

South Gloucestershire

# LOCAL PLAN

2018-2036

## Sustainability Appraisal

February 2018

## Contents

2. Scoping Report & Sustainability Objectives.....	1
3. Undertaking Sustainability Appraisal - New Local Plan Consultation Document.....	1
4. Sustainability Appraisal Approach - New Local Plan Consultation Document Components.....	4
Core Strategy Developments .....	4
Strategic Development Places .....	4
Approach to Urban Living.....	5
Non-Strategic Growth in Rural Areas .....	5
Policy Discussion Points .....	6
5. New Approach to Urban Living – Sustainability Appraisal .....	7
Urban Living – Sustainability Considerations Findings.....	7
Increasing Housing Delivery and Density .....	7
Addressing Deprivation and Inequality .....	8
Wise Use of Land.....	8
Retail, Education and Employment Sustainable Access.....	8
Capacity Pressure.....	8
Ecology and Heritage Considerations .....	9
Uncertain Effects on Employment Land .....	9
Heat Networks .....	9
6. Non-Strategic Growth Options Sustainability Appraisal .....	10
Non-Strategic Growth Options - Sustainability Appraisal Methodology .....	11
Limitations – At this stage .....	12
Non-Strategic Growth Options – Alternative Options Not Considered Realistic .....	12
Non-Strategic Growth Options – SA Findings .....	13
Table 1 - Non-Strategic Growth Options – Appraisal Effects.....	14
General Findings - Uncertain Effects.....	15
Range of Places in each Option – Potential Effect .....	15
Non-Strategic Housing Delivery and Proportional Development.....	15
Green Belt.....	15
Air Quality .....	15
Access to Educational Facilities .....	16
Access to Healthcare & Hospitals .....	16
Access to Employment.....	16
Potential Impact on Heritage, Ecology and Landscape Assets and their Settings .....	17
Potential Loss of High Quality Agricultural Land & Flood Risk.....	17
Appendix 1 – SA Framework (Sustainability Objectives and Effect Criteria).....	18

# 1. What is Sustainability Appraisal

1.1 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a statutory requirement for development plans. It is a process used to assess the economic, social and environmental implications of proposed planning policies to help inform the plan-making process. The intention is to promote sustainable development by better integrating sustainability considerations into the preparation of planning documents.

1.2 Undertaking SA during the preparation of a plan aids understanding of choices between alternative policy options and different policy choices, highlighting potential problems and opportunities.

## 2. Scoping Report & Sustainability Objectives.

2.1 In September 2017 the council published a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the new Local Plan for comment over a 5 week period.

2.2 The Scoping Report sets out baseline data on sustainability issues in South Gloucestershire, key issues relating to sustainability along with plans and programmes relevant to consider when producing the new Local Plan. The key output of the Scoping Report is the identification of a set of Sustainability Objectives. These Objectives are used to appraise the potential effects of emerging policy and options for achieving growth.

2.3 Comments on the Scoping Report were received from the following statutory agencies: Natural England, Environment Agency and Heritage England. Subsequently, the Sustainability Objectives have been updated. Appendix 1 contains the SA Framework, which sets out each Sustainability Objective along with “effect criteria”, which are examples for each Objective of what would be considered a positive or a negative effect.

2.4 It should be noted that updating the baseline data, plans and programmes and Sustainability Objectives will be a continual process during the preparation of the new Local Plan. The current revised version of the Scoping Report, dated XX (TBC) 2017 is available to view online here: (LINK TO BE INSERTED)

## 3. Undertaking Sustainability Appraisal - New Local Plan Consultation Document

3.1 The new Local Plan Consultation Document, sets out a strategy for growth that has four main components (See Part 2 of the document (LINK TO BE INSERTED)). The new Local Plan also contains a fifth component related to individual development polices. Combined the five components of the new Local Plan Consultation Document are:

1. **Core Strategy Developments** - As part of the new Local Plan period 22,300 new homes which arose from the Core Strategy are proposed to be constructed up to 2036.

2. **JSP, Strategic Development Places** - The JSP has identified that these new larger scale developments will deliver a minimum of 6,000 new homes (within the plan period) as well as new employment opportunities.
3. **Urban Living** - The JSP has identified that this new approach to urban living will deliver a minimum of 2,900 additional homes as well as employment opportunities in the urban areas of South Gloucestershire
4. **Non-Strategic Development in the rest of South Gloucestershire** - The JSP has identified a need for 1,300 new homes and the potential for an additional 500 home contingency, in the rural areas of South Gloucestershire
5. **Policy Discussion Points** – This section of sets out discussion points for a range of policy areas.

3.2 The approach to undertaking SA of the new Local Plan Consultation Document and its various components has taken into consideration National Planning Policy Guidance note: Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. Of particular relevance to sustainability appraisal at this early stage of the new Local Plan are the following sections:

*“The sustainability appraisal should only focus on what is needed to assess the likely significant effects of the Local Plan. It should focus on the environmental, economic and social impacts that are likely to be significant. It does not need to be done in any more detail, or using more resources, than is considered to be appropriate for the content and level of detail in the Local Plan”.* Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 11-009-20140306

*...The sustainability appraisal should identify any likely significant adverse effects and measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and, as fully as possible, offset them. The sustainability appraisal must consider all reasonable alternatives and assess them in the same level of detail as the option the plan-maker proposes to take forward in the Local Plan (the preferred approach).*

*Reasonable alternatives are the different realistic options considered by the plan-maker in developing the policies in its plan. They must be sufficiently distinct to highlight the different sustainability implications of each so that meaningful comparisons can be made. The alternatives must be realistic and deliverable...*  
Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 11-018-20140306

3.3 The early stage of a plan’s preparation are often focused on high level ideas for policy and approaches, with the content often focussing on potential issues, challenges and opportunities. This means the various components of this consultation document do not contain sufficient detail, information or clarity to be subject to full Sustainability Appraisal. Undertaking a full SA of many components of the new Local Plan Consultation Document would not be proportionate to the information available at this stage and would result in very uncertain findings and minimal useful outputs.

3.4 For many elements of the new Local Plan at this stage there are no realistic alternatives to the proposed high level approach set down in the JSP. Most of the components at this stage do not yet contain a level of detail which allows exploration of different options to achieve the high level approach. Moreover, neither is it the role of the SA to the Local Plan to assess matters which are the role and purpose of the JSP and its supporting SA to undertake.

3.5 However, undertaking SA of this early stage plan can be useful to highlight sustainability issues for further consideration as the plan progresses and inform more detailed appraisal. Where sufficient detail is available with regards to policy approaches, or broad options exist, the SA process can also be used at this stage to highlight the potential for negative, positive or uncertain effects, which will need further investigation and appraisal as the plan progresses. As further work on the new Local Plan progresses, detailed policies and sites will be identified which will be subject to further SA.

## 4. Sustainability Appraisal Approach - New Local Plan Consultation Document Components

4.1 The section below sets out the approach to undertaking SA on each component of the new Local Plan Consultation Document, taking account of the relevant guidance, potential for alternative approaches to certain topics, and current lack of detail on the end policy approach.

### Core Strategy Developments

4.2 A requirement for a minimum of 28,355 new homes was found sound in the Core Strategy (adopted 2013). As part of the new Local Plan period, covering 2018-2036, 22,300 new homes which arose from the Core Strategy are proposed to be constructed.

4.3 The selection of strategic sites and the decision to allocate them for development in the Core Strategy was subject to a separate sustainability appraisal process as part of the Core Strategy work. The strategic commitments are now subject to live applications and others have already been permitted for development. They have been factored into the JSP as a key competent of growth and will continue to be built out during the plan period.

4.4 There is not considered to be a need for further Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy commitments. No alternatives to this component of growth have been investigated, as a 'do nothing' or different approach on large strategic sites, in an adopted Plan with live and current permissions is not considered realistic or necessary at this stage.

4.5 **Appraisal Outcome:** This component of the new Local Plan Consultation Document is not subject to consideration of alternative option or further Sustainability Appraisal work.

### Strategic Development Places

4.6 Five Strategic Development Places (Yate, Charfield, Thornbury, Coalpit Heath and Buckover Garden Village) have been chosen to achieve the best access to existing or improved transport corridors and support existing or new services and facilities. Collectively these will provide 8500 new homes and employment opportunities, of which 6,000 are to be built out in this Plan period (i.e. up to 2036).

4.7 The principle and alternative approaches explored to establish these SDLs have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal as part of work on the Joint Spatial Plan. The SA of the JSP can be found here (<https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti/JSPPublication/view?objectId=313139#313139>). There is not considered to be a need for further SA of the principle of the SDLs and a 'do nothing' option in the new Local Plan is not considered realistic.

4.8 However, future versions of the emerging Local Plan will identify development boundaries for each of the SDLs.

4.9 **Appraisal Outcome:** This component of the new Local Plan Consultation Document is not subject to consideration of alternative options to the inclusion of SDL's or further sustainability appraisal work at this stage. It should be noted that future stages of the new Local Plan will likely contain additional detail on SDLs, above and beyond that set in the

JSP. The detail and any options at the SDLs in South Gloucestershire will be subject to further Sustainability Appraisal at that stage.

### **Approach to Urban Living**

4.10 The JSP requires a focus on maximising the potential of urban areas and sets out a target for 2,900 new homes within the Urban Area of South Gloucestershire. As this component has been introduced by the JSP there is not considered to be a 'do nothing' option.

4.11 The new Local Plan sets out a high level approach to achieve urban living, to meet the target for new homes in the main urban areas of South Gloucestershire. Whilst it is stated that this will require a new approach to maximise the use of brownfield land within our urban areas for both residential and employment uses, there are no detailed policies or detailed site allocations identified at this stage. Despite this, it was considered appropriate to begin considering sustainability issues that could arise from the approach to urban living, taking account of the potential locational focus of future delivery.

4.12 Future stages of the Plan will contain further detail on the urban living approach, and likely options across the urban areas for achieving the target currently proposed by the JSP of 2900 new homes, along with individual site allocations and if necessary area specific policies. These will be suitable for a full SA of potential effects and any options arising.

4.13 **Appraisal Outcome:** The overall requirement for Urban Living component of the new Local Plan Consultation Document is driven by the JSP and therefore there is not considered to be an alternative option. However, consideration of sustainability implications of the proposed approach to meeting the urban living target is provided in this report. Future stages of the new Local Plan will be subject to fuller SA as detail of the urban living policies and approach increases in parallel with confirmation of the final target through the JSP Examination process.

**4.14 Sustainability consideration of the Urban Living component of this new Local Plan consultation document, is set out in section 5 of this document**

### **Non-Strategic Growth in Rural Areas**

4.15 The JSP has identified a need for additional non-strategic scale development, with 1,300 homes being required in the current rural area of South Gloucestershire and a potential additional 500 home contingency; because this target has been set by the JSP there is not considered to be a 'do nothing' option.

4.16 There are considered to be realistic alternative options for how this component of the required growth is approached, at this early stage of the new Local Plan, which are set out in the Consultation Document.

4.17 The council is carrying out a Sustainability Appraisal, which focusses on understanding the effects of the 3 high level options for achieving the target for non-strategic growth in the rural area. As this stage of the plan the level of non-strategic growth within individual places has not been assessed as this detail is not currently known.

**4.18 Outcome: Section 6 of this document, sets out the sustainability appraisal of 3 high level options for Non-Strategic Growth target in the rural areas.**

## Policy Discussion Points

4.19 This section of the new Local Plan Consultation Document sets out discussion points for a range of policy areas. However these discussion points do not contain sufficient policy detail to appraise and understand potential sustainability effects.

4.20 In future stages of the plan, when detailed policies are presented, they will be appraised to understand their effect on sustainability.

4.21 **Appraisal Outcome:** This component of the new Local Plan Consultation Document is not subject to sustainability appraisal at this stage due to lack of detail and information. Future versions of policy and potential policy options will be subject to SA consideration.



## 5. New Approach to Urban Living – Sustainability Appraisal

5.1 The new Local Plan consultation document sets out how a new approach to development in the urban area will provide for 2900 new homes and other uses.

5.2 The requirement for urban living to deliver this quantum of growth, and the focus for the growth in the existing urban areas of South Gloucestershire is set by the JSP. Therefore there is not considered to be a sound or realistic do nothing option, or a set of different options to this component of growth.

5.3 The new Local Plan consultation document at this stage is limited to setting out that achieving the required levels of growth will require a new approach to development in the urban areas of South Gloucestershire and identifies broad considerations and a number of high level urban localities where growth will be focussed. In the future there may well be different options for achieving urban living due to different approaches within the urban localities, choices on individual development sites, differing detailed policy and funding available. However, at this stage of the plan, the Urban Living section does not provide detailed policy considerations and outputs, or identify sites and detailed approaches within individual localities as to how growth might be achieved.

5.4 Accordingly, the sustainability appraisal (SA) at this stage has assessed the proposed high level approach to urban living along with the opportunities and challenges flowing from this approach. The Approach to Urban Living, Opportunities and Challenges set out in the consultation document can be viewed in the consultation document here ([Insert Hyperlink](#)).

5.5 Due to the high level nature of the urban living approach, the SA does not contain scoring against the sustainability objectives. Instead consideration of the individual sustainability objectives against the proposed urban living approach, opportunities and challenges has been used to highlight the potential impact on different areas of sustainability and understand key sustainability issues to be aware of for future stages of the plan and sustainability appraisal.

5.6 Presented below are the findings from consideration of this new approach to urban living and the effects on opportunities and challenges against the sustainability objectives. **Appendix 1** sets out the Sustainability Objectives.

### Urban Living – Sustainability Considerations Findings

#### Increasing Housing Delivery and Density

5.7 The urban living approach aims to encourage higher density mixed-uses and building more housing around town centres, including above shops and offices. By using higher densities, South Gloucestershire Council is able to deliver more houses in urban areas than with previous approaches, and will also be able to provide a wider variety of housing types. This has the potential to positively impact objective 2a 'Deliver a suitable quantum of high quality housing for South Gloucestershire', and 2b, 'Deliver a suitable mix of high quality housing types and tenures'.

## **Addressing Deprivation and Inequality**

5.8 The urban living approach also has the potential to enable more diverse, resilient and sustainable urban communities; through increasing the supply and choice of housing and employment. By encouraging investment, development and regeneration, including diversification of economies in the areas of South Gloucestershire suffering from deprivation such as Kingswood and Staple Hill, the approach can generate long term economic sustainability. However, until more information is available regarding individual site places and proposals it is not possible to assess the impacts on specific places fully.

## **Wise Use of Land**

5.9 By using the existing urban area to increase density the Urban Living approach also maximises the use of brownfield land, which reduces the requirement for utilising green field land and rural land beyond the urban areas, which serves a purpose for amenity, landscapes and in places food growing for urban and rural residents alike.

## **Retail, Education and Employment Sustainable Access**

5.10 Because the urban living approach focusses on pre-existing urban centres with high streets, town centres, food buying opportunities and educational facilities, there is the potential for development to provide a positive impact on objectives relating to sustainable access to retail/food buying facilities (2e) and sustainable access to educational facilities (2d). An additional impact may be that the increased footfall and presence of mixed use development has the potential to increase the customer base for retail and town centre facilities, providing an economic boost to the area

5.11 Locating development in existing urban centres means that new residents will have good access to existing employment opportunities, with the potential for positive effects on objective 3b 'Sustainable access to major employment areas'. Furthermore, the urban living approach aims to increase the supply of housing and employment space, helping to diversify local economies, provide a range of business premises (including through the redevelopment of underused land) and revitalise employment areas. However, for all of the above, until more information is available regarding individual site places and proposals it is not possible to assess the effects to a high level of certainty.

## **Capacity Pressure**

5.12 As explained above, the urban living approach aims to increase the density of urban areas, resulting in a higher population in the same amount of space. Although there are a wide range of education facilities across the localities proposed for growth, introducing a large number of new homes into urban areas may place additional pressure on these educational facilities. The same argument is also applied to community services and health facilities, however until more information is available regarding individual site places and proposals it is not possible to assess the impacts fully. These issues will need to be considered in more detail as the sites for growth and levels of growth proposed in different areas emerges.

5.13 Increased density and numbers of people in existing urban areas will also place pressure on the existing network of open spaces in the urban areas; with population increase and proposed growth, pressure on demand for access to open space is recognised. However, the approach includes reference to including green infrastructure,

quality of life, changes to green spaces and catering for all forms of transport. Green infrastructure should be a key component in planning and delivering the change proposed, especially with reference to encouraging walking and cycling facilities. The impact of regeneration and higher densities on access to open space and quantities of open space within individual localities will need to be considered in more detail as further information emerges.

### **Ecology and Heritage Considerations**

5.14 The uncertainty regarding individual site places and proposals mean that it is not possible to fully assess the impact of the urban living approach on ecology and heritage considerations, but increased density and thus increased population has the potential to create additional pressure on ecological and heritage assets. In light of this, the approach recognises the need to safeguard, celebrate and repurpose historic assets, and to this end aims to minimise impacts on and maximise enhancement opportunities for these assets.

### **Uncertain Effects on Employment Land**

5.15 The urban living approach recognises that an increased demand on existing business land and premises may require some existing employment land to be lost or changed to other uses. This may cause particular issues in localities where the number of jobs and employment opportunities has fallen in recent years, such as Kingswood and Staple Hill and will need to be considered in more detail as further detail emerges.

### **Heat Networks**

5.16 Higher density as a result of the urban living approach may make energy solutions such as heat networks more viable. There is the potential for development under this approach to connect to existing combined heat and power networks, and also encourage the provision of new networks. This will need further investigation at the site level within individual localities.

## 6. Non-Strategic Growth Options Sustainability Appraisal

6.1 The West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) requires 1300 new homes to be provided as Non-Strategic Growth across rural places in the district, these will be delivered through the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan. The JSP also proposes a contingency from non-strategic growth, comprising 500 new homes. The intention is, subject to being confirmed through the JSP, that the release of the contingency will be considered through the process of Plan review, conducted every 5 years following adoption. Release of contingency will only take place where it is demonstrated that housing provision is not being delivered at the levels being planned for and where there would be no reasonable prospect of planned delivery being met otherwise. Further details about the JSP can be found here [\[https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti/JSPPublication/consultationHome\]](https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti/JSPPublication/consultationHome).

6.2 The new Local Plan Consultation Document considered which rural places would be suitable for further investigation for Non-Strategic Growth. As a result, 35 places have been identified. These places are set out in **Table 1**, on the next page.

6.3 Appendix 1, 2 and 3 to the Non-Strategic component of the new Local Plan contains a rationale outlining why some rural places have not been considered suitable for investigation at this stage, in terms of their suitability for growth. The rationale includes responding to the sequential flood risk test set out in national policy and avoiding the most isolated rural areas which lack a basic level of sustainable access to key services and facilities, also a requirement of national policy.

6.4 For non-strategic rural growth the Council has identified three broad options. Individually each option would need to meet the requirement for 1300 new homes and the potential additional 500 new homes contingency;

**Option 1 – Rural Places Outside the Green Belt (Investigates 12 places)**

**Option 2 – Rural Places Inside the Green belt (Investigates 28 Places)**

**Option 3 – Rural Places Both Inside and Outside the Green Belt (Investigates all 35 places)**

6.5 Further detail on the process of choosing 35 places and the 3 Non-Strategic Growth Options, including the places within each option, can be found in Part 2 of the new Local Plan consultation document.

6.6 The following pages provide detail on the methodology and limitations of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) at this stage, as well as identifying the options that are not considered to be realistic alternatives for non-strategic growth. The Sustainability Appraisal of the non-strategic growth options are then providing, highlighting effects of each option against the Sustainability Objectives and providing a commentary of the main sustainability issues arising.

**Table 1 - Places for Investigation**

Almondsbury	Mangotsfield *
Alveston	Marshfield
Bitton	Old Down
Bridgeyate	Old Sodbury
Chipping Sodbury	Oldland *
Cold Ashton	Olveston
Cromhall	Pucklechurch
Easter Compton	Rangeworthy
Engine Common	Rudgeway
Falfield	Shortwood
Frampton Cotterell	Tockington
Hambrook	Tytherington
Hanham *	Warmley *
Hawkesbury Upton	Westerleigh
Hortham Village	Wick
Horton	Wickwar
Iron Acton	Winterbourne
Longwell Green *	

\* Outside Urban Area

## Non-Strategic Growth Options - Sustainability Appraisal Methodology

6.7 The Sustainability Objectives were used to appraise the potential effects of the 3 high level policy options to establish how each grouping of places might affect the various areas of sustainability.

6.8 The sustainability objectives are available to view in Appendix 1. The effect of each option, on the sustainability objectives, were considered on the following basis:

Symbol	Effect Type	Please see Appendix 1 for the SA Framework which provides examples of what would lead to a positive, negative and neutral effects on individual sustainability objectives.
++	significant positive effect	
+	positive effect	
+ / -	+/- mixed effect	
-	negative effect	
--	significant negative effect	
N	neutral effect	
n/a	not relevant	

6.9 Baseline data set out in the scoping report was utilised to inform the appraisal of effects. In addition, GIS (Geographic Information System) information relating to a range of environmental issues such as heritage assets, agricultural land values, national and local ecological sites and flood risk zones was utilised. In addition, the council's Sustainable Access Profiles and underlying evidence relating to public transport journey times also informed the evidence for objectives relating to sustainable access.

6.10 For all rural places in the non strategic growth options, a 200 metre buffer was drawn in GIS, around the edge of existing villages and settlements to capture potential environmental and other assets, rather than just considering the potential effects on sustainability issues within the existing built up area of villages or settlements. This was considered appropriate as future development sites may be located either within existing settlements or on their periphery. This level of analysis is considered proportionate given the early stage of the plan making process. The use of smaller or larger buffers maybe required as part of SA work on future versions of the plan when there is more certainty on the levels of growth and individuals sites at each rural place.

### **Limitations – At this stage**

6.11 At this stage of the plan, the Non-Strategic Options presented **do not**:

- identify individual sites around rural places;
- set levels of growth for individual places; or
- suggest a preferred approach.

6.12 At this stage the SA has focused on assessing the effect of each option in terms of how effective it would be at delivering the non-strategic growth target, set against the individual sustainability objectives. This has not involved a detailed assessment of individual settlements and potential development sites. Subsequent stages of the Plan will carry out further more detailed appraisals of individual places to reduce the uncertainty of effects where necessary and appropriate. At this stage, the Sustainability Appraisal is used to highlight broad trends and assist in revealing where groups or individual places create potential for effects e.g. some places might contain sensitive landscapes or heritage assets, while some might not.

### **Non-Strategic Growth Options – Alternative Options Not Considered Realistic**

6.13 The following options for non-strategic growth were not considered as realistic alternatives, and as such are not included as options in the new Local Plan Consultation Document or subject to sustainability appraisal.

- A. Strategic Level Growth (e.g 500+) or 3 to 4 Large Sites (e.g 350 - 500) around existing settlements, or**
- B. One or two new free standing settlements in rural area.**
- C. A percentage of Non-Strategic Growth split across all rural villages and settlements/ distribute growth based on existing size of rural village and settlement.**

6.14 Options A and B in the list above would require a focus on strategic scale or very limited number of larger (350+ new homes) development sites. Including such

an approach as a Non-Strategic Option would not assist in delivering a portfolio of sites, particularly smaller sites, in a range of places to assist in providing housing across rural communities and support services and facilities across a number of rural communities. Such an approach would also fail to take on board Government's White Paper requirement for 10% of plan housing target to be on smaller sites, below 0.5ha.

6.15 New freestanding communities and neighbourhoods developed in the rural area would need to be of sufficient size and scale to create and support viable key services, facilities and public transport, if they are to avoid being car dependent and have sustainable access to such facilities. Such scales of developments are also likely to require new strategic levels of infrastructure such as entirely new A roads, primary schools, sewage and other utilities connections. Infrastructure required for new freestanding communities, and the scale of development needed to support creation of totally new key services and facilities require a level of development similar to the Strategic Development Places being investigated and set out through the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). The Non Strategic growth is not intended to bring about creation of a new SDL, which are being determined through the JSP process.

6.16 Both options A and B would require strategic scales of housing, or larger sites in a small number of places. This would most likely lead to delivery of housing on a time scale beyond 5 years. Non-strategic growth has a key role in providing housing sites deliverable in 5 years, if the new Local Plan is to be sound.

6.17 Rejected Option C would require setting out a percentage of growth for all rural places at the outset. This is not be considered to be realistic or sound approach, for a number of reasons. There may not be suitable or available sites for development at some places; Set levels of development at some rural places; would not take account of whether a place contains a high degree of environmental assets and constrains, and whether they would be sensitive to development e.g Grade 1 listed buildings, national or local biodiversity sites. Such an approach would also not take account of varying degrees of sustainable access and in some cases lack of sustainable access to key services and facilities.

6.18 The lack of sustainable access to some key services and facilities' (as set out in Appendix 1 of the new Local Plan Consultation Document) has led to some places not being included as suitable for investigation of Non-Strategic Growth, due to potential for creation of unsustainable patterns of development and creation of isolated rural homes. Option C which would distribute growth based on a set percentage across all rural places would fail to take into account the varying levels of sustainable access to key services and facilities, conflicting with requirements for sustainable patterns of development and avoiding isolated rural dwellings, as set out in the NPPF.

## **Non-Strategic Growth Options – SA Findings**

6.19 By undertaking this appraisal of the three Non-Strategic Growth Options, the council is able to make some general observations of potential effects and carry out a comparison between them.

6.20 The potential effect of each option against the Sustainability Objectives is presented in the table below, followed by a commentary of the main findings.

**Table 1 - Non-Strategic Growth Options – Appraisal Effects**

Sustainability Objective	Option 1 (non GB Places)	Option 2 (GB Places)	Option 3 (Combined)
1a. Access to public open space	?	?	+ / ?
1b. Impact of noise	?	?	+ / ?
1c. Air quality	+ / ?	- / ?	?
1d. Sustainable access to healthcare	N	+ / N	+ / N
1.e Public Transport access to hospitals	+ / -	+	+ / -
2a. Deliver quantum of high quality non-strategic housing	- / ?	+ / ?	++ / ?
2b. Suitable mix of high quality housing types and tenures	?	?	?
2c. Sustainable access to community facilities	+ / N	+	+
2d. Sustainable access to educational facilities	+ / N	++ / N	+ / N
2e. Sustainable access to retail/food buying facilities	N	N	N
2f. Reduce poverty and income inequality in Kingswood; Staple Hill and Yate	n/a	n/a	n/a
2g. Access to high speed broadband	+	+	+
3a. Deliver employment floor space	?	?	?
3b. Sustainable access to major employment areas	+ / N	++ / N	++
4a. Designated Assets: heritage assets and their settings	- / ?	?	+ / ?
4b. Undesignated Assets: heritage assets and their settings	?	?	?
4c. Impact on Habitats and species	- / ?	?	+ / ?
4d. Impact on valued landscapes	- / ?	?	+ / ?
4e. Deliver and protect GI	?	?	?
4f. Promote the conservation and wise use of land – brownfield/greenfield	?	?	?
4g. Protect and enhance valuable Green Belt	+	-	- / ?
4h. Minimise loss of high quality agricultural land	?	?	+ / ?
4i. Minimise vulnerability to tidal/fluvial flooding	?	?	+ / ?
4j. Minimise vulnerability to surface water flooding and other sources of flooding	?	?	?
4k. Minimise harm to, water quality and quantity/availability	?	?	?
5a. Reduce non-renewable energy consumption and 'greenhouse' emissions	?	?	?
5b. Reduce waste	?	?	?
5c Minimise consumption and extraction of minerals	?	?	?



## **General Findings - Uncertain Effects**

6.21 It has not been possible to accurately appraise the effect on some of the objectives as there is no information on the level of growth at individual places and potential sites for growth. At the next stage of the plan making process, when suitable and deliverable sites around rural places are considered, this issue will be more fully appraised. This will allow the council to more accurately identify both positive and negative effects.

### **Range of Places in each Option – Potential Effect**

6.22 During assessment of the three options the council found that the effect on some objectives were directly influenced by the number of available places in each option. Option 3 (In and Outside the Green Belt) and to a lesser extent Option 2 (In the Green Belt), contain a much wider range of places than Option 1 (outside-Green Belt places). Options with a wider range of places potentially allow the council to mitigate harm by directing development to alternative places which would have less negative effects, or by avoiding parts of a place which may be most sensitive to development.

### **Non-Strategic Housing Delivery and Proportional Development**

6.23 Option 1 which contains only 12 places, was considered at this early stage to create potential negative impacts on the housing delivery objective, in comparison to Options 2 and 3. This was because Option 1 is likely to lead to development of the required number of homes within a smaller range of places, thereby increasing the potential to lead to significant negative effects in certain settlements and requiring the use of larger sites, reducing the potential portfolio of smaller sites. However, for all options, investigation of the available sites for development will be required to be certain of effects.

### **Green Belt**

6.24 Assessment of sustainability objective 4g 'To protect and enhance valuable green belt' has a clear distinction in effect across the options. Option 1 results in a positive effect as all development would take place on land outside of the Green Belt. Option 2 assesses 28 places within the Green Belt, with development in these places resulting in the loss of some Green Belt land. Depending on the individual sites that come forward, the council believes the effect on this objective could range from neutral to significant negative. Finally, Option 3 uses a combination of places within and outside of the Green Belt. This gives the council the flexibility of a wide range of places; although using this option may result in the loss of some Green Belt land. It should however be possible to minimise the loss of valuable areas, whilst making small changes in Green Belt places that are otherwise sustainable for some level of non-strategic growth, resulting in less negative effects than Option 2. An assessment of Green Belt value will be required in and around rural places at a site level to fully understand the nature of the potential effects of each option.

### **Air Quality**

6.25 Assessment of sustainability objective 1c, 'minimise impact on air quality and locate sensitive development away from areas of poor air quality', resulted in varied outcomes for the 3 options. The presence of an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Kingswood as well as the presence of the A4174 and M4/M5 motorways creates the potential for negative impacts for Option 2, due to a range of Green Belt places being adjacent to the urban edge. Places in Option 1 are not affected by the AQMA and are less proximate to the major transport infrastructure mentioned above. This gives the potential for Option 1 to have a positive effect on this objective. Option

3 includes places close to the AQMA, A4174 and M4/M5, however the wide range of other places creates the potential to avoid harm.

### **Access to Educational Facilities**

6.26 Impacts on objective 2d, 'achieve reasonable sustainable access to educational facilities', and broadly resulted in a positive effect for all places. However, due to the high number of places with walking and cycling access to both primary and secondary schools for places in Option 2 (Within Green Belt places), there is considered more scope for a significant positive effect than Option 1 (Outside-Green Belt places) which has a greater reliance on public transport to access primary and secondary schools.

### **Access to Healthcare & Hospitals**

6.27 Objectives 1d, 'sustainable access to healthcare', and 1e, 'public transport access to hospitals', display varied results across the three options but show similar trends. Whilst the large majority of Option 1 places are reliant on public transport access with a journey of below 30 minutes to access healthcare facilities (GP, pharmacy and dentist), 13 places in Option 2 have walking access to healthcare facilities. The reliance on rural public transport for Option 1 places is considered to have a more neutral effect, than Option 2 which has a mixed positive/neutral. Option 3 contains all places and thus a mixture of accessibility, also resulting in a positive/neutral outcome.

6.28 Public transport access to hospitals also varies across the options. Option 1 has some places with good access but this is balanced by half of the places taking over an hour to reach a hospital by public transport, resulting in a mix of positive and negative effects for this option. The vast majority of places in Option 2 have public transport access to hospitals in under an hour, and development in these places would be considered to have a positive effect on this objective. Overall, Option 2 has been considered to have a positive result for this objective. Once again, as Option 3 contains all of the places it has a range of accessibility levels, so is considered to be a combination of positive and negative effects.

### **Access to Employment**

6.29 When assessing objective 3b, 'achieve reasonable sustainable access to major employment areas', the impact was to some extent positive for all options. Option 2 (Green Belt) includes 22 places which have walking and cycling access to employment opportunities, some places around the urban fringe have access to multiple employment opportunities and the Enterprise Area at Emersons Green, with only 5 places in Option 2 being solely reliant on rural public transport connections to access employment opportunities. Whilst Engine Common & Chipping Sodbury have good walking and cycling access to multiple employment opportunities, the remaining places in Option 1 are dependent on public transport to reach multiple employment opportunities. However, with the exception of Cromhall, these places are able to access these opportunities with rural public transport journey time of less than 30 minutes. Overall Option 1 has a more neutral/positive impact on this objective, and Options 2 and 3, due to the larger range of places which have walking and cycling access to employment opportunities, are considered to create more potential for significant positive impact.

## **Potential Impact on Heritage, Ecology and Landscape Assets and their Settings**

6.30 Of particular importance is that all options contain places with of heritage, landscape and ecological assets, both national and local. Some places contain both national and locally designated assets. The Non Green Belt places in Option 1 contained the most places that are within and directly adjacent the AONB.

6.31 Objectives 4a, 4c and 4d, which cover heritage assets, valued landscapes, habitats and species, have the same uncertain effect for each option at this stage, with future appraisal at a site level necessary to understand effects with certainty. However, effects at this stage are also considered to be influenced by the range of places available in each option. Option 1 (Outside-Green Belt places) has only 12 places, reducing the chance to avoid harm by locating in alternative places. Option 3 (all places combined) has the widest range of places and therefore offers the best chance to avoid harm. It allows for more flexibility when considering the impact on these objectives. Option 1 has been appraised as having uncertain but negative effects on these objectives, whilst Option 3 has a positive impact.

## **Potential Loss of High Quality Agricultural Land & Flood Risk**

6.32 Sustainability objective 4h 'minimise the loss of productive land, especially best and most versatile agricultural land', along with objectives 4i, 'minimise vulnerability to tidal and fluvial flooding without increasing flood risk elsewhere' and 4j. "Minimise vulnerability to surface water flooding and other sources of flooding" have uncertain effects until more information is available regarding individual site places and proposals.

6.33 All three of the options contain places with high grade agricultural land within and surrounding settlements, all three options also contain places with some level of Flood Zone 3 and 2 within and surrounding settlements. No one option is fully surrounded by Flood Risk Zones or subject to highest level of surface water and ground water flooding across the entire settlement. Option 3 creates the greatest chance to minimise vulnerability to flooding and loss of agricultural land when compared to both options 1 and 2. As it creates the greatest flexibility regarding which places and sites are progressed, due to the larger range of alternative places available for development.

## Appendix 1 – SA Framework (Sustainability Objectives and Effect Criteria)

Theme	Sustainability Objective	SEA Topic	Example Effect Criteria	
			Positive Effect	Negative Effect
Improve the health, safety and wellbeing of all	<p><b>1a. Achieve reasonable access to public open space</b>, taking into account quality and quantity</p> <p><b>Reasonable Distance</b>  <i>Within 400m – Significant positive</i>  <i>Beyond 800m - Significant negative</i></p>	Landscape  Human Health  Population	<p><b>Significant Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of public open space as part of development that is easily accessible</li> <li>Development in location with existing reasonable access to suitable (in terms of both quantity and quality) public open space</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development provides off site open space that is easily accessible by the wider community</li> <li>Development in close proximity to public open space</li> </ul>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development on public open space which reduces quantity, quality and Accessibility</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development does not include provision of open space that is easily accessible or</li> <li>Development in location lacking access to suitable (in terms of both quantity and quality) public open space</li> </ul>
	<p><b>1b. Minimise the impact of noise on sensitive receptors</b>            Sensitive uses = residential, schools</p>	Human Health  Population	<p><b>Significant Positive</b>            Sensitive developments located away from major roads and infrastructure, heavy industry</p> <p><b>Positive</b>            Construction methods seek to reduce impacts</p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b>            Sensitive developments located close to noise generating uses e.g. major roads and infrastructure, heavy industry</p> <p><b>Negative</b>            No mitigation in design of development to reduce adverse impact of noise</p>
	<p><b>1c. Minimise impacts on air quality and locate sensitive development away from areas of poor air quality</b>            Sensitive uses = residential, schools, children’s facilities, nursery’s, elderly people accommodation</p>	Air  Climatic factors  Human health  Population	<p><b>Significant Positive</b>            Sensitive uses placed outside of AQMA</p> <p><b>Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sensitive uses away from road edge</li> <li>Construction methods/design to reduce and, or eliminate air pollution within new sensitive development, including high rise</li> <li>Use trees/vegetation to assist in reducing poor air quality</li> </ul>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No consideration or inclusion of mitigation techniques/methods proposed for sensitive development in areas of high air pollution and AQMAs</li> <li>Development which will significantly increase pollution in and around AQMA</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No trees/vegetation used to mitigate poor air quality</li> </ul>
	<p><b>1d. Achieve reasonable sustainable access to healthcare services and facilities</b> (Doctors, Opticians, Pharmacies, Dentists)  <b>Reasonable walking and cycling distance</b>  <i>GP Surgery 800m</i>  <i>Dentist 800m</i></p>	Material assets  Human health	<p><b>Significant Positive</b>            Development generating need for health facilities located within reasonable walking and cycling distance of all health facilities <b>OR</b> public transport to places containing health services and facilities, with journey time under 20 minutes.</p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b>            Development generating need for health facilities beyond reasonable walking and cycling access to any health facilities <b>AND</b> Public Transport to places containing health services and facilities that takes over 40 minutes</p>

	<p><i>Opticians</i> 800m <i>Pharmacies</i> 800m</p> <p><b>Reasonable public transport access</b> Significant Positive – Under 20 minutes Positive – Under 30 Negative – 30 to 40 minutes Significant Negative – Over 40 minutes</p>	Population	<p><b>Positive</b> Development within reasonable walking and cycling distance of some, but not all health services and facilities, <b>AND/OR</b> Public transport to places containing health services and facilities, with a journey time between 20 and 30 minutes</p> <p><b>Neutral</b> Development does not have walking and cycling access to any healthcare services and facilities, but has access via public transport with a journey time of under 30 minutes.</p>	<p><b>Negative</b> Development within reasonable walking and cycling distance of some, but not all health services and facilities <b>AND/OR</b> Public Transport to places containing health services and facilities, which takes 30 – 40 minutes</p>
	<p><b>1e. Achieve reasonable Public Transport Access to hospitals</b> Hospital (BRI, Southmead or Royal Unit Bath)</p>	<p>Material assets</p> <p>Human health</p> <p>Population</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b> Development generating need for access to hospital with public transport connections, journey under 30 minutes, with suitable window for visits and return journey.</p> <p><b>Positive</b> Development generating need for access to hospital with public transport connections, taking under 1 hour, with suitable window for visits and return journey.</p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b> Development generating need for access to hospital with no public transport connections, or connections taking over 1 hour 30 minutes and/or very limited window for visits and limited or no return journey</p> <p><b>Negative</b> Development generating need for access to hospital with limited public transport connections, or connections taking over 1 hour s and limited possible return journey</p>
<p><b>Support communities that meet people’s needs</b></p>	<p><b>2a. Deliver a suitable quantum of high quality housing for South Gloucestershire</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDL – 5 places approximately 7900 dwellings</li> <li>• Urban Living – 2900 new homes</li> <li>• Non-Strategic – 1300 new homes</li> </ul>	<p>Material assets</p> <p>Population</p>	<p><b>SDL Criteria TBC</b></p> <p><b>Non-Strategic/Urban Living - Positive</b> Deliverable within 5 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites with certainty of achievability (ownership) and availability (ownership)</li> <li>• Provide for range of smaller site (below white paper target of 0.5ha)</li> <li>• Sites of 150 or less (50per annum) Provides range of site sizes in places across rural area <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>• Demonstrable through phasing and ownership information that sites over 150 units have certainty of deliverability</li> </ul>	<p><b>SDL Criteria TBC</b></p> <p><b>Non-Strategic/Urban Living - Negative</b> Uncertainty over delivery within 5 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites with limited information on phasing or ownership to guarantee delivery</li> <li>• Sites over 150 with limited evidence of phasing and ownership to provide certainty of deliverability within 5 years</li> <li>• Agglomerates housing around one or two settlements</li> </ul>
	<p><b>2b. Deliver a suitable mix of high quality housing types and tenures (including affordable housing) for all parts of society within south Gloucestershire</b></p>	<p>Material assets</p> <p>Population</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b></p> <p>Development that assists meeting affordable housing target and lifetime homes</p> <p><b>AND/OR</b></p> <p>Development that delivers a well-integrated mix of homes of different types and tenures to support a range of household sizes, ages and incomes</p> <p><b>Positive</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b></p> <p>Sites make no contribution on site to affordable housing or lifetime homes</p> <p><b>Negative</b> Developments that don’t deliver a range or good mix of type and tenure.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributes on a limited basis to meeting affordable housing target and lifetime homes</li> <li>• Development that contributes on a limited basis to delivering well-integrated mix of homes of different types and tenures to support a range of household sizes, ages and incomes</li> <li>• Sites that make a financial contribution for off-site affordable housing or lifetime homes</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>2c. Achieve reasonable sustainable access to community facilities</b> (post office, Dedicated Community Centre, Public House, Library)</p> <p><b>Reasonable walking or cycling distance</b></p> <p><i>Post Offices 800m</i></p> <p><i>Dedicated Community Centres 800m</i></p> <p><i>Public House 800m</i></p> <p><i>Library 800m</i></p> <p><b>Reasonable public transport access</b></p> <p><i>Significant Positive – Under 20 minutes</i></p> <p><i>Positive – Under 30</i></p> <p><i>Negative – 30 to 40 minutes</i></p> <p><i>Significant Negative – Over 40minutes</i></p>	<p>Material assets</p> <p>Human health</p> <p>Population</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development generating need for community facilities are within reasonable walking and cycling distance of all facilities, <b>OR</b> public transport to places containing community facilities, with a journey time under 20 minutes.</li> <li>• Provision of community facilities as part of any allocation</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>Development within reasonable walking and cycling distance of some, but not all community facilities, <b>AND/OR</b> public transport to places containing community services and facilities, with a journey time between 20 and 30 minutes</p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development generating need for community facilities beyond reasonable walking and cycling access to any <b>AND</b> public transport to places containing community facilities, which takes over 40 minutes</li> <li>• No provision of community facilities as part of any allocation</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative</b></p> <p>Development within reasonable walking and cycling distance of some, but not all community services and facilities <b>AND/OR</b> public transport to community services and facilities, which takes 30 – 40 minutes</p>
	<p><b>2d. Achieve reasonable sustainable access to educational facilities</b> (primary schools, secondary schools)</p> <p><b>Reasonable walking or cycling distance</b></p> <p><i>Primary School 2miles</i></p> <p><i>Secondary School 3miles</i></p> <p><b>Reasonable public transport access</b></p> <p><i>Significant Positive – Under 20 minutes</i></p> <p><i>Positive – Under 30</i></p> <p><i>Negative – 30 to 40 minutes</i></p> <p><i>Significant Negative – Over 40minutes</i></p>	<p>Material assets</p> <p>Population</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development generating need for education facilities are within reasonable walking and cycling distance of primary and secondary schools</li> <li>• Development which adds to capacity of educational facilities, where known capacity issues exist.</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>Development within reasonable walking and cycling distance of a primary OR Secondary school but not both.</p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development generating a need for educational facilities beyond a reasonable walking and cycling distance <b>AND</b> public transport to places containing schools takes over 40 minutes</li> <li>• Development which places capacity issues on educational facilities, where known capacity issues exist.</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative</b> Development reliant on public transport journeys of 30-40 minutes to reach a school.</p>
			<p><b>Neutral-</b> Development does not have walking and cycling access to community facilities, but has access via public transport with a journey time of under 30 minutes.</p>	
			<p><b>Neutral-</b> Development does not have walking and cycling access to a primary or secondary school, but has access via public transport with a journey time of under 30 minutes.</p>	

	<p><b>2e. Achieve reasonable sustainable access to retail and food buying services and facilities</b> (Town and District Centres or local comparison stores, supermarkets and local convenience stores)  <b>Reasonable walking and cycling distance</b>  <i>Town and District Centre: 1200 metres</i>  <i>Supermarkets: 1200 metres</i>  <i>Local convenience and comparison stores: 1200metres</i>  <b>Reasonable public transport</b>  <i>Significant Positive – Under 20 minutes</i>  <i>Positive – Under 30</i>  <i>Negative – 30 to 40 minutes</i>  <i>Significant Negative – Over 40 minutes</i></p>	<p>Material assets  Population</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b>  Development generating need for retail and food buying within reasonable walking and cycling distance of all retail and food buying services and facilities <b>OR</b> public transport to town centre and food buying facilities, with journey time under 20 minutes.</p> <p><b>Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development within reasonable walking and cycling distance of some, but not all retail and food buying services and facilities, <b>AND/OR</b> Public transport to town centre and food buying facilities, with journey time between 20 and 30 minutes</li> <li>• Development which adds to the retail and leisure services and facilities within a town or district centre.</li> <li>• Development which would create a demonstrable increase in footfall and potential use of a centre.</li> </ul> <p><b>Neutral-</b> Development does not have walking and cycling access to retail and food buying services and facilities, but has access via public transport with a journey time of under 30 minutes.</p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b>  Development generating need for retail and food buying beyond reasonable walking and cycling distance of any retail and food buying services and facilities <b>AND</b> Public Transport to town centre and food buying services and facilities takes over 40 minutes</p> <p><b>Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development within reasonable walking and cycling distance of some, but not all retail and food buying services and facilities, <b>AND/OR</b> Public Transport to town centre and food buying services and facilities, which takes 30 – 40 minutes</li> <li>• Development that would reduce the retail and leisure services and facilities within a town or district centre</li> </ul>
	<p><b>2f. Reduce poverty and income inequality, and improve the life chances of those living in areas of concentrated disadvantage around Kingswood; Staple Hill and Yate</b></p>	<p>Material assets  Population</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that provides employment opportunities within areas identified as the most deprived 20% of areas in England</li> <li>• Development that helps to regenerate the areas identified as the most deprived 20% of areas in England</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive</b>  Development that provides good access to employment opportunities for the areas identified as the most deprived 20% of areas in England</p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that does not provide employment opportunity within areas identified as the most deprived 20% of areas in England</li> <li>• Development that does not help to regenerate the areas identified as the most deprived 20% of areas in England</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative</b>  Development that does not provide good access to employment opportunities for the areas identified as the most deprived 20% of areas in England</p>
	<p><b>2g. Access to high speed broadband</b></p>	<p>Population</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b>  Access to super-fast broadband  <b>Positive</b>  Access to good broadband coverage</p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b>  No access to broadband coverage  <b>Negative</b>  Uncertain or intermittent broadband coverage</p>
<p>Develop a diverse and thriving economy that</p>	<p><b>3a. Deliver a reasonable quantum of employment floorspace/land and increase access to work opportunities for all parts of society within South Gloucestershire</b></p>	<p>Material assets  Population</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development <b>provides additional employment floorspace/land</b> for residential areas within a reasonable</li> </ul>	<p><b>Significant negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development leads to <b>loss of current active or suitable employment site</b>, for residential areas within a reasonable</li> </ul>

<p>meets people's needs</p>	<p><b>Reasonable walking and cycling distance</b> 2km <b>Reasonable public transport</b> <i>Significant Positive – Under 20 minutes</i> <i>Positive – Under 30</i> <i>Negative – 30 to 40 minutes</i> <i>Significant Negative – Over 40 minutes</i></p>		<p>walking/cycling distance, or public transport with journey times under 20 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development <b>increases diversity of work opportunity</b> for residential areas, within a reasonable walking/cycling distance or public transport with journey time under 20 minutes</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive</b> Development provides <b>additional employment floorspace</b>, for residential areas within a reasonable walking/cycling distance <b>AND/OR</b> public transport with journey time between 20 and 30 minutes</p>	<p>walking/cycling distance or public transport with journey times under 20 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development leads to <b>loss of diversity</b> of work opportunity, for residential areas, within a reasonable walking/cycling distance or public transport with journey time under 20 minutes</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development leads to a <b>part loss of employment floorspace</b></li> <li>Development <b>decreases access to work opportunities</b></li> </ul>
	<p><b>3b. Achieve reasonable sustainable access to major employment areas Employment Areas within 2km</b> Enterprise Zones (EZ) Major Employer (100+ employees) Safeguarded Employment Areas Town Centres <b>Reasonable public transport</b> <i>Significant Positive – Under 20 minutes</i> <i>Positive – Under 30</i> <i>Negative – 30 to 40 minutes</i> <i>Significant Negative – Over 40 minutes</i></p>	<p>Material assets Population Air Climatic factors</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b> Development generating need for employment within walking/cycling distance of an Enterprise Zone, or a wide range of unique Safeguarded Employment Areas, Major Employers or Town Centres, <b>AND/OR</b> public transport to an EZ, or a wide range of unique Major Employers, Safeguarded Employment Areas or Town Centres, with journey times under 20 minutes.</p> <p><b>Positive</b> Development generating need for employment within walking/cycling distance of more than one unique Safeguarded Employment areas, Major employers or Town Centres, <b>AND</b> public transport to any employment areas with a journey time between 20 and 30 minutes</p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b> Development generating need for employment beyond walking/cycling distance of any employment areas <b>AND/OR</b> public transport to any employment areas which takes over 40 Minutes</p> <p><b>Negative</b> Development generating need for employment outside walking and cycling distance of a Safeguarded Employment Area, Major Employer or Town Centre <b>AND/OR</b> public transport to employment areas which takes 30 – 40 minutes</p>
<p>Maintain and improve environmental quality and assets</p>	<p><b>4a. Designated Assets: Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance the historic environment, national heritage assets and their settings</b> <b>Designated Assets</b> Listed Buildings, Grade 1, Grade 11*, Grade II Conservation Areas Scheduled Ancient Monuments Registered Historic Parks and Gardens Registered Battlefields</p>	<p>Cultural heritage</p>	<p><b>Designated Assets</b> <b>Significant Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development that <b>seeks to enhance</b> the significance of any affected heritage asset, historic townscape or landscape</li> <li>Development which <b>brings into use</b> an existing built heritage asset</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive</b></p>	<p><b>Designated Assets</b> <b>Significant Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development that leads to <b>loss of significance</b> of any affected heritage asset, historic townscape or landscape</li> <li>Development in a location that would lead to <b>loss of character and setting</b> of an asset</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative</b></p>



			Development that <b>safeguards and protects</b> the significance of any affected heritage asset, historic townscape or landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that leads to <b>harm or change of significance</b> to a heritage asset</li> <li>• Development in a location that would lead to <b>harm of character and setting</b> of an asset</li> </ul>
<b>4b. Undesignated Assets: Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance the historic environment, local heritage assets and their settings</b> <b>Local Assets:</b> <b>Unregistered Historic Parks and Gardens</b> <b>Non-designated heritage assets</b> <b>Locally Listed Buildings</b>			<b>Significant Positive</b>  <b>Positive</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that seeks to enhance the significance of any affected local heritage asset, historic townscape or landscape</li> <li>• Development which brings into use an existing built local heritage asset</li> <li>• Development that safeguards and protects the significance of any affected local heritage asset, historic townscape or landscape</li> <li>• Developments that take account of local unregistered, non-designated or locally listed assets of importance to the local community</li> </ul>	<b>Significant Negative</b>  <b>Negative</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that leads to loss of significance of any affected local heritage asset, historic townscape or landscape</li> <li>• Development in a location that would lead to loss of character and setting of a local asset</li> <li>• Development that leads to harm or change of significance to a local asset</li> <li>• Development in a location that would lead to harm of character and setting of a local asset</li> <li>• Developments that don't take account of unregistered, non-designated or locally listed assets of importance to the local community</li> </ul>
<b>4c. Minimise impact on and where possible enhance habitats and species (taking account of climate change)</b> <b>International and European designated sites</b> Special Areas of Conversation (SAC) Special Protection Areas (SPA) RAMSAR <i>Note: The HRA will consider these in more detail. SA will recognise where a European Protected Sites might be affected and therefore an Appropriate Assessment as part of the HRA may be required.</i> <b>National Sites and assets</b> SSSI National Nature Reserves Local Nature Reserves UK Priority Habitat <b>Local Sites</b> SNCI Ecological Networks	Biodiversity  Geodiversity  Climatic factors  Fauna & Flora  Landscape		<b>Significant Positive</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that creates new wildlife areas of high quality and would support UK Priority Habitats</li> <li>• Development that enhances existing and increases connectivity between existing and new wildlife networks, habitats or features</li> <li>• Development that safeguards, preserves and protects existing national sites habitats or features</li> </ul> <b>Positive</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that safeguards, preserves and protects existing local sites habitats or features</li> <li>• Development that maintains the connectivity and integrity of wildlife networks</li> </ul>	<b>Significant Negative</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on or adjacent national sites that results in loss or significant harm to designated sites or features</li> <li>• Development that results in loss of wildlife networks</li> </ul> <b>Negative</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on or adjacent local sites (including wildlife corridors) that creates harm or loss</li> <li>• Development that would fragment connectivity and integrity of wildlife networks</li> </ul>
<b>4d. Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance valued landscapes</b> <b>National designations</b> AONB	Cultural heritage Landscape		<b>Significant Positive</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development utilises topography and landform to inform proposals and enhance valued landscapes, as defined</li> </ul>	<b>Significant Negative</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that leads to irreversible damage and loss to sensitive areas of the AONB/Ancient Woodland</li> </ul>

	<p>Ancient Woodland</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>The South Gloucestershire Adopted Landscape Character Assessment SPD (Revised 2014) will be used to assess the plan utilising the 21 identified Character Areas and the Landscape Strategy developed for each character area.</i></p>		<p>in the SG adopted Landscape Character Assessment (2014)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development avoids harm and enhances AONB/Ancient Woodland</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development seeks to preserve and protect adverse impacts on the AONB/Ancient Woodland</li> <li>Development seeks to incorporate the SG adopted Landscape Character Assessment (2014), landscape strategy principles, where applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development that does not consider landscape features in proposals, as defined in the SG adopted Landscape Character Assessment (2014)</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overbearing or unsympathetic development in and around key landscape features (AONB/Ancient Woodland)</li> </ul>
	<p><b>4e. Deliver a range and quality of, and increased access to new green infrastructure across South Gloucestershire AND protect and enhance existing GI</b></p> <p><b>Green Infrastructure typology:</b></p> <p><b>Parks and Gardens</b></p> <p><b>Amenity Greenspace</b> – including: informal recreation spaces, domestic gardens, village greens, green roofs</p> <p><b>Natural and semi-natural urban greenspaces</b> – including: woodland and scrub, grassland, heath or moor, wetlands, open and running water</p> <p><b>Green corridors</b> – rivers and canals including their banks, road and rail corridors, cycling routes, pedestrian paths, and rights of way</p> <p><b>Other</b> - allotments, community gardens, city farms, cemeteries and churchyards.</p>	<p>Biodiversity Climatic factors Fauna &amp; Flora Landscape Soil Water</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development delivers a range of new GI appropriate to the scheme to a high quality AND is easily accessible</li> <li>Development seeks to enhance existing GI</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development delivers some new GI of a reasonable quality and is accessible</li> <li>Development seeks to enhance links to existing and new GI</li> <li>Development avoids loss and severance of existing GI</li> </ul>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development does not offer any new GI</li> <li>Development does not seek to increase access to existing or new GI</li> <li>Development results in total loss or severance of existing GI</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development does not seek to enhance links to existing or new GI</li> <li>Development results in some loss or severance of existing GI</li> </ul>
	<p><b>4f. Promote the conservation and wise use of land, maximising the re-use of previously developed land.</b></p>	<p>Fauna &amp; Flora Landscape Soil</p>	<p><b>Positive</b></p> <p>Major Development on previously developed land/brownfield sites</p>	<p><b>Negative</b></p> <p>Development on previously undeveloped greenfield sites</p>

<p><b>4g. Protect and enhance valuable Green Belt</b>  Purposes of Green Belt land in S.G defined in JSP Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment  Grading of some Green Belt areas determined in JSP Stage 2 GB Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major</li> <li>• Contribution</li> <li>• Limited</li> </ul>	<p>Material assets</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on land <b>outside of Green Belt</b>, and</li> <li>• Development <b>enhances access/recreational benefits</b> of open countryside in to the Green Belt</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive</b>  Development on land <b>outside of Green Belt</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b>  Development on land inside the Green Belt making Major Contribution to Green Belt purpose(s), leading to urban sprawl, physical merger between towns or settlements or loss of open countryside</p> <p><b>Negative</b>  Development on land inside the Green Belt making a contribution to the Green Belt purpose(s), leading to urban sprawl, perception or reduced distance between towns or settlements or loss of open countryside</p>
<p><b>4h. Minimise the loss of productive land, especially best and most versatile agricultural land.</b></p>	<p>Landscape  Soil</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b>  Development that avoids and therefore safeguards the protection of high value agricultural land (1 to 3a) which is also outside of flood risk zones 3a and 3b.</p> <p><b>Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on land with no current or immediate potential agricultural value</li> <li>• Development that provides or enhances local food growing land of demonstrable value</li> </ul>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b>  Development on land resulting in loss of agricultural value Grade 1 to 3a, which is also outside of flood risk zones 3a and 3b.</p> <p><b>Negative</b>  Development that results in loss of local food growing land of demonstrable value</p>
<p><b>4i. Minimise vulnerability to tidal/fluvial flooding (taking account of climate change), without increasing flood risk elsewhere</b></p>	<p>Climatic factors  Water</p>	<p><b>Significant Positive</b>  Highly vulnerable and more vulnerable development in flood zone 1 (as contained in Table 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG).</p> <p><b>Positive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposed in areas of lowest flood risk (as contained in Table 2 and 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG).</li> <li>• Development which mitigates existing flood risk from tidal or fluvial sources</li> </ul>	<p><b>Significant Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly, more and less vulnerable development in flood risk zone 3b (as contained in Table 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG).</li> <li>• Highly vulnerable development in flood risk zone 3a</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any other development in areas of flood risk (as contained in Table 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG).</li> <li>• Flood defences and mitigation measures would have negative effects on flooding elsewhere</li> </ul>

	<b>4j. Minimise vulnerability to surface water flooding and other sources of flooding, without increasing flood risk elsewhere</b>	Climatic factors  Water	<b>Significant Positive</b> Development proposed outside of identified high risk surface water areas. <b>Positive</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development which includes measures to reduce run off</li> <li>• Development which mitigates existing surface water flood risk.</li> </ul>	<b>Significant Negative</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposed in identified areas at high risk from surface water flooding.</li> <li>• Development which significantly increases run off, increasing the risk of surface water flooding</li> </ul> <b>Negative</b> Development that does not consider how to mitigate existing surface water flood risk
	<b>4k. Minimise harm to, and where possible protect and enhance (surface and groundwater) water quality and quantity/availability</b>	Water	<b>Significant Positive</b> Development with potential to protect and enhance surface and groundwater water quality and/or quantity/availability  <b>Positive</b> Maximise use and opportunity of grey water recycling	<b>Significant Negative</b> Development posing a risk to water quality and/or quantity/availability  <b>Negative</b> Development that does not integrate water saving technologies
Use of natural resources	<b>5a. Reduce non-renewable energy consumption and ‘greenhouse’ emissions and provide opportunities to link into existing heat networks</b>	Air  Climatic factors  Material assets	<b>Significant Positive</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that contributes to reducing non-renewable energy consumption and ‘greenhouse’ emissions</li> <li>• Developments that incorporate district heating or other renewable energy supply</li> <li>• Development that provide opportunities to link into an existing energy network</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <b>Positive</b> Development that integrates electric car charging points	<b>Significant Negative</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that does not contribute to reducing non-renewable energy consumption and ‘greenhouse’ emissions</li> <li>• Development that does not incorporate district heating or other renewable energy supply</li> <li>• Development that does not provide opportunities to link into an existing energy network</li> </ul> <b>Negative</b> Development that does not integrate electric car charging points
	<b>5b. Reduce waste</b>	Material Assets	<b>Significant Positive</b> Development that encourages waste minimisation and the sustainable management of future streams e.g. community recycling or composting infrastructure. <b>Positive</b> Development that seeks to reuse and recycle demolition waste	<b>Significant Negative</b> Development that does not minimise waste or provide for recycling/composting <b>Negative</b> Development that does not seek to recycle demolition waste
	<b>5c. Minimise consumption and extraction of minerals</b>	Material Assets	<b>Significant Positive</b> Development that seeks the greatest possible reuse of old material in new construction <b>Positive</b> Development that provides for the reuse and recycling of minerals/materials	<b>Significant Negative</b> Development that does not seek to reuse or recycle materials <b>Negative</b> Development that only has limited reuse/recycling of materials