



www.landuse.co.uk

West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy SA Addendum

Non-Technical Summary

Prepared by LUC
December 2013

Project Title: West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy SA Addendum

Client: West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by Principal
1	6.12.13	Non-Technical Summary of the Final SA Report	Kate Nicholls	Jeremy Owen	Jeremy Owen

Introduction

- 1.1 This Sustainability Appraisal Addendum Report (non-technical summary) relates to the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy, which is being produced by the West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit (JPU). The Joint Core Strategy is at an advanced stage having been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. Examination hearings took place in April 2013.
- 1.2 Plans and strategies such as the Joint Core Strategy are subject to a process called Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which assesses the potential effects of a plan on social, economic, and environmental issues. During the Examination hearing sessions for the Joint Core Strategy in April 2013, the Inspector requested that the JPU undertake some additional work to assess levels of housing needs in the plan area and also to prepare a SA Addendum Report to address some shortcomings in the SA work that had been undertaken previously. The JPU commissioned LUC in June 2013 to carry out this additional SA work for the Joint Core Strategy on its behalf.

Purpose of the SA Addendum Report and this non-technical summary

- 1.3 The full SA Addendum Report (which this non-technical summary relates to) is an addendum to two other SA documents: the full 2011 SA Report¹ for the Pre-Submission Joint Core Strategy and the 2012 SA Addendum² that was prepared to accompany the Proposed Changes Joint Core Strategy for Submission to the Secretary of State. This non-technical summary should therefore be read alongside those reports, as well as the full version of the SA Addendum Report.
- 1.4 The SA Addendum describes the different options that were considered by the JPU following the hearing sessions in April 2013 - these include options for the amount of housing and employment development in West Northamptonshire, as well as spatial options relating to how the development should be distributed. The full SA Addendum and this non-technical summary describe the likely sustainability effects of the various options and summarise the JPU's reasons for selecting or discounting options. They also report on the SA implications of the Main Modifications that are being proposed to the Joint Core Strategy (described in more detail further ahead in this summary).

Sustainability Appraisal

- 1.5 The JPU is required by law to carry out Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the emerging Joint Core Strategy, and has appointed LUC to undertake the latest stage of the SA on its behalf. The Government recommends that these two requirements are met through one integrated process, referred to as Sustainability Appraisal (or SA).
- 1.6 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 potential social, economic and environmental effects of the plan and the extent to which sustainable development is expected to be achieved.
- 1.7 SA must be conducted in accordance with Government guidance, and must meet the requirements of the European Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive³. A description of the method used in carrying out the additional SA work for the Joint Core Strategy is set out below. The relationship between the full SA Addendum and the SA work undertaken previously for the Joint Core Strategy is also described below.

¹ West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. Environ, February 2011.

² West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Volume 1: Sustainability Appraisal Report Proposed Changes Addendum and Volume 2: Appendix D: Sustainability Appraisal Proposed Changes Assessment Tables. Environ, July 2012.

³ European Directive 2001/42/EC 'on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment'.

Stage A: Scoping

- 1.8 An SA Scoping Report was published for consultation in 2006 as part of the SA of the Joint Core Strategy and the information in it was updated in the subsequent SA Reports. LUC prepared an additional SA Scoping Report⁴ in July 2013 to address the scope of this additional SA work.

Stage B: Options development and assessment

- 1.9 Chapter 3 of the 2011 SA Report⁵ summarises the options that were considered at each stage in the Joint Core Strategy's preparation, and Appendices B, C and D of the 2011 SA Report set out the potential sustainability effects of all of those options.
- 1.10 The work that the JPU has been undertaking since the Examination hearing sessions in April 2013 has involved revisiting a number of options (or alternatives), including potential locations for sustainable urban extensions (SUEs) around the four main towns, as well as considering additional new options such as the amount of housing to be delivered. These options, including the reasons for selecting or discounting them, are described in more detail further ahead in this summary.

Stage C: Preparing the SA Report

- 1.11 The SA Reports up to and including the 2012 SA Addendum were prepared by Environ on behalf of the West Northamptonshire JPU. LUC has now prepared the SA Addendum Report to describe the findings of the additional work that the JPU has carried out since the hearings in April 2013.

Stage D: Consulting on the SA Report and plan

- 1.12 All of the earlier SA Reports were published for consultation alongside the relevant version of the Joint Core Strategy. The Scoping Report for the SA Addendum work was subject to a five week consultation period, and the full SA Addendum (and this non-technical summary) will be available during the consultation period for the proposed Main Modifications to the Joint Core Strategy during January-February 2014.

Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Plan

- 1.13 Chapter 8 of the 2011 SA Report set out recommendations for monitoring the social, environmental and economic effects of implementing the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. Based on the SA findings, the monitoring recommendations have been updated and are set out in Chapter 11 of the full SA Addendum and in this non-technical summary.

Relevant policy context

- 1.14 In order to carry out the SA Addendum work it is necessary to understand the policies, plans and strategies that are relevant to the Joint Core Strategy.
- 1.15 Chapter 2 in the full SA Addendum describes the relationship between the additional Joint Core Strategy work and other relevant plans or programmes, and considers the most recent policy context for the Joint Core Strategy, including the current environmental, social and economic policy objectives set at the international, European and national levels.
- 1.16 The most significant developments for the policy context of the emerging Joint Core Strategy have been the Coalition Government's abolition of the regional spatial strategies, such as the East Midlands Plan, and the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and associated Technical Guidance. Other relevant national strategies, policies and White Papers have also been published since 2011 relating to the natural environment and biodiversity, sustainable development, sustainable transport, and travellers' sites, and their objectives are also summarised in Chapter 2 in the full SA Addendum.

⁴ West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy SA Addendum – Scoping Report. LUC, July 2013.

⁵ West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report. Environ, February 2011.

Characteristics of areas likely to be affected

- 1.17 Baseline information provides the basis for predicting and monitoring the likely sustainability effects of a plan and helps to identify key sustainability issues and means of dealing with them.
- 1.18 The SA Report⁶ that accompanied the Pre-Submission Core Strategy described the broad environmental, economic and social character of West Northamptonshire, the sustainability issues facing the area and considered how those issues would be likely to evolve if the Joint Core Strategy wasn't to be implemented. Chapter 3 in the full SA Addendum provides a focussed description of the characteristics of the areas that are most likely to be affected by the reasonable alternatives considered in this SA Addendum work, i.e. the urban fringe areas of Northampton, Daventry, Brackley and Towcester. A set of maps to support the information in that chapter can be found in Appendix 2 in the full SA Addendum).

Method used in SA Addendum work

Reasonableness criteria

- 1.19 The SEA Regulations require that reasonable alternatives to options, policies or site allocations included in the plan need to be subject to SA. In order to identify 'reasonable' alternatives for the spatial distribution of SUEs around the towns to be assessed as part of this additional SA work, a set of 'reasonableness' criteria was developed – these are presented in Chapter 4 in the full SA Addendum and were used to identify which SUE options should be included in the SA.

SA Framework

- 1.20 The SA Framework that was developed originally for the SA of the Joint Core Strategy (presented in the 2006 SA Scoping Report) comprises a set of SA objectives which cover all of the specific topics that the SEA Regulations require to be considered. The same framework has been used in this further SA work and is presented below in **Table 1** below. A more detailed version of the framework, which includes a number of specific 'appraisal questions' in relation to each SA objective, can be found in Chapter 4 in the full SA Addendum.

Table 1 SA Framework

SA Objective
1. Air quality and noise
a) Reduce the need to travel and facilitate modal shift. b) Reduce/minimise the potential increase in congestion. c) Avoid sensitive development within areas of high noise levels or poor air quality.
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage
a) Protect the fabric and setting of designated and undesignated archaeological sites, monuments, structures and buildings, registered Historic Parks and gardens, registered battlefields, listed buildings and conservation areas (or their settings).
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna
a) Maintain and enhance the structure and function of habitats and populations of species, including those specifically protected. b) Enhance and protect greenspace networks and habitat connectivity, including river and stream corridors, to assist in species migration and dispersal. c) Increase the land area of UK Biodiversity Action Plan habitats within the area. d) Maintain and improve the conservation status of selected non-designated nature conservation sites.
4. Crime and community safety
a) To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.
5. Education and training

⁶ West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report, Environ, February 2011.

SA Objective
a) Improve educational attainment and promote lifelong learning. b) Promote sustainable modes of travel to access education.
6. Energy and climatic factors
a) Continue to improve energy efficiency of dwellings. b) Continue to increase the provision of 'affordable warmth'. c) To decrease the dependency on oil for space heating. d) Increase the local renewable energy generating capacity.
7. Health and well being
a) To improve health and reduce health inequalities.
8. Labour market and economy
a) To create high quality employment opportunities and develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation.
9. Landscape and townscape
a) Ensure that the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the landscape, and the features within them are conserved and enhanced. b) Enhance the form and design of the built environment.
10. Material assets
a) To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the local people.
11. Population
a) To develop and maintain a balanced and sustainable population structure with good access to services and facilities.
12. Social deprivation
a) To reduce spatial inequalities in social opportunities.
13. Soil, geology and land use
a) Reduce land contamination, and safeguard soil and geological quality and quantity.
14. Waste
a) To reduce waste generation and disposal, increase recycling and achieve the sustainable management of waste.
15. Water
a) Maintain and continue to improve the <u>ecological and chemical</u> quality of groundwater and river <u>water surface waters</u> . b) Reduce risk of flooding. c) Improve efficiency of water use. d) Identify opportunities to implement strategic flood risk management options/measures to reflect the objectives in the River Nene and Great Ouse CFMPs.

Predicting effects

- 1.21 The assessment has focused on the likely significant effects of implementing the options being addressed in the SA Addendum work. This inevitably requires a series of judgements to be made. To assist with this process and to ensure consistency between the appraisals, specific assumptions have been used to determine the likely effects of the SUE locations and the strategic employment site options on each SA objective (see Appendices 5 and 12 in the full SA Addendum).
- 1.22 The SA has been carried out using a matrix-based approach and has attempted to differentiate between significant effects and other more minor effects through the use of colours and symbols as shown below. Note that each of these effects may have uncertainty attached (shown by a '?' after the score), but the colour does not change.

++	Significant positive effect likely
+	Minor positive effect likely
0	Negligible effect likely
-	Minor negative effect likely
--	Significant negative effect likely
?	An element of uncertainty is attached to the effect
++/--	Mixed (significant positive and significant negative) effect likely
++/-	Mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect likely
--/+	Mixed (significant negative and minor positive) effect likely
-/+	Mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect likely

Appraisal of quantum of development

- 1.23 At the JCS Examination Hearings the Inspector asked the JPU to consider the implications of two alternative plan period end dates, 2029 and 2031, in order to ensure that the Joint Core Strategy would cover at least a 15-year period (this is required by the NPPF).
- 1.24 In preparing the objectively assessed housing need, the JPU therefore sought to identify the housing and job requirements for the existing plan period end date of 2026 and the two alternative plan period end dates: 2029 and 2031. For reasons described in detail in Chapter 5 of the full SA Addendum, the JPU is recommending that an extension of the Plan period to 2029 is preferable to an extension to 2031.
- 1.25 Given the extension of the end date of the plan period to 2029, the quantum of development set out in the JCS as submitted is now out of date and so this has not been subject to further appraisal.
- 1.26 Therefore, two reasonable alternatives for the quantum of development over the extended plan period 2011-2029 have been subject to SA in the Addendum:
- **Cambridge Tracking**, which represents the Preferred Choice of the JPU.
 - **2011 Census-based projections (extended)**, which represents the reasonable alternative, but has been discounted by the JPU.
- 1.27 These two reasonable alternatives, showing the differences between the two, are summarised in **Tables 2** and **Table 3** below.

Table 2 Net additional dwellings 2011-2029

Alternative	2011-2029	Difference (%)
Cambridge Tracking	41,760	
ONS 2011 Extended	36,972	
Difference	-4,788	-11%

Table 3 Net additional jobs 2011-2029

Alternative	2011-2029	Difference (%)
Cambridge Tracking	28,520	
ONS 2011 Extended	26,849	
Difference	-1,671	-6%

Approach to the appraisal

- 1.28 The two alternatives were divided into three options for the purposes of the appraisal. The Cambridge Tracking option represents the preferred option that is presented in the proposed Main Modifications to the JCS. The other two options represent variants of the ONS Extended alternative, on the basis that this alternative could be delivered in two ways: first, by reducing the phasing by which development is delivered keeping the overall spatial strategy in the proposed Main Modifications to the JCS including all the SUEs at all four towns; second, by reducing the number of SUEs needed, but developing the remaining SUEs at the same rate of delivery as in the proposed Main Modifications to the JCS.
- 1.29 The three options appraised are therefore as follows:
- **Option 1 – Cambridge Tracking:** This option assumes the delivery of 41,760 net additional dwellings and 28,520 net additional jobs over the period 2011-2029 in accordance with the proposed Main Modifications to the JCS.
 - **Option 2 – ONS 2011 Extended (reduced phasing):** This option assumes the delivery of 36,972 net additional dwellings and 26,849 net additional jobs over the period 2011-2029 in accordance with the proposed Main Modifications to the JCS, but with a slower rate of delivery.
 - **Option 3 – ONS 2011 Extended (reduced SUEs):** This option assumes the delivery of 36,972 net additional dwellings and 26,849 net additional jobs over the period 2011-2029 in accordance with the proposed Main Modifications to the JCS, but with the deletion of between two and five SUEs (unspecified).
- 1.30 It should be noted that the amount of employment land to be delivered under all three options would be the same. The new strategic employment site at Junction 16 included in the proposed Main Modifications to the JCS would be required under all three options.
- 1.31 It should also be noted that the JPU was unable to indicate for Option 3 which SUEs would not be needed. It was of the view that it would be much more likely for Option 2 to take place rather than Option 3, if the ONS 2011 Extended alternative were to be selected. This is because:
- In practical terms, the proposed build-out rates are very challenging for the Cambridge Tracking alternative, and might be difficult to achieve. To build out over a longer period would help this, but removing one or more SUEs would maintain the challenging rates (and the increased risk of non-delivery associated with that).
 - In terms of spatial distribution, there are three main sectors where development is planned around Northampton: the north; the west and south west; and the south. It would be important to maintain all these areas producing development otherwise the market in any of the other sectors could become swamped, and delivery fail.
 - Although the JCS plan period ceases in 2029, development will continue to occur after this, and therefore the strategy that is set now needs to stand the test of time beyond the plan period. Therefore, keeping all the SUEs would allow both flexibility and certainty in planning how, in particular, the Northampton Related Development Area (NRDA) would develop over time.
- 1.32 Attempting to summarise the effect on each SA objective into a single appraisal score for each quantum of development is inevitably a challenge, given the different effects that could arise in different locations. However, the approach is intended to give an overall indication of the effects that would be likely to arise, and to enable comparison between the three options.
- 1.33 The appraisal took as its reference point the findings of the appraisal of the proposed Main Modifications to the JCS, and in particular the appraisals of the individual SUEs and strategic employment sites since these are where most of the planned development will be delivered. Overall appraisal scores were assigned for each SA objective, taking into account the likely overall effect of the quantum of development and spatial strategy depending upon the option being appraised.

Summary of the appraisal findings

- 1.34 The findings of the appraisal of the three options are summarised in **Table 2**, and the full appraisal matrices are presented in Appendix 3 in the full SA Addendum.
- 1.35 It can be seen from the summary table that the effects of the three options are likely to be similar. This is not surprising, given that all three options would result in significant development, much of which would be on greenfield land. Even Option 3, which would result in fewer SUEs, would still result in similar effects (with the potential exception of SA objective 2: archaeology and cultural heritage), given that it would still require the majority of SUEs to be developed, plus all the strategic employment sites identified as being needed under Options 1 and 2. It would inevitably mean that the effects on the particular locations for the SUEs that would be removed from the proposed Main Modifications to the JCS would no longer take place, but this would not be sufficient to alter materially the overall effects on the SA objectives as a whole.
- 1.36 A summary of the likely significant effects of the three options for each SA objective is provided below **Table 4**.

Table 4 Summary of SA scores for the three options for the quantum of development

SA Objective	Option 1: Cambridge Tracking	Option 2: ONS 2011 Extended (reduced phasing)	Option 3: ONS 2011 Extended (reduced SUEs)
1. Air quality and noise	+/-	+/-	+/-
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	--?	--?	-?
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?
4. Crime and community safety	0	0	0
5. Education and training	++/-?	++/-?	++/-?
6. Energy and climatic factors	0?	0?	0?
7. Health and well-being	++	++	++
8. Labour market and economy	++	++	++
9. Landscape and townscape	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?
10. Material assets	++	++?	++?
11. Population	++	++?	++?
12. Social deprivation	+	+	+
13. Soils, geology and land use	-/0	-/0	-/0
14. Waste	0	0	0
15. Water	0?	0?	0?

Reasons for selecting the preferred alternative

- 1.37 The JPU has selected the Cambridge Tracking (Option 1) as the preferred alternative to act as the basis of the proposed Main Modifications to the JCS, because it is the alternative that the JPU is most confident in relying on with respect to methodology, taking into account the requirements of the NPPF.

- 1.38 The JPU has rejected the ONS 2011 Extended reasonable alternative (which formed the basis of Options 2 and 3), since it is less confident that it will pass the NPPF test of Objectively Assessed Housing Need, compared to the Cambridge Tracking alternative.

Appraisal of overall spatial distribution of development

- 1.39 This component of the SA work focused on three different options for distributing development within West Northamptonshire:
- Option A – distributing growth widely around the edges of the urban areas in many locations where development is found to be feasible.
 - Option B – focusing growth in a small number of larger development areas.
 - Option C – new settlements in sustainable locations including brownfield land in the countryside.
- 1.40 Options A and B were originally considered by the JPU as part of the Emergent Joint Core Strategy in 2009, as alternative overall approaches to delivering the development required. Option B was the preferred option and has been taken forward in each version of the JCS since (expressed as Policy S1 in the JCS as submitted). Option C was identified during the Examination process because stakeholders put forward two options for potential new settlements to be considered (their locations are mapped in Figures 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 in Appendix 15 in the full SA Addendum). These new settlement alternative locations were considered by stakeholders to be an alternative way of delivering some of the development required in the plan area.
- 1.41 Therefore, the two proposed new settlement locations have been appraised and the SA findings are summarised in this section, but the three options (A-C) that are compared in this section relate to comparing the principle of creating new settlements (Option C) with the alternatives of distributing growth around the edges of the urban areas (Option A) or focusing growth in a small number of larger development areas (Option B).

Comparison between Option C (New Settlements) and Options A and B

- 1.42 The 2009 SA Report for the Emergent Core Strategy assessed the likely effects of Options A and B (referred to in the 2009 SA Report as Options 1 and 2 respectively). It concluded that Option B performs generally better than Option A.
- 1.43 Now that a third option (Option C) has been identified, it is necessary to consider the relative effects of that Option in comparison to those of the existing Options A and B. Regardless of the specific locations chosen, the principle of providing development through new settlements under Option C has generally less positive sustainability effects than both the preferred Option B and the alternative Option A. This is because the new settlements would not be able to make use of the better transport links, services and facilities that exist in and around the urban areas and would require significant new infrastructure provision if they were not to result in very high levels of car use amongst residents, which could in turn have negative effects in relation to air quality and noise. However, depending on the size of the individual new settlements, the provision of extensive new infrastructure may not be viable if the new settlement was too small.
- 1.44 The likely effects of Option C on many of the SA objectives would depend on the specific location of the new settlements to be delivered, as the type and sensitivity of potentially affected receptors will be different in different locations. The findings for the two specifically proposed new settlements are presented below, and show how the sustainability effects can differ depending on the location of the settlement, for example in relation to biodiversity, cultural heritage, and flood risk. However, in general, more dispersed development further outside of the main urban areas (as would be delivered under Option C) could be more likely to have a negative effect on landscape character and may represent less efficient use of land.

Reason for selecting the preferred alternative

- 1.45 The JPU has decided to continue with Option B (focusing growth in a small number of larger development areas, i.e. the SUEs around the four main towns), because it is still considered to be

the most appropriate approach to delivering the quantum of housing and employment needed in the plan area. Many more than two new settlement locations would be required to meet the quantum of housing and employment needed, and these would also need to be capable of accommodating around 1,000-2,000 new dwellings, which is not considered realistic within the plan area.

SA findings for the new settlement options

- 1.46 The two new settlement options proposed by stakeholders have been appraised against the SA objectives, drawing on the assumptions set out for the SUE locations appraisal (see Appendix 5 in the full SA Addendum).
- 1.47 **Table 5** below summarises the SA scores for these two new settlement options, and the detailed SA matrices are presented in Appendix 4 in the full SA Addendum.

Table 5 Summary of SA scores for the two new settlement options proposed

SA Objectives	SA51: Land west of Northampton Road, Blisworth	SA38: Sulby Estate
1. Air Quality and Noise	-?/0	-?/0
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	-?	--?
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	--?/+?	--?/+
4. Crime and community safety	0	0
5. Education and training	+?	-?
6. Energy and climatic factors	0	0
7. Health and wellbeing	+?	+?
8. Labour market and economy	-/+?	-/+?
9. Landscape and townscape	-?	?
10. Material assets	+/-?	+/-?
11. Population	-?	-?
12. Social deprivation	-?	-?
13. Soil, geology and land use	+/-/0?	-?/0
14. Waste	+?	0
15. Water	--	-

- 1.48 Only four potential significant effects were identified in relation to these two options. SA38 may have a significantly negative effect on archaeology and cultural heritage due to the fact that the site is adjacent to a Scheduled Monument (Old Sulby Medieval Settlement). Both sites could have a potential significant negative effect on biodiversity due to their proximity to designated biodiversity sites - SA38 includes three potential Local Wildlife Sites within the boundary of the site itself, and SA51 is located approximately 50m from a potential Local Wildlife Site. SA51 is also likely to have a significant negative effect on flood risk as the western and central parts of the site are located in flood zones. Given the relatively small size of the site it may be difficult to avoid developing those areas.

Reasons for selecting or rejecting options

- 1.49 Following the SA of the reasonable alternative new settlement options, the JPU undertook a wider planning assessment of whether each new settlement option should be included in the JCS or not. The JPU Planning Assessment is set out in a separate document: "Site Selection Report" (December 2013), but a summary of the JPU's conclusions regarding whether to select or reject each of the new settlement options from further consideration is provided at the end of Appendix 4 in the full SA Addendum.

Appraisal of SUE distribution around the four main towns

- 1.50 This part of the SA work involved reconsidering alternative locations for the distribution of sustainable urban extensions (SUEs) at each of the towns of Northampton, Daventry, Towcester and Brackley. A number of potential alternative SUE locations were proposed by stakeholders during the Examination hearings in April/May 2013 and the JPU was asked by the Inspector to address shortcomings in the SA work done to date, particularly relating to the reasons for selecting SUE sites around Northampton and other urban areas.
- 1.51 The locations of the SUE alternatives considered are shown in Figures 7.1-7.4 in Appendix 15 in the full SA Addendum. Sixteen SUE options that did not meet the reasonableness criteria that had been developed during the Scoping stage were not subject to SA.

Approach to the appraisal

- 1.52 Each reasonable alternative SUE location was appraised against the SA Framework, taking into account some overarching assumptions about the development to be included within the SUEs (as described in Chapter 7 in the full SA Addendum), for example assuming that there would be a balance of housing and employment, a local centre and schools/nurseries within each SUE. A set of detailed assumptions for determining the significance of effects for each SA objective was also used appraising the alternative SUE locations. These assumptions are presented in Appendix 5 in the full SA Addendum.
- 1.53 The detailed SA matrices for each reasonable alternative SUE location around the four towns are presented in Appendices 6, 7, 8 and 9 in the full SA Addendum and the findings are summarised below.

Northampton

- 1.54 Maps of all the alternative SUE sites considered at Northampton are shown in Figures 7.1-7.5 in Appendix 15 in the full SA Addendum. **Table 6** below summarises the SA scores for each of the sites.
- 1.55 Most of the potential significant negative effects identified relate to SA objectives 2: archaeology and cultural heritage, 3: biodiversity and 9: landscape and townscape. Eighteen of the site options around Northampton could have a significant negative effect on SA objective 2 as they are within or adjacent to areas classified as high sensitivity for cultural heritage. Twenty seven of the site options are in medium to high or high landscape sensitivity areas and therefore could have a significant negative effect on SA objective 9. Most of the sites that are likely to have significant negative effects in relation to the landscape are to the north, east and west of Northampton although there are a few to the south.
- 1.56 Thirty two of the site options have designated biodiversity sites within 250m of the site boundary and therefore have the potential to have a significant negative effect on this objective. Some of the site options have Local Wildlife Sites or Potential Local Wildlife Sites within the site boundaries.
- 1.57 Most of the potential significant positive effects identified relate to SA objective 5: education and training. Twenty three of the site options are within walking distance of at least one school or college so SUE development therefore would have an overall significant positive effect on this objective. The distribution of sites with significant positive effects against this objective is evenly spread to the north, east, west and south of Northampton.

Table 6 Summary of SA findings for potential SUE locations around Northampton

SA Objectives	SA03	SA03 & SA53	SA04 & NJO_12	SA31	SA44 & SA52	SA60	SA61	SA12 & SA62	SA63	DDC 070, 143 & 794	DDC 062, 071, 111 & 793	NBC 175	SNC079	SHLAA 579 & 788	NJO_01	NJO_02	NJO_03	NJO_04	NJO_05	NJO_06		
1. Air Quality and Noise	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	Unreasonable Alternative	Unreasonable Alternative	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/-	
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	--?	--?	--?	-?	--?	--?	--?	-?	-?	--?	--?	--?	-?	--?	--?			-?	-?	--?	--?	--?
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	-?	-?	+/-?			+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?
4. Crime and community safety	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0
5. Education and training	+	+	+++?	+	+++?	+	+++?	+++?	+++?	+++?	+	++?	++?	+++?	++?			+	+	+	++?	++?
6. Energy and climatic factors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0
7. Health and wellbeing	+	+	+++?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+++?	+	++?	++?	+	+			+	+	+	++?	++?
8. Labour market and economy	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+	+	+
9. Landscape and townscape	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	-?	--?	--?	-?	-?	--?	--?			--?	--?	--?	--?	-?
10. Material assets	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+	+	+
11. Population	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+	+	+
12. Social deprivation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0
13. Soil, geology and land use	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-	-/0	-/0	--/0	-/0	-	-/0	-	-/0	-/0			-/0	-/0	-	-/0	-/0
14. Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0
15. Water	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	-?	0

SA Objectives	NJO_07	NJO_08	NJO_09	NJO_10a	NJO_10b	NJO_10c	NJO_10d	NJO_10e	NJO_11	NJO_13	NJO_14	NJO_15	NJO_16	NJO_18	NJO_18 & SA45	NJO_17	NJO19	NJO_20 & NJO_21a	NJO_22 & NJO_21b	NJO_23	NJO_24 & SA20	
1. Air Quality and Noise	+/-	Unreasonable Alternative	+/0	+/-?	+/-?	+/0	+/0	+/-?	+/-?	+/0	+/--	+/--	+/-	+/--	+/--	+/--	+/--	+/--	+/--	+/-	+/-	
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	-?		-?	-?	-?	--?	-?	-?	-?	-?	--?	-?	--?	--?	-?	-?	-?	-?	--?	-?	-?	--?
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	+/--?		+/--?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+++?	+/0?	+/-?	+/--?	+/--	+/--	+/--	+/-?	+/-?	+/-	+/-	+/-?
4. Crime and community safety	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Education and training	+++?		+	+++?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+++?	+	+++?	+++?	+	+	+	+++?	+	+++?	+	+
6. Energy and climatic factors	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Health and wellbeing	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+++?	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+++?/-	+++?	+	+
8. Labour market and economy	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
9. Landscape and townscape	--?		--?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	-/0	-/0	-/0	0	--?	--?	--?	--?
10. Material assets	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
11. Population	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
12. Social deprivation	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. Soil, geology and land use	-/0		-/0	-	--	-	-/0	-	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-	-	-	-/0	-/0	-/0	-	-
14. Waste	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15. Water	--?		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	--?	-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SA Objectives	NJO_25	NJO_26	NJO_27	NJO_28	NJO_29	NJO_30	NJO_31	NJO_32	NJO_33	NJO_34	NJO_37	NJO_38	NJO_39	NJO_40	NJO_41	NJO_42	NJO_43			
1. Air Quality and Noise	Unreasonable Alternative	Unreasonable Alternative	Unreasonable Alternative	Unreasonable Alternative	Unreasonable Alternative	+/0	Unreasonable Alternative	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/-			
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage						-?		-?	-?	-?	-?	0	-?	-?	-?	-?				
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna						+/-?		+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?		
4. Crime and community safety						0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
5. Education and training						++?		++?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++?	++?			
6. Energy and climatic factors						0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Health and wellbeing						+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
8. Labour market and economy						+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
9. Landscape and townscape						-?		-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?	--?	--?
10. Material assets						+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
11. Population						+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
12. Social deprivation						0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
13. Soil, geology and land use						-/0		-/0	-/0	--/0	--/0	--/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0		
14. Waste						0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Water						-?		0	0	-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Daventry

- 1.58 A map of all the alternative SUE sites considered at Daventry is shown in Figure 7.6 in Appendix 15 in the full SA Addendum. **Table 7** below summarises the SA scores for each of the sites.
- 1.59 As with the Northampton site options, most of the potential significant negative effects identified relate to SA objectives 2: archaeology and cultural heritage, 3: biodiversity and 9: landscape and townscape. However, a number of potential significant negative effects have also been identified in relation to SA objective 13: soil, geology and land use. Three parts of the SUE that was allocated in the JCS as submitted are on higher quality agricultural land (Grade 2) so are likely to have a significant negative effect on this objective. Six other sites could also have a significant negative effect on this objective as there are potential ground instability issues in those locations.
- 1.60 Most of the potential significant positive effects identified are again in relation to SA objective 5: education and training.

Table 7 Summary of SA findings for potential SUE locations around Daventry

SA Objectives	SA08A	SA08B	SA08C	SA08D	SA39: Micklewell Park	SA57: Malabar Farm	SA59A: Daventry SE	SA59B: Daventry SE	DDC068: Brookfields Farm	DDC148: Brookfield Farm, London Road	DJO-01	DJO-02	DJO-03	DJO-04	DJO-05	DJO-06	DJO-07	DJO-08	DJO-09	DJO-010	DJO-011
1. Air Quality and Noise	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/0	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/0	+/0	+/0	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-?	+/-?	
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	--?	0	--?	--?	--?	-?	--?	--?	--?	-?	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	-?	-?	0	-?	
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?
4. Crime and community safety	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Education and training	+++	+	+	+	+++	+++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+++	+	+	+	+	+	+
6. Energy and climatic factors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Health and wellbeing	+++	+++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
8. Labour market and economy	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
9. Landscape and townscape	-?	--?	--?	--?	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?	--?
10. Material assets	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
11. Population	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
12. Social deprivation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. Soil, geology & land use	--?	--?	--?	-/0	-?	-?	--?	--?	-?	-?	--?	--?	-?	-/0	-?	-/0	-/0	--?	-?	--?	
14. Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15. Water	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Unreasonable Alternative

Towcester

- 1.61 A map of all the alternative SUE sites considered at Towcester is shown in Figure 7.6 in Appendix 15 in the full SA Addendum. **Table 8** below summarises the SA scores for each of the sites. Relatively few potential significant negative effects were identified for the Towcester options, with most being in relation to SA objective 9: landscape and townscape. Ten of the sites are located within areas of high or medium-low landscape sensitivity and could therefore have significant or minor negative effects on SA objective 9 for that reason.
- 1.62 Ten of the sites are within 250m of a designated biodiversity site so could also have a significant negative effect on SA objective 3. However, in all cases these potential negative effects are uncertain as the potential for effects will depend on the exact nature and design of the sites.
- 1.63 The potential significant positive effects identified for the Towcester sites are all in relation to SA objectives 5: education and training and 7: health.

Table 8 Summary of SA findings for potential SUE locations around Towcester

SA Objectives	TJ_01	TJ_02	TJ_03	TJ_04	TJ_05	TJ_06	TJ_07	TJ_08	TJ_09a	TJ_09b	TJ_09c	TJ_10	TJ_11	TJ_12	TJ_13	SNC576	SNC591	SA58	SNC045
1. Air Quality and Noise	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+0	+/-	Unreasonable Alternative	Unreasonable Alternative	Unreasonable Alternative	Unreasonable Alternative	+/-	+0	+/-	+/-
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	-?	-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-?	-?					0	0	0	0
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/--?	+/--?	+/-?					+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?
4. Crime and community safety	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					0	0	0	0
5. Education and training	+++?	+	+++?	+++?	+++?	+++?	+++?	+	+++?	+++?	+++?					+	+	+	+
6. Energy and climatic factors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					0	0	0	0
7. Health and wellbeing	+?	+?	+?	+++?	+++?	+?	+?	+?	+++?	+++?	+++?					+?	+?	+?	+
8. Labour market and economy	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+					+	+	+	+
9. Landscape and townscape	-?	--?	-?	-?	0	0	0	--?	--?	--?	--?					0	--?	-?	0
10. Material assets	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+					+	+	+	+
11. Population	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+					+	+	+	+
12. Social deprivation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					0	0	0	0
13. Soil, geology and land use	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0					-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0
14. Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					0	0	0	0
15. Water	0	0	-?	-?	0	0	-?	0	-?	0	0					-?	0	0	0

Brackley

- 1.64 A map of all the alternative SUE sites considered at Brackley is shown in Figure 7.6 in Appendix 15 in the full SA Addendum. **Table 9** below summarises the SA scores for each of the sites.
- 1.65 As with other towns, the only potential significant negative effects identified relate to SA objectives 3: biodiversity and 9: landscape. Eight of the sites are within 250m of a designated biodiversity site so could have a significant negative effect on SA objective 3 for that reason. However, in all cases these potential negative effects are uncertain as the potential for effects will depend on the exact nature and design of development. Three of the sites surrounding the north of Brackley are located within areas of high or high-medium landscape sensitivity and could therefore also have a significant negative effect on SA objective 9. Site SNC052 to the north west is also within an area of high to medium landscape sensitivity.
- 1.66 The potential significant positive effects identified for the Brackley sites are again all in relation to SA objectives 5: education and training and 7: health due to the proximity of some of the SUE options to schools and healthcare facilities.

Table 9 Summary of SA findings for potential SUE locations around Brackley

SA Objectives	SA10	SA24	SA41	SNC052	SNC634	BJO-01	BJO-02	BJO-03	BJO-04	BJO-05	BJO-06	BJO-07
1. Air Quality and Noise	+/-	+/0	+/-	+/-	+/0	+/-	+/-	Unreasonable Alternative	+/-	+/0	+/-	+/-
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	0	0	0	-?	0	0	0		-?	-?	-?	-?
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	+/-?	+/-?	+/--?	+/--?	+/-?	+/--?	+/--?		+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?
4. Crime and community safety	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
5. Education and training	++?	+	+?	+	+	++?	++?		+	++?	++?	++?
6. Energy and climatic factors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
7. Health and wellbeing	++?	+?	+?	++?	+?	+?	+?		+	++?	+?	+?
8. Labour market and economy	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+
9. Landscape and townscape	--?	-?	-?	--?	0	-?	-?		--?	--?	-?	-?
10. Material assets	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+
11. Population	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+
12. Social deprivation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
13. Soil, geology and land use	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0		-/0	-/0	-/0	-/0
14. Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	+	0	0
15. Water	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	-

Reasons for selecting the preferred alternatives

- 1.67 Alongside the SA of the reasonable alternative SUE locations around each of the four main towns, the JPU undertook a wider planning assessment of whether each SUE location should be included in the JCS or not. This involved considering whether the SUE location complies with the JCS Vision, Objectives and overarching policy S1, taking the SA findings into account, as well as other deliverability issues such as whether the site is available and any infrastructure requirements. The JPU Planning Assessment is set out in a separate document: "Site Selection Report" (December 2013).
- 1.68 Drawing on these conclusions and the work undertaken to determine the objectively assessed housing and employment requirements over the new plan period, the JPU has identified its Preferred Choice for which SUEs to allocate, including the amount of housing to be delivered at each one, as shown in **Table 10**.
- 1.69 A summary of the reasons for selecting the preferred alternatives at each town is provided in Chapter 7 in the full SA Addendum. There are a wide range of reasons why the other options have been discounted, and the JPU's full conclusions regarding whether to select or reject each SUE site alternative from further consideration can be found in Appendix 10 in the full SA Addendum.

Table 10 JPU's Preferred Choice for the distribution of housing development

Town	Development locations to be allocated
Daventry	
Preferred Choice	Daventry North East SUE (SA08) - No change (As Policy D3 in Submitted JCS)
Alternatives	No alternatives
Brackley	
Preferred Choice	Brackley East SUE (BJO_04) - Changed (See proposed Main Modifications – Policy B2)
	Brackley North SUE (BJO_05) - No change (As Policy B3 in Submitted JCS)
Alternatives	No alternatives
Towcester	
Preferred Choice	Towcester South SUE (TJO_09) - No change (As Policy T3 in Submitted JCS)
Alternatives	No alternatives
Northampton	
Preferred Choice	Northampton North SUE - Increased by 1,500 dwellings (See Proposed Modifications – Policy N3)
	Northampton West SUE - Increased by 1,050 dwellings (See Proposed Modifications – Policy N4)
	Northampton South SUE - No change (As Policy N5 in Submitted JCS)
	Northampton South of Brackmills SUE - Increased by 300 dwellings (See Proposed Modifications – Policy N6)
	Northampton Kings Heath SUE

Town	Development locations to be allocated
	- No change (As Policy N7 in Submitted JCS)
	Northampton North of Whitehills SUE - No change (As Policy N8 in Submitted JCS)
	Northampton Upton Park SUE - No change (As Policy N9 in Submitted JCS)
	Northampton Upton Lodge/ Norwood Farm SUE - Previously a committed site now to be allocated in the JCS and increased in size from the existing commitment by 1,000 dwellings (See Proposed Modifications – Policy N9A)
	Northampton - Increased Urban Capacity 1,750 dwellings (No policy changes)
Alternatives	See Table 11

Appraisal of preferred and alternative SUE locations

- 1.70 The reasons for selecting the preferred SUE locations at each town were described above. The locations of the preferred SUEs at Northampton, Daventry, Towcester and Brackley are shown in Figures 8.1-8.4 in Appendix 15 in the full SA Addendum.
- 1.71 In order to test its revised Preferred Choice, the JPU decided that the sustainability effects of the revised Preferred Choice needed to be appraised in terms of policy approach and then compared with an appraisal of the current distribution of SUEs as allocated in the JCS as submitted. In addition, an alternative option for distributing the development required at Northampton was proposed by Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) during the Examination (see Figure 8.5 in Appendix 15 in the full SA Addendum), and the Inspector requested that it be subject to SA. Therefore, this section summarises the SA findings for the distribution of development at Northampton as set out under the following three alternative options:
- The submitted JCS.
 - The JPU’s Preferred Choice.
 - The NCC option.
- 1.72 **Table 11** shows the numbers of dwellings proposed to be delivered in the urban area and relevant SUEs under each of these three alternatives. The green shaded cells in **Table 11** show those elements of the JPU’s Preferred Choice and Northamptonshire County Council’s option that are different from the allocations in the submitted JCS. It should be noted that only the dwelling numbers proposed in the JPU’s Preferred Choice would meet the new housing requirements identified in the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs paper (July 2013), as the submitted JCS and NCC options are based on the housing requirements set out in the submitted JCS, which go up to 2026.

Table 11 Number of dwellings to be delivered under the three alternative options for the distribution of housing development at Northampton

Submitted JCS	New 'preferred choice'	NCC Option
Northampton North SUE - 2,000 dwellings	Northampton North SUE - Increased by 1,500 dwellings (3,500 dwellings total)	Northampton North SUE - Increased by 2,500 dwellings (4,500 dwellings total)
Northampton West SUE - 1,500 dwellings	Northampton West SUE - Increased by 1,050 dwellings (2,550 dwellings total)	Northampton West SUE - Not included.

Submitted JCS	New 'preferred choice'	NCC Option
Northampton South SUE - 1,000 dwellings	Northampton South SUE - No change (1,000 dwellings total)	Northampton South SUE - Not included.
Northampton South of Brackmills SUE - 1,000 dwellings	Northampton South of Brackmills SUE - Increased by 300 dwellings (1,300 dwellings total)	Northampton South of Brackmills SUE - No change (1,000 dwellings total)
Northampton Kings Heath SUE - 3,000 dwellings	Northampton Kings Heath SUE - No change (3,000 dwellings total)	Northampton Kings Heath SUE - No change (3,000 dwellings total)
Northampton North of Whitehills SUE - 1,000 dwellings	Northampton North of Whitehills SUE - No change (1,000 dwellings total)	Northampton North of Whitehills SUE - No change (1,000 dwellings total)
Northampton Upton Park SUE - 1,000 dwellings	Northampton Upton Park SUE - No change (1,000 dwellings total)	Northampton Upton Park SUE - No change (1,000 dwellings total)
Northampton Upton Lodge/ Norwood Farm SUE - Not included	Northampton Upton Lodge/ Norwood Farm SUE - New SUE: (3,500 dwellings total)	Northampton Upton Lodge/ Norwood Farm SUE - Not included.
Northampton urban area - 1,500 dwellings	Northampton urban area - Increased Urban Capacity 1,750 dwellings (3,250 dwellings in total)	Northampton urban area - No change (1,500 dwellings)

Approach to the appraisal

- 1.73 The starting point for the appraisal of the three options was to draw from the SA matrices for the relevant alternative SUE sites that were produced during the earlier stage of appraisal (see previous section). The SA matrices for each SUE site were revised and amended, taking into account the specific wording of the relevant policies in the JCS as submitted as well as any relevant proposed Main Modifications (these are described in detail in the next section). Where appraisal scores had previously been based on the high level assumptions used for the SUE options appraisals, this information was replaced drawing on the specific details of the relevant policy. Additional matrices were prepared to identify the potential sustainability effects of increasing the number of dwellings within the Northampton urban area, as this was not specifically appraised in the SA Report that accompanied the submitted JCS.
- 1.74 Appendix 11 in the full SA Addendum presents the SA matrices for each SUE location and the Northampton urban area. The information shown in **Table 11** above and in Figures 8.1-8.5 in Appendix 15 in the full SA Addendum informed the SA by showing exactly where the additional housing would go under each option. The appraisal has also taken into account the fact that all of the other policies in the JCS would apply to any development that takes place on the allocated SUEs and within Northampton urban area, and these policies should help to mitigate or enhance many of the potential effects identified.

Summary of the appraisal findings for Daventry, Towcester and Brackley

- 1.75 The SUEs for Daventry, Towcester and Brackley remain unchanged in terms of the location of the SUEs, and their overall potential in terms of numbers of dwellings to be delivered within and beyond the JCS plan period (although the extension of the end date of the plan period to 2029 means that more dwellings will now be delivered within the plan period at these SUEs than was the case in the JCS as submitted).
- 1.76 A summary of the appraisal scores, using the SA assumptions that have been applied to the SA objectives in this SA Addendum and the more detailed information and analysis undertaken during the work for the SA Addendum is shown in **Table 12**.

- 1.77 The summary shows that all of the SUEs are likely to have significant negative effects on SA objective 3: biodiversity due to their proximity to designated wildlife sites. They are all also likely to have significant negative effects with respect to SA objective 9: landscape due to their being in areas considered to be of medium or medium-high sensitive landscape. For both these SA objectives there is the potential for some mitigation.
- 1.78 Daventry North East SUE has the potential for significant negative effects on SA objective 2: archaeology and cultural heritage due to its location in close proximity to Borough Hill Scheduled Monument, and also for SA objective 13: soil, geology and land use because it contains grade 2 agricultural land, and because of some potential land instability issues.
- 1.79 All the SUEs, except Brackley East SUE, have the potential to have significant positive effects on SA objective 5: education and training and SA objective 7: health and well-being because these SUEs would be required to provide educational facilities as part of the package of development, and because they would either include health facilities or be well located to existing health facilities, and provide good opportunities for physical recreation due to access to open space and walking opportunities.
- 1.80 Similarly, all SUEs except Brackley East SUE would have potential significant positive effects on SA objective 10: material assets and SA objective: population because of the significant provision of housing and associated services and facilities at these SUEs, all of which should make a material contribution to meeting local needs.
- 1.81 Towcester South East SUE and Brackley East SUE have the potential to have significant positive effects on SA objective 8: labour market and economy due to the provision of significant amounts of land employment land as part of the SUEs.

Table 12 Summary of SA scores for the distribution of development at Daventry, Towcester and Brackley

SA objectives	Daventry North East SUE	Towcester South East SUE	Brackley East SUE	Brackley North SUE
1. Air Quality and Noise	+/0	+/-	+/-	+/-/0?
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	--?	-?	-?	-?
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?
4. Crime and community safety	0	0	0	0
5. Education and training	++?	++?	-?	++/-?
6. Energy and climatic factors	0?	0?	0?	0?
7. Health and wellbeing	++	++	+	++
8. Labour market and economy	+	++	++	+
9. Landscape and townscape	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?
10. Material assets	++	++	+	++
11. Population	++	++	+	++
12. Social deprivation	+	+	+	+
13. Soil, geology and land use	--?	-/0	-/0	-/0
14. Waste	0	0	0	+?
15. Water	0	-?	0	0

Summary of the appraisal findings for Northampton

- 1.82 This section summarises firstly the potential sustainability effects of the distribution of development at Northampton as it is set out in the submitted JCS, comprising the SUEs allocated in Policies N3 to N9, and the 1,500 net additional dwellings proposed to be delivered in the

Northampton urban area. Secondly, it presents the SA scores from the appraisal of the JPU's Preferred Choice for distributing development at Northampton in the proposed Main Modifications.

- 1.83 Finally, the likely effects of the distribution of development at Northampton as it is set out in the Northamptonshire County Council option are considered, in comparison to the likely effects of both the submitted JCS and the Preferred Choice.

Distribution of development at Northampton as set out in the Submitted JCS

- 1.84 **Table 13** summarises the SA scores for the distribution of development at Northampton, as set out in the submitted JCS. It shows that one of the SUEs, Northampton South, could have a significant negative effect on SA objective 1: air quality and noise as it is adjacent to the M1, meaning that noise effects are likely to be greater.
- 1.85 The South of Brackmills, North of Whitehills and Upton Park SUEs are in areas of higher sensitivity in relation to cultural heritage, and so development at those locations may have significant negative effects on SA objective 2: archaeology and cultural heritage.
- 1.86 All of the SUEs as set out in the submitted JCS are likely to have significant negative effects (as part of overall mixed effects) on SA objective 3: biodiversity as all are within 250m of biodiversity designations (most of which are Local Wildlife Sites and Potential Local Wildlife Sites) that could potentially be affected by development.
- 1.87 The SUE policies in the submitted JCS all provide for new schools or school places as part of the SUEs, meaning that positive effects on SA objective 5: education and training are likely in relation to all of the SUEs and development in the urban area and the effects for four of the SUEs (Northampton North, Northampton West, North of Whitehills and Upton Park) are likely to be significantly positive.
- 1.88 All of the SUEs will have at least a minor positive effect on SA objective 7: health, with most of the likely effects being significantly positive, as all of the SUE policies in the submitted JCS specify that healthcare facilities will be provided within the local centres that will be included in the SUEs. This will help to ensure easy access to doctor's surgeries etc. and will help to ensure that existing facilities do not become overloaded. In addition, the SUEs will all incorporate walking and cycling routes and open space which will help to facilitate and encourage active outdoor activities.
- 1.89 Three of the SUEs (South of Brackmills, Kings Heath and Upton Park) are located in areas of medium-high or high landscape sensitivity which means that development in these locations could have a significant negative effect on SA objective 9: landscape. However, in all cases the effects are uncertain depending on the specific design of the developments, which are all likely to include areas of green infrastructure which could help to mitigate effects on the landscape. It is also recognised that the SUE policies in the submitted JCS provide some mitigation as they require detailed masterplans that will demonstrate how the development will positively respond to context and design issues.
- 1.90 All of the likely effects on SA objective 10: housing are significantly positive as all of the SUEs, as well as development within the urban area, would result in the provision of large number of new homes and it is assumed that the new development would be built to high standards and would be in accordance with JCS Policy H1: Housing Density and Mix of Type, which specifies the need to accommodate the needs of older and vulnerable groups, as well as Policy H2: Affordable Housing, which specifies that 35% of new housing developments in the Northampton Related Development Area must be affordable. However, it is noted that while the SUEs all individually provide for high numbers of new homes, the combined total housing numbers provided by the allocated SUEs and urban capacity figures set out in the submitted JCS would not meet the most up-to-date objectively assessed housing need figure for West Northamptonshire⁷.
- 1.91 All of the allocated SUEs will also have a significant positive effect on SA objective 11: population as all of the SUE policies provide for a new local centre which would include health, retail and community services and facilities to serve the local residents and which would avoid existing facilities nearby becoming overloaded.

⁷ Objectively Assessed Housing Needs V2. West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit, December 2013.

- 1.92 Northampton North SUE could have a significant negative effect on SA objective 13: soil, geology and land use as more than half of the site is classed as Grade 2 agricultural land.

Table 13 Summary of SA scores for the distribution of development at Northampton as set out in the submitted JCS

SA Objectives	North SUE (Policy N3)	West SUE (Policy N4)	South SUE (Policy N5)	South of Brackmills SUE (Policy N6)	Kings Heath SUE (Policy N7)	North of Whitehills SUE (Policy N8)	Upton Park SUE (Policy N9)	Urban Capacity (Policy S3)	Northampton Upton Lodge/ Norwood Farm SUE
1. Air Quality and Noise	+/-	+/-	+/--	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-?	n/a
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	-?	-?	-?	--?	-?	--?	--?	-?	n/a
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/-	n/a
4. Crime and community safety	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
5. Education and training	++/-?	++/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+	++/-?	++/-?	+	n/a
6. Energy and climatic factors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
7. Health and wellbeing	++	++	+/-	+	+	++	++	+/-?	n/a
8. Labour market and economy	++	+	+	+	++	+	+	+	n/a
9. Landscape and townscape	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/--?	+/--?	+/-?	+/--?	+	n/a
10. Material assets	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	n/a
11. Population	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+/-?	n/a
12. Social deprivation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	n/a
13. Soil, geology and land use	--/0	-/0	-/0	-	-	-/0	-/0	-?/+/0	n/a
14. Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	n/a
15. Water	0	0	+/0	0	0	0	-	-?	n/a

SA findings for the distribution of development at Northampton under the Preferred Choice

- 1.93 **Table 14** summarises the SA scores for the distribution of development at Northampton, as proposed under the Preferred Choice. All of the SA scores for the SUEs proposed under the Preferred Choice are the same as for the distribution of development set out in the submitted JCS, except for the dwellings to be delivered in the urban area and the additional SUE proposed (Upton Lodge/Norwood Farm), which was not allocated in the submitted JCS. Therefore, the potential sustainability effects set out above also apply to the Preferred Choice. The similarity in sustainability effects is because the proposed SUEs and the housing numbers have not changed in the Preferred Choice for four of the SUEs (Northampton South, Kings Heath, North of Whitehills and Upton Park).
- 1.94 Overall, as more greenfield land around Northampton would be developed under the Preferred Choice than in the submitted JCS, cumulatively, there is potential for more negative effects on biodiversity, heritage assets, landscape and loss of high quality agricultural land. However, there are a number of policy safeguards within the JCS and the Main Modifications proposed for the revised SUE allocations which would seek to reduce and mitigate these potential effects.

Table 14 Summary of SA scores for the distribution of development at Northampton under the Preferred Choice

SA Objectives	North SUE	West SUE	South SUE	South of Brackmills SUE	Kings Heath SUE	North of Whitehills SUE	Upton Park SUE	Upton Lodge / Norwood Farm SUE	Urban Capacity
1. Air Quality and Noise	+/-	+/-	+/--	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	++/--?
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	-?	-?	-?	--?	-?	--?	--?	--?	--?
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/-
4. Crime and community safety	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Education and training	++/-?	++/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+	++/-?	++/-?	++?	++?
6. Energy and climatic factors	0?	0?	0?	0?	0?	0?	0?	0?	0
7. Health and wellbeing	++	++	+/-	+	+	++	++	++	++/--?
8. Labour market and economy	++	+	+	+	++	+	+	+	++/-
9. Landscape and townscape	+/--?	+/-?	+/-?	+/--?	+/--?	+/-?	+/--?	+/-?	++?
10. Material assets	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
11. Population	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++/--?
12. Social deprivation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++
13. Soil, geology and land use	--/0	-/0	-	-/0	-	-/0	-/0	-	-?/++/0
14. Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
15. Water	0	0	+/0	0	0	0	-	0	--?

SA findings for the distribution of development at Northampton under the Northamptonshire County Council Option

Comparison with the Submitted JCS

- 1.95 **Table 15** summarises the SA scores for the distribution of development at Northampton, as proposed under the Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) option. The key difference between this option and the submitted JCS is that the SUEs at Northampton West and South would not be developed and the 2,500 homes that would have come forward in those locations under the submitted JCS (1,500 at Northampton West and 1,000 at Northampton South) would instead be delivered at the Northampton North SUE, the area of which would be extended to the west to accommodate the additional 2,500 homes. As a result, the areas of greenfield land to the west and south of Northampton would remain undeveloped and the potential positive and negative effects of the Northampton West and South SUEs identified above in relation to the submitted JCS would not occur. Overall, as less greenfield land to the west and south of Northampton would be developed under the NCC option than in the submitted JCS, cumulatively, there is potential for less negative effects on biodiversity, heritage assets, landscape and loss of high quality agricultural land. All of the SA scores for the remaining SUEs proposed under the NCC option (Northampton North, South, Kings Heath, North of Whitehills and Upton Park) and the urban area, are the same as those for the distribution of development set out in the submitted JCS, except for one difference in the Northampton North SUE. Therefore, the potential sustainability effects for these locations described above for the submitted JCS also apply to the NCC option.
- 1.96 The similarity in sustainability effects between the NCC option and the submitted JCS is because the proposed SUEs and the housing numbers have not changed in the NCC option for four of the SUEs (South of Brackmills, Kings Heath, North of Whitehills and Upton Park). The number of homes to be delivered in the urban area of Northampton under the NCC option is also the same as under the submitted JCS, as is the total number of houses to be delivered at Northampton.
- 1.97 While the number of new homes to be provided at one of the SUEs (Northampton North) is significantly higher under the NCC option in comparison with the submitted JCS (4,500 as opposed to 2,000), the additional land area that would be included within the boundary of that SUE to accommodate the 2,500 extra houses has only resulted in one different SA score from the allocated SUE in the submitted JCS on the basis of the assumptions that have been used for the appraisals. The allocated Northampton North SUE was already scored as likely to have a significant negative effect (as part of an overall mixed, uncertain effect) on SA objective 3: biodiversity because the SUE (prior to the increase in site area) was already within 250m of Crowfields Common Local Nature Reserve and Cowpasture Spinney Local Wildlife Site lies within the SUE itself. The increased site area of the SUE under the NCC option would mean that another Local Wildlife Site (Hog Head Spinney) would lie within 800m of the SUE to the west; however this level of proximity would only be associated with a potential minor negative effect and the potential for a significant negative effect had already been identified in relation to the other, closer biodiversity designations.
- 1.98 The key difference between the extended area of the Northampton North SUE under the NCC option and the allocated Northampton North SUE in the submitted JCS is that there could be a potentially significant negative effect on SA objective 4: landscape under the NCC option, with only a minor negative effect identified for this SUE as allocated in the submitted JCS. This is due to the area of the SUE that would be delivered under the NCC option being within an area of medium to high landscape sensitivity. The additional land that would be developed to the north of Moulton under this option would encroach on the areas of open land to the north of the village.

Comparison with the Preferred Choice

- 1.99 The NCC option varies quite considerably from the Preferred Choice in terms of the distribution of development and the total number of homes to be delivered at Northampton would be lower. The Northampton West and South SUEs would not be delivered and a greater number of houses would instead come forward at the Northampton North SUE (4,500 in total). In addition, under the NCC option the Upton Lodge/Norwood Farm SUE proposed as part of the Preferred Choice would not be delivered and the number of dwellings to be delivered in both the urban area and the South of Brackmills SUE would be lower (in both cases the figure would be the same as in the submitted JCS).

- 1.100 As a result, the areas of greenfield land to the west and south of Northampton would remain undeveloped and the potential positive and negative effects of the Northampton West, Northampton South and Upton Lodge SUEs identified in relation to the Preferred Choice would not occur. Therefore, cumulatively, there is potential for less negative effects on biodiversity, heritage assets, landscape and loss of high quality agricultural land under the NCC option compared to the Preferred Choice.
- 1.101 The number of homes to be delivered in the urban area of Northampton would also be lower under the NCC option than under the Preferred Choice (1,500 instead of 3,250). This reduction means the figure would be the same as that described above under the submitted JCS and the effects of a lower urban capacity figure under the NCC option remain as described above under the submitted JCS option. Overall, the NCC option would have more minor positive effects associated with development in the urban area compared to a number of potentially significant positive effects identified for the urban area under the Preferred Choice. Similarly, the potentially significant negative effects on SA objective 1: air quality and noise, 2: heritage assets, 7: health, 11: population and 14: water identified for the urban area under the preferred Choice would be minor negative effects under the NCC option due to the lower number of net additional dwellings to be delivered resulting in less pressure on infrastructure, facilities and services or sensitive receptors.
- 1.102 While the number of new homes to be provided at the Northampton North SUE is higher under this NCC option in comparison to the Preferred Choice (4,500 as opposed to 3,500) and the number of homes to be provided at the South of Brackmills SUE is slightly lower, the SA scores for both SUEs (as shown in Tables 8.4 and 8.5) are the same. Based on the assumptions that have been applied throughout the SA, the changes in the land area of these SUEs between the NCC option and the Preferred Choice would not lead to any major differences in the characteristics/circumstances of the SUE that would warrant different SA scores. However, it should be noted that while Northampton North SUE is identified as having a potential significant negative effect on SA objective 4: landscape under both the NCC option and JPU's Preferred Choice, the landscape impacts relate to both the extended area proposed in the Preferred Choice, as well as the additional land that would be developed to the north of Moulton under the NCC option. Therefore, although both options are identified as significant, potentially more landscape effects would occur under the NCC option due to the larger area proposed for development, and the proximity to Moulton village.

Table 15 SA Scores for the distribution of development at Northampton under the NCC option

SA Objectives	North SUE (increase by 2,500)	West SUE	South SUE	South of Brackmills SUE	Kings Heath SUE	North of Whitehills SUE	Upton Park SUE	Urban Capacity	
1. Air Quality and Noise	+/-	SUE Rejected	SUE Rejected	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-?	
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	-?			--?	-?	--?	--?	--?	-?
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	+/--?			+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+/-
4. Crime and community safety	0			0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Education and training	++/-?			+/-?	+	++/-?	++/-?	++/-?	+
6. Energy and climatic factors	0			0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Health and wellbeing	++			+	+	++	++	++	+/-?
8. Labour market and economy	++			+	++	+	+	+	+
9. Landscape and townscape	+/--?			+/--?	+/-?	+/--?	+/--?	+/--?	+
10. Material assets	++			++	++	++	++	++	++
11. Population	++			++	++	++	++	++	+/-?
12. Social deprivation	+			+	+	+	+	+	+
13. Soil, geology and land use	--/0			-	-	-/0	-/0	-/0	-?/+/0
14. Waste	0			0	0	0	0	0	+
15. Water	0			0	0	0	0	-	-?

Reasons for selecting the preferred alternatives

1.103 The Preferred Choice has been selected by the JPU because it considers that:

- It supports the Joint Core Strategy Vision.
- It is consistent with the spatial strategy of concentrating growth at the principal urban area of Northampton.
- It would focus growth on and joined to the urban area of Northampton helping to foster a successful economy and expanding diverse and sustainable communities, supported by good social and integrated transport facilities and infrastructure.

- It could support existing communities through the provision of a range of facilities including education and health.
- The Planning Assessment indicates that environmental constraints identified in the SA are capable of mitigation and outweighed by other social and economic benefits.
- The sites are suitable, available and achievable in the plan period and therefore would meet the objectively assessed housing needs for Northampton.
- Infrastructure requirements have been identified for the site and are capable of being delivered within the plan period.

Appraisal of employment sites

1.104 As well as the alternative SUE locations that were proposed by stakeholders during the Examination, a number of strategic employment sites were also proposed. The JPU agreed to consider these alternative sites against the two strategic employment sites that were identified in the JCS as submitted (the DIRFT extension and Silverstone Circuit). In total, nine strategic employment site options were considered, including the two identified in the JCS as submitted (maps showing the location of the sites can be found in Figures 9.1.1-9.1.7 in the full SA Addendum).

Approach to the appraisal

1.105 Each of the strategic employment site options was appraised in SA matrices provided in Appendix 13 in the full SA Addendum. As with the SUE options, a set of assumptions was used for determining the significance of effects - these can be found in Appendix 12 in the full SA Addendum. Information provided in the JCS as submitted or provided by the site promoters was used to understand how much and what types of employment might be delivered at each site.

Summary of the appraisal findings

1.106 **Table 16** at the end of this section summarises the SA scores for the nine strategic employment site options. The likely significant effects identified are summarised by SA objective below.

SA objective 1: Air quality and noise

1.107 The proximity of sites to the M1 motorway is a key factor in determining effects, with several of the sites (the currently identified site SA28 and alternative sites SA29, SA36/50, SA49 and NBC208) having a potential significant effect in relation to noise because they are adjacent to the motorway, meaning that employees could be affected by traffic noise, particularly in those parts of the sites that abut the M1.

1.108 Two of the alternative site options (SA49 and NBC208) are adjacent to the AQMA that has been designated along part of the M1 motorway and are therefore likely to have significant negative effects on this objective, particularly if commercial activities at those sites were to compound existing air quality problems.

SA objective 2: Archaeology and cultural heritage

1.109 One of the alternative sites (SA49) is adjacent to a high sensitivity area (the Collingtree Village Conservation Area to the north east of the site) and so could have a significant negative effect on this objective. It is however noted that the fact that the M1 already lies between the site and the Collingtree Conservation Area could mean that significant effects on its setting are less likely.

SA objective 3: Biodiversity, flora and fauna

1.110 Most of the employment site options (all except for the alternative site SA36/50) are within 250m of a designated biodiversity site so could have a significant negative effect on this objective. In all cases, these potential negative effects are uncertain as they will depend on the exact nature and design of the new employment development.

SA objective 8: Labour market and economy

- 1.111 Most of the site options (all apart from the identified site SJ01) would have a significant positive effect on this objective due to being proposed for employment development and because they are generally close to sustainable transport links such as public footpaths as well as existing residential areas which should make non car-based modes of travel more feasible for commuters. A number of the sites have uncertainty attached to the likely significant positive effects as although they are proposed for employment development which would in principle have a positive effect on this objective, it is noted that they are adjacent to the M1 motorway and so employment development there could potentially encourage and facilitate less sustainable commuting patterns.

SA objective 9: Landscape and townscape

- 1.112 Three of the alternative employment site options (SA29, SA36/50 and SA31) are in areas of high landscape sensitivity; therefore are likely to have a significant negative effect on this objective. Another alternative site (SA46) is in an area classed as being of medium landscape sensitivity; however it is likely to have an overall significantly negative effect on this SA objective as it would also contribute to settlement coalescence as the small existing area of open land between the eastern edge of Great Houghton and Brackmills Industrial Estate which is part of the main urban area of Northampton would be filled in (although it is noted that further west the village is already connected to the main urban area of Northampton through continuous development). In all cases, the potential significant negative effects identified are uncertain as the exact impacts on the landscape will depend on factors relating to the specific design and layout of the new employment development.

SA objective 15: Water

- 1.113 One of the alternative sites (SHLAA NBC 208) is likely to have a significant negative effect on this objective as approximately half of this site is located within flood zones 2 and 3 (the northern and eastern areas of the site). This is linked to the fact that the Grand Union Canal flows through the site.

Table 16 Summary table of scores for alternative strategic employment site locations

SA Objectives	SA29	SA36 and SA50	SA46	SA49	SA82	SA28 (DIRFT)	SJO1 (Silverstone)	SHLAA NBC 208	SA31
1. Air Quality and Noise	--?/0	--?/0	0?/-	--?	0?/-	+/-/0	+/-/0	--	+/-/0
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage	-?	-?	-?	--?	-?	-?	-?	-?	-?
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna	--?/+	-?/+	--?/+?	--?/+?	--?/+?	--?/+?	--?/+	--?/+?	--?/+
4. Crime and community safety	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Education and training	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
6. Energy and climatic factors	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Health and wellbeing	+?	+?	+?	+?/-?	+?	+?	0?	+?/-?	+
8. Labour market and economy	++?	++?	++	++?	++	++?	+	++?	++
9. Landscape and townscape	--?	--?	--?	-?	-?	0?	0?	0	--?
10. Material assets	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Population	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Social deprivation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. Soil, geology and land use	-/0	-	-/0	-/0	-/0	0/-	0/-	-/0	-/0
14. Waste	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15. Water	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	--	0

Appraisal of Proposed Main Modifications proposed for the Joint Core Strategy

1.114 The JPU has prepared a set of proposed Main Modifications to the JCS as submitted. These are changes that the JPU intends to make to the document, and they include amendments to the wording of some of the policies and supporting text as well as a small number of new policies. The proposed Main Modifications are set out in a schedule that was prepared by the JPU, and are further changes to the July 2012 Tracked Changes version of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission version as amended by Proposed Changes [Examination document SUB04]. In the schedule, the JPU has set out clear reasons for including each proposed Main Modification in the JCS.

Approach to the appraisal of the proposed Main Modifications

- 1.115 Consideration needed to be given to how the proposed Main Modifications affect the earlier SA findings for the JCS (as described in the SA Addendum for the JCS as submitted (Volumes 1 and 2 July 2012)). LUC has reproduced the schedule of proposed Main Modifications and added an extra column to record the SA implications of each proposed Main Modification, stating whether the change that the JPU proposes to make to the plan affects the SA scores for the policy or proposal in question.
- 1.116 Where a proposed Main Modification relates to a significant change to the JCS that has not previously been appraised (for example a new policy or SUE allocation), the proposed Main Modification has been appraised as part of this current SA work and reported on in the full SA Addendum and this summary. The relevant sections of the full SA Addendum are referred to in the schedule.
- 1.117 The schedule showing the SA implications of the proposed Main Modifications is presented in Appendix 14 in the full SA Addendum and the findings are summarised in full in Chapter 14 of that document. Most of the changes in the proposed Main Modifications do not represent significant changes to the JCS as they are generally minor in nature and are intended either to correct factual errors or to provide better clarity. A small number of new policies have been introduced through the proposed Main Modifications, including policy E8 which allocates a strategic employment site at Junction 16 of the M1, policy N9A which allocates Northampton Norwood Farm/Upton Lodge SUE and a new overarching policy which sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The allocations in the new policies E8 and N9a have been appraised in the full SA Addendum and likely significant effects have been identified in relation to some of the SA objectives as follows:
- Potential significant negative effects from the employment site allocated in the new Policy E8 have been identified in relation to SA objective 1: sustainable transport, noise and air quality and SA objective 9: landscape and townscape, while a potential significant positive effect is identified for SA objective 8: employment.
 - Potential significant negative effects from the SUE allocated in policy N9A have been identified in relation to SA objective 2: archaeology and cultural heritage and SA objective 3: biodiversity, while potential significant positive effects are identified for SA objective 5: education, SA objective 7: health, SA objective 10: material assets and SA objective 11: population.
- 1.118 The new policy which sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have broadly positive effects across all of the SA objectives, as its overarching aim is to ensure sustainable development (this is considered to include all of the issues addressed by the SA objectives e.g. biodiversity, cultural heritage, landscape etc.). The effects are considered to be minor rather than significant, due to the general nature of the policy.

Conclusions

- 1.119 This SA Addendum Report brings together the results of an intense period of work over nearly six months that has sought to identify the effects of a range of alternatives to the JCS as submitted in order to ensure that the final adopted JCS will be the most sustainable one for West Northamptonshire.
- 1.120 The SA Addendum work builds on the earlier SA work on the JCS as submitted. It is not intended to replace the earlier SA work, but to supplement it, by providing further more detailed assessment in order to help the JPU make decisions and choose the most appropriate strategy for development over the period covered by the plan.
- 1.121 The SA Addendum has identified the effects of developing in different locations in the JCS area, primarily around the four main settlements, and the JPU has sought to avoid where possible the most sensitive environmental locations, while also having to be guided by other factors (e.g. transport implications). For example, the JPU has deliberately avoided choosing locations for SUEs that could affect the integrity of the internationally important Upper Nene Gravel Pits nature conservation site. This does not mean that all potentially sensitive locations have been avoided, but it is reasonable to conclude that the alternatives would also result in significant effects, although they would be experienced in different locations.

Cumulative effects

- 1.122 The earlier SA work on the JCS as submitted identified a number of potential cumulative effects. In addition to the cumulative effects identified in the earlier SA work, there is the potential for cumulative effects arising from the proposed strategic employment site at Junction 16 on air quality and noise associated with traffic using the M1. There is also the potential for cumulative effects of increasing the amount of development to be delivered through 'urban capacity' sites (likely to be a large number of smaller sites) on the townscape of Northampton and flood risk of both existing and new development. The overall increase in development in the proposed Main Modifications will inevitably put pressure on natural resources, and in this respect there could be cumulative significant negative effects on the achievement of Water Framework Directive objectives and targets.

Difficulties encountered

- 1.123 The main difficulty encountered while carrying out the SA work was determining the appropriate method for assessing all the areas of land that, at least in theory, had the potential to become SUEs, and then ensuring that each was appraised on a consistent and objective basis.
- 1.124 It is for this reason that detailed assumption tables were drawn up in order to make the process for making judgements as transparent and systematic as possible. This resulted in a large number of appraisal matrices being produced but it was felt this needed to be done if the SA work, and the decisions linked to the work, was to prove robust and reliable.

Monitoring

- 1.125 Once the JCS is adopted, the significant effects identified in the earlier SA work and this SA Addendum will need to be monitored. In addition to the monitoring framework contained in the earlier SA work, it is considered that the JPU will need to work with partners to monitor the following significant effects:
- Effects on noise and air quality associated with Northampton South SUE, development within the Northampton urban area, and Junction 16 strategic and DIRFT employment sites.
 - Effects on cultural heritage associated with the SUEs at Northampton South of Brackmills, Northampton North of Whitehills, Northampton Upton Park, Northampton Upton

Lodge/Norwood Farm, Daventry North East, and from development within the urban area at Northampton.

- Effects on biodiversity, flora and fauna at virtually all the SUEs, and the DIRFT strategic employment site.
- Effects on access to educational facilities for virtually all the SUEs and from development within the urban area of Northampton.
- Effects on health including access to health facilities at virtually all the SUEs and from development within the urban area of Northampton.
- Effects on employment land take-up and job creation of SUEs at Northampton North, Northampton Kings Heath SUE, Brackley East, Towcester South East, development within the urban area of Northampton, and at the two strategic employment sites.
- Effects on the landscape from development at virtually all the SUEs, the Junction 16 strategic employment site, and the significant positive effects identified from development in the urban area of Northampton.
- Effects on objectively assessed housing needs and community facilities and service provision at all the SUEs, and from development in the urban area of Northampton.
- Effects on loss of best and most versatile agricultural land at Northampton North SUE, and Daventry North East SUE, and effects on land stability at Daventry North East SUE.
- Effects on flood risk from development within the urban area of Northampton.

1.126 It is recommended that a comprehensive combined monitoring framework is provided in the SA Adoption Statement to accompany the JCS when adopted.

LUC

December 2013