.25km).		
<b>Keyworth</b>			
Policy 4.1 Land off Nicker Hill, Keyworth	Development will have a major positive for the Housing objective by providing around 150 dwellings with 20% of the dwellings (up to 30) for affordable housing. Minor negative identified for the Landscape objective as site is of higher landscape quality. The development of the site for housing and will inevitably conflict with Waste, Energy and Natural Resources objectives. Minor negative on the Biodiversity and GI objective due to the	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	potential loss of priority habitats.		
Policy 4.2 Land between Platt Lane and Station Road, Keyworth	Development will have a major positive for the Housing objective by providing around 190 dwellings with 20% (up to 38) for affordable housing. Significant negative on the Natural Resources objective as the site is Grade 2 agricultural land value (Best and Most Versatile). Part of the site identified as being at high risk of flooding from surface water but mitigation could reduce this through SuDS. The development of the site for housing and will inevitably conflict with Waste and Energy objectives. Minor negative on the Biodiversity and GI objective due to the potential loss of priority habitats.	None	N/A
Policy 4.3 Land south of Debdale Lane, Keyworth	Development will have a major positive for the Housing objective by providing around 190 dwellings with 20% (up to 38) for affordable housing. Significant negative on the Natural Resources objective as part of the site is Grade 2 agricultural land value (Best and Most Versatile). Part of the site identified as being at high risk of flooding from surface water but mitigation could reduce this through SuDS. The development of the site for housing and will inevitably conflict with Waste and Energy objectives. Minor negative on the Biodiversity and GI objective due to the potential loss of	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	priority habitats.		
Policy 4.4 Hillside Farm, Keyworth	Minor positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 50 dwellings with 20% (up to 10) as affordable. Significant negative on the Natural Resources objective as part of the site is Grade 2 agricultural land value (Best and Most Versatile). Part of the site identified as being at high risk of flooding from surface water but mitigation could reduce this through SuDS. The development of the site for housing and will inevitably conflict with Waste and Energy objectives. Minor negative on the Biodiversity and GI objective due to the potential loss of priority habitats.	None	N/A
<b>Radcliffe on Trent</b>			
Policy 5.1 Land north of Nottingham Road, Radcliffe on Trent	Significant positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 150 dwellings with 30% (up to 45) as affordable. Minor negative identified for the Flooding objective as the site is within Flood Zone 2 and a significant area of the site is at a high risk, medium and low risk of surface water flooding. Most recent SFRA work indicates that only the northern part of the site is at risk of flooding in a 1 in 1000 flood risk event however. Minor positive impact also identified on the Employment and Economic Structure objectives as policy requires part of the site to be developed for employment uses. Minor negative on the Biodiversity and GI	None	N/A



Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	objective due to the potential loss of priority habitats.		
Policy 5.2 Land adjacent Grooms Cottage, Radcliffe on Trent	Minor positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 50 dwellings with 30% (up to 15) as affordable. Minor negative impacts on environmental SA objectives due to the potential adverse effects on priority habitats; however this could potentially be mitigated. In terms of landscape, there is considered to be a minor negative effect as the site is of medium landscape value.. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives. In terms of social objectives, there would be a positive impact in that the site would provide for additional housing to meet local and market area demand..	None	N/A
Policy 5.3 Land off Shelford Road, Radcliffe on Trent	Significant positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 400 dwellings with 30% (up to 120) as affordable. Minor positive impact on the Health objective as policy requires provision of a new health centre on the site. Minor negative on Heritage objective due to an identified area of potential archaeology. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives. Significant negative on the Natural	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	Resources objective due to the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land.		
Policy 5.4 Land north of Grantham Road, Radcliffe on Trent	Significant positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 240 dwellings with 30% (up to 72) as affordable. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives. Significant negative on the Natural Resources objective due to the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. Minor negative on the Biodiversity and GI objective as a LWS lies adjacent to the site. Minor negatives identified on the Flooding objective as there are areas identified at high risk of surface water flooding but this could be mitigated through SuDS.	None	N/A
Policy 5.5 72 Main Road, Radcliffe on Trent	Due to minor level of housing proposed not considered to have a major impact on the Housing objective. Positive impact on the Transport objective due to proximity to village centre and accessibility of village services and public transport which should reduce reliance on the motor car.	None	N/A
Policy 5.6 The Paddocks, Radcliffe on Trent	Minor positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 75 dwellings with 30% (up to 22) as affordable. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives. Minor negatives	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	identified on the Flooding objective as there are areas identified at high risk of surface water flooding but this could be mitigated through SuDS.		
<b>Ruddington</b>			
Policy 6.1 Land west of Wilford Road, Ruddington	Significant positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 130 dwellings with 30% (up to 39) as affordable. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives. Significant negative identified against the Flooding objective as there are areas within the site in Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3. There is also a negative impact identified against the Biodiversity and GI objective as the site is bounded by Packman Dyke which feeds into the Fairham Brook (a priority habitat).	None	N/A
Policy 6.2 Land south of Flawforth Lane, Ruddington	Minor positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 50 dwellings with 30% (up to 15) as affordable. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives. Minor negatives identified on the Flooding objective as there are areas identified at high risk of surface water flooding but this could be mitigated through SuDS. Minor negative highlighted for the Heritage objective due to the impact on the	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	setting of the nearby Conservation Area and Grade II listed Easthorpe House. Minor positive impact on Transport objective due to close proximity to both a frequent bus service and the centre of the village which should incentivise walking and public transport use.		
Policy 6.3 Land opposite Mere Way, Ruddington	Significant positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 170 dwellings with 30% (up to 51) as affordable. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives. Minor negatives identified on the Flooding objective as there are areas identified at low risk of surface water flooding but this could be mitigated through SuDS. Minor negative highlighted for the Heritage objective due to the potential for harm to panoramic views from Loughborough Road out of the Conservation Area. Minor positive for the Health objective due to opportunities for physical recreation provided at the nearby Country Park.	None	N/A
<b>Cropwell Bishop</b>			
Policy 7 Land east of Church St, Cropwell Bishop	Minor positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 70 dwellings with 30% (up to 21) as affordable. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives. Minor negatives	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	<p>identified on the Flooding objective as there are areas identified at high risk of surface water flooding but this could be mitigated through SuDS. Negative impact highlighted for the Transport objective as although there is a bus stop within a 5 minute walk, this is not served by a frequent service.</p>		
<b>East Bridgford</b>			
<p>Policy 8.1 Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford</p>	<p>Minor positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 80 dwellings with 30% (up to 24) as affordable. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives. Significant negative impact on the Natural Resources objective due to the loss of Best and Most Versatile Land. Negative impact highlighted for the Transport objective as although there is a bus stop within a 5 minute walk, this is not served by a frequent service.</p>	None	N/A
<p>Policy 8.2 Land south of Butt Lane, East Bridgford</p>	<p>Minor positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 45 dwellings with 30% (up to 13) as affordable. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives. Significant negative impact on the Natural Resources objective due to the loss of Best and Most Versatile Land. Negative impact highlighted for the Transport</p>	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	objective as although there is a bus stop within a 5 minute walk, this is not served by a frequent service. Minor negative also identified for the Heritage objective as the East Bridgford Conservation Area borders the site.		
<b>Gotham</b>			
Policy 9 Land east of Gypsum Way/ The Orchards, Gotham	Minor positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 70 dwellings with 30% (up to 21) as affordable. Minor negative impact on Biodiversity and GI objective as an LWS borders the site and the site is also included within the Gotham Hills Ecological Network. Minor negatives identified on the Flooding objective as there are areas identified at high, medium and low risk of surface water flooding but this could be mitigated through SuDS. Neutral impact on Transport as although not in close proximity to Nottingham, the village is well served by public transport.	None	N/A
<b>Sutton Bonington</b>			
Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington	Minor positive to the Housing objective as contributing around 80 dwellings with 30% (up to 24) as affordable. The development of the site for housing and their occupation will inevitably conflict with waste, energy and climate change objectives Minor negatives identified on the Flooding objective as there are areas identified at high, of surface water flooding but this could be mitigated through	None	N/A

Draft Policy	Key Sustainability Appraisal findings	Recommended changes to policy	Change incorporated in the draft plan
	SuDS.Minor negative on the Transport objective as although there is a bus stop within 5 mins walking distance, this is not served by a frequent service.		