

West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy SA Addendum: Final Report (December 2013)

Appendix 5

SA Assumptions for SUE Options

Table 1: SA Framework and Assumptions for the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy SA Addendum

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
1. Air quality and noise		
<p>a) Reduce the need to travel and facilitate modal shift.</p> <p>b) Reduce/minimise the potential increase in congestion.</p> <p>c) Avoid sensitive development within areas of high noise levels or poor air quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in motor vehicle trips and increased dependence on car use? • Sensitive location of new development in areas of high noise levels or poor air quality. • Support for the objectives of local air quality action plans? • Improvements in existing local public transport infrastructure or access to public transport? • Exacerbating existing traffic congestion hotspots or improvements to the current situation? • The inclusion of policies to enhance air quality where new development may deliver a means of doing so? 	<p>Sustainable Transport</p> <p>It is assumed that all of the SUE site options will have a minor positive (+) effect on this part of the SA objective, as it is assumed that sustainable transport links would be provided as part of the new SUE development at any site. Note that the SA has not taken into account the proximity of SUE options to main roads where public transport links such as bus routes may be more likely to be provided. This is because effects will depend largely on the frequency/reliability of services and on the exact routes taken by buses in relation to key destinations such as town centres and employment areas. Assumptions cannot be made about these issues on the basis of a potential SUE site being close to a main road; therefore the proximity of sites to main roads has not been taken to indicate good access to public transport.</p> <p>Noise</p> <p>Sites that are within close proximity of features such as strategic roads or large industrial areas, which could result in noise disturbance for residents would have a minor negative (-) effect on this objective while sites that are not in proximity of these features would have a negligible (0) effect in relation to noise. Where a site is adjacent to a motorway, a significant negative (--) effect on noise is likely.</p> <p>Air Quality</p> <p>Sites that are within or close to AQMAs are likely to have a minor negative (-) effect, while sites that are well outside of an AQMA would have a negligible (0) effect.</p> <p>Mixed effects (+/-) will be recorded for this SA objective, reflecting the potential for positive effects in relation to facilitating sustainable transport modes, but potential for negative effects on residents of the new development arising from noise and/or air pollution. Where sites will have a minor negative effect in relation to both noise and air quality, a significant negative effect will be recorded in relation to those components of the SA objective, so the mixed effect would be minor positive for sustainable transport, significant negative for noise and air quality (+/--). Where sites would have a negligible effect in relation to both noise and air</p>

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
		quality, this would again result in an overall mixed effect (+/0).
2. Archaeology and cultural heritage		
<p>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).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development that affects listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments, registered historic parks and gardens, and registered battlefields (or their settings)? • Development being steered to where it can be accommodated in less sensitive areas? • Distinctive development that is well related to the natural environment and characteristic scale, form materials and detailing of the settlement and contributes to a sense of place? • Promotes the enhancement of the archaeological resource and other aspects of heritage, such as, parks and open spaces, and areas with a particular historical or cultural association? • Will the plan proposals provide opportunities for the enhancement of historic assets, townscapes and landscapes? 	<p>English Heritage bases its definition of the setting of a heritage asset on the previous national Planning Policy Statement 5, as 'the surroundings in which [the asset] is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance, or may be neutral'¹. Therefore, it is not possible to determine actual effects on the setting of heritage assets during a desk-based strategic SA exercise such as this. As an indication of potential effects on heritage assets from development of a SUE at any of the potential development sites, the 2009 Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study² for each town has been used as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where sites are mainly or entirely within an area classed as being of high sensitivity in terms of cultural heritage, a significant negative (--) effect is likely. High sensitivity areas were identified in the 2009 studies as including features of international or national statutory designation status, rarity or strategic importance, which present a significant constraint to development such that large-scale mixed-use urban extension development would result in significant harm. • Where a small part of a site is within an area classed as being of high sensitivity in terms of cultural heritage, or where a site is adjacent but not within such an area, an uncertain significant negative (--?) effect is likely, as there is potential to affect the setting of the heritage assets. • Where sites contain an area classed as being of medium or low sensitivity in terms of cultural heritage, an uncertain minor negative (-?) effect is likely. Areas of medium sensitivity were defined in the 2009 studies as including features and areas of local designation status, local significance or inclusions within/association with a wider complex of sites and features of interest. The study noted that some development may be possible

¹ English Heritage. The Setting of Heritage Assets REVISION NOTE June 2012.

² Daventry Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study. URS, January 2009; Northampton Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study. Living Landscapes Consultancy Ltd. February 2009; Brackley Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study, Quartet Design. June 2009; Towcester Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study. Quartet Design, June 2009;

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
		<p>in these areas, although further investigation would be required. Low sensitivity areas include features that are generally not designated but regarded as locally important assets, which may qualify for designation in the future. The study noted that development may be possible although further investigation would be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where sites are within an area classed as having no known assets/issues (or 'lowest sensitivity' in the Brackley and Towcester studies) in terms of cultural heritage, a negligible (0) effect is likely. <p>Designated heritage assets (e.g. listed buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens or Conservation Areas), within 250m and 1km of the potential sites have also been identified as new development may have a negative effect on the setting of those assets. However, in all cases the potential for negative effects on cultural heritage assets will depend on the exact scale, design and layout of the new development and opportunities may exist to enhance the setting of heritage features (e.g. where sympathetic development replaces a derelict brownfield site which is currently having an adverse effect).</p> <p>Conservation Area appraisals, where they exist, were reviewed but generally the information they contained was not very relevant to identifying sustainability effects, and in many cases the appraisals were a number of years old so likely to be out of date.</p>
3. Biodiversity, flora and fauna		
<p>a) Maintain and enhance the structure and function of habitats and populations of species, including those specifically protected. Enhance and protect greenspace</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance of net loss, damage to, or fragmentation and positive enhancement of designated wildlife sites protected species and priority species / habitats within the Northamptonshire BAP? • Opportunities for people to come into contact with robust wildlife places whilst encouraging respect for and raising awareness of the sensitivity of these sites? • Development which includes the integration of 	<p>Similar to heritage assets, there is not a fixed distance at which biodiversity sites may be affected by new development, as the habitats and species for which biodiversity sites are designated are different, and different types of effects can be transmitted across different distances (e.g. air or water pollution may travel much further than noise or disturbance from physical presence of humans or dogs). Therefore, it is not possible to determine actual effects on the structure and function of habitats and populations of species during a desk-based strategic SA exercise such as this. However, as an indication of potential effects on protected habitats and species from development of a SUE at any of the potential</p>

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
<p>networks and habitat connectivity, including river and stream corridors, to assist in species migration and dispersal.</p> <p>b) Increase the land area of UK Biodiversity Action Plan habitats within the area.</p> <p>c) Maintain and improve the conservation status of selected non-designated nature conservation sites.</p>	<p>ecological conditions and contributes to improvement in ecological connectivity in rural and urban areas?</p>	<p>development sites the following assumptions have been applied.</p> <p>Where potential development sites are within 250m of designated biodiversity sites (at the local level, i.e. Local Wildlife Sites, national, i.e. SSSIs, or international levels i.e. SPA, SAC, Ramsar sites), new development may have a significant negative (--?) effect on biodiversity at those sites. Where development is between 250m and 1km from designated sites, a minor negative (-?) effect may occur.</p> <p>However, in all cases these effects are uncertain as the potential for effects will depend on the exact nature and design of the new development and opportunities may exist to enhance biodiversity through appropriate design and the incorporation of biodiversity enhancement measures.</p> <p>It is assumed that all of the SUEs would incorporate an element of green infrastructure provision, which may help to create new areas of BAP habitats and contribute to habitat connectivity; therefore all sites could have a minor positive (+) effect on this element of the objective.</p> <p>Therefore, mixed effects (+/-? or +/-?) will be recorded for this SA objective, reflecting the potential for positive effects in relation to green infrastructure provision, but potential for negative effects on designated nature conservation sites.</p> <p>The impact on maintenance and improvement of the conservation status of selected non-designated nature conservation sites cannot be determined for the SA of potential SUE locations, as the location of non-designated nature conservation sites is not known. It would need to be considered as part of a planning application, through habitat surveys undertaken by the developer.</p>
<p>4. Crime and community safety</p>		
<p>a) To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in crime levels and fear of crime through improvements to the environment, layouts of streets and public space, passive surveillance, lighting etc. • Leisure facilities for young people at the neighbourhood level including consideration of 	<p>The effects of new development on safety, crime and fear of crime will depend on design proposals for the SUEs and factors such as the inclusion of open spaces that are overlooked by buildings to improve safety and security and sufficient lighting. However, these issues will not be influenced by the location of development and will instead be determined through the detailed proposals for each site. Therefore, the effects of all</p>

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
	provision as part of large new residential developments.	development site options on this objective will be negligible (0).
5. Education and training		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Improve educational attainment and promote lifelong learning. b) Promote sustainable modes of travel to access education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements in educational attainment, qualification levels and participation in education and training. • Adequate supporting educational infrastructure associated with new residential developments. • New education facilities well located in relation to walking, cycling and public transport routes. 	<p>The effects of new development on this objective will depend on the availability of school and college places to serve the growing population. It is assumed that all of the SUEs would incorporate either new schools or the expansion of existing facilities to accommodate growing demand; therefore all sites will have at least a minor positive (+) effect on this objective.</p> <p>Where sites are within reasonable walking distance (800m) of existing schools or colleges, a potential significant positive (++?) effect may occur because it could be easier and more resource/cost efficient to expand those existing facilities to accommodate new residents as required, rather than building new schools within the SUE area. However, there is uncertainty attached to this effect due to a lack of information about existing capacity and the potential to expand those schools/colleges if required. In addition, where a site is within walking distance (800m) of existing schools or colleges but where it is known that there are potential topography issues that may mean that they are still not within an easy walking distance for all ages and abilities, a minor positive (+) rather than a significant positive score is given.</p>
6. Energy and climatic factors		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An average increase in the SAP rating of dwellings? • A reduction of the average household fuel bill. • A decrease in oil consumption. • Major developments incorporating renewable energy measures into the design. • An increase in energy efficient measures and CHP in the design new developments. • An increase in the number of large scale renewable energy schemes. • A better consideration of climate change adaptation measures? 	<p>While all new development is likely to involve an increase in energy consumption over current consumption in West Northamptonshire, new development may offer good opportunities for incorporating renewable energy generation and it is assumed that new development will be built to high standards of energy efficiency. However, the effects of new development on efficient energy consumption will not be determined by the location of the development, instead it will be determined through the detailed proposals for each site. Therefore the effect of all of the site options on this SA objective will be negligible (0).</p>
7. Health and well being		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) To improve health and reduce health 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthier lifestyles? • Improved access to healthcare? 	<p>All of the site options are likely to have at least a minor positive (+) effect on this SA objective, as it is assumed that all of the SUEs would include the</p>

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
inequalities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the quality of homes? 	<p>provision of new healthcare facilities to support the growing population, or the expansion of existing facilities. It is also assumed that new green infrastructure including walking and cycle routes would be provided within the sites, which should have a positive effect in relation to encouraging more active lifestyles.</p> <p>Sites that are within reasonable walking distance (800m) of three or more existing health-related assets including at least one of either a doctor's surgery and a hospital and at least one of either an area of open space, allotments or footpaths and cycle routes may have a significant positive (++) effect because of the potential to use these facilities and recreational areas as well as the new ones. With respect to the health services and facilities it may also be easier and more resource/cost efficient to expand those existing facilities to accommodate new residents as required, rather than providing new ones within the SUE area. However, this effect is uncertain due to a lack of information about capacity and the potential to expand those services and facilities if required.</p> <p>Where a site is within walking distance of two or fewer of the above health-related features, or where the site is not within walking distance of both a doctor's surgery/hospital and a green infrastructure/open space-related feature, the minor positive (+) effect will apply. In addition, where a site is within walking distance (800m) of three or more health-related assets as detailed above, but where it is known that there are potential topography issues that may mean that they are still not within an easy walking distance for all ages and abilities, a minor positive (+) rather than a significant positive score is given.</p> <p>In combination with the above, if a site is within (or adjacent to) an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) there could be a minor negative (-?) impact on health, particularly if vehicle movements associated with the new development compound existing air quality problems. This would give rise to a mixed positive and negative (+/-) effect on this objective. However, sites that are not within or adjacent to an AQMA would have a negligible effect on health in relation air quality, and only the proximity to health facilities and recreational areas would be recorded.</p> <p>All new homes will be expected to be of high quality; therefore the <u>location</u></p>

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
		of new development will not affect the achievement of that element of the SA objective.
8. Labour market and economy		
<p>a) To create high quality employment opportunities and develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An adequate supply of land, skills and infrastructure (such as ICT) to meet the requirements of growth sectors and fully exploit locational/ economic opportunities while not harming the environment. • Minimise travel distances to work and commuting by modes other than the car. Ensuring access to employment by public transport, walking and cycling. • An appropriate range of employment opportunities in rural areas. 	<p>All of the site options are likely to have a minor positive (+) effect on this SA objective, as it is assumed that all of the SUEs would involve employment provision will have a positive (+) effect on this objective.</p> <p>All of the SUEs are assumed to provide a mix of housing and employment, therefore all will have positive effects in relation to minimising travel distances and enabling easier access to employment opportunities.</p> <p>None of the site options being considered are located in rural areas; therefore none will have any effect in relation to employment opportunities in rural areas.</p> <p>It is recognised that broadband access could have an influence on people's ability to work flexibly and from home; however this is not something that can be assessed at this stage on the basis of the spatial location of SUEs. Information about current levels of broadband provision at the different towns has not been available, and access will also depend heavily on the incorporation of broadband infrastructure into the new SUEs. Therefore, broadband access has not been taken into account in the SA.</p>
9. Landscape and townscape		
<p>a) Ensure that the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the landscape, and the features within them are conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>b) Enhance the form and design of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the character areas and SLA's with the highest level of policy protection, make appropriate provision for their economic and social wellbeing and reflect Management Plan objectives? • Encourage development which considers the existing character, form and pattern of the landscape, buildings and settlements? • Encourage development which incorporates green infrastructure into the design e.g. green 	<p>Landscape character</p> <p>There are no designated landscapes in West Northamptonshire. Potential effects on landscape features and character will be assessed through the sensitivity score given for each landscape area assessed in the 2009 Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Studies³ for each town as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites that are within areas that are assessed as being of low sensitivity are likely to have a negligible (0) effect on landscape character and features.

³ Living Landscapes Consultancy Ltd. on behalf of the River Nene Regional Park CIC (2009) Northampton Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study
 Quartet Design on behalf of the West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit (2009) Brackley Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study
 WNDC (2009) Daventry Infrastructure Studies: Green Infrastructure and Landscape Technical Report
 Quartet Design on behalf of the West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit (2009) Towcester Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
built environment.	corridors, linking open space etc.? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage development which incorporates sports infrastructure into the design e.g. public football pitches, mini pitches, swimming pools? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites that are within areas that are assessed as being of medium sensitivity could have a minor negative (-?) effect on landscape character and features. Sites that are within areas that are assessed as being of high sensitivity could have a significant negative (--?) effect on landscape character and features. <p>In all cases, potential negative effects will be uncertain as the exact impacts on the landscape will depend on factors relating to the specific design and layout of the new development.</p> <p>Form and design of built environment In combination with the above, sites that could result in the loss of settlement character through settlement cohesion could have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this is again uncertain. This could add to a potential minor negative effect on landscape character (if the site is within an area assessed as being of medium landscape sensitivity) and make the effect significant negative (--?). However, sites that are unlikely to result in settlement cohesion would have a negligible effect on loss of settlement character, and only the potential effect on landscape character above would be recorded.</p> <p>All new SUE development will be expected to be of high quality design; therefore the location of new development will not affect the achievement of that element of the SA objective.</p> <p>Green infrastructure and sports infrastructure It is assumed that all of the SUEs would incorporate green infrastructure and sports infrastructure, therefore the <u>location</u> of new development will not affect the achievement of that element of the SA objective.</p>
10. Material assets		
a) To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the local people.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient affordable housing to meet identified needs, including the needs of the community and local economy. Achieve well-designed compact communities which are developed at sufficient density to support viable local services and public transport 	All of the SUEs are assumed to provide a mix of housing, therefore all site options are expected to have positive effects (+) on this objective. It is assumed that all new development would be built to high standards and would be in accordance with JCS policy H2: Affordable Housing. It is also assumed that all of the SUEs will incorporate sustainable transport links.

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
	provision and which achieve efficient use of land. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good access to facilities, particularly by public transport, walking and cycling. 	
11. Population		
a) To develop and maintain a balanced and sustainable population structure with good access to services and facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development which delivers an appropriate mix of housing including affordable housing and appropriate housing for older people in locations close to local services/facilities. • Appropriate community, social and transport infrastructure. 	<p>The provision of housing is addressed separately under SA objective 10 above and so is not considered again as part of this SA objective.</p> <p>It is assumed that an appropriate range of services and facilities to support the growing population including older people will be provided as part of the development of the SUEs, or that existing services and facilities would be expanded. Therefore, minor positive (+) effects are likely in relation to all of the site options.</p>
12. Social deprivation		
a) To reduce spatial inequalities in social opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved provision of key services in deprived communities. • Reduced spatial inequalities in access to services including healthcare and education and local/community services. • Provision of local facilities which are accessible by walking and cycling and public transport. 	<p>The provision of new services and facilities is addressed under SA objective 11 and so is not assessed again as part of this objective.</p> <p>Proximity to healthcare and educational facilities and local/community services are also already addressed under SA objectives 5, 7 and 11, so are not considered as part of this objective.</p> <p>It is assumed that walking and cycle routes would be incorporated into all of the SUEs, to provide sustainable access to services and facilities.</p> <p>The provision of additional services and infrastructure within an SUE could contribute to the regeneration of the wider area, particularly where deprivation is already an issue. However, the potential for effects is uncertain because it will depend on the factors contributing to the deprivation in that area and whether the SUE development addresses those particular issues,</p>
13. Soil, geology and land use		
a) Reduce land contamination, and safeguard soil and geological quality and quantity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The remediation of contaminated sites? • Development on brownfield sites? • Development that protects soil processes and functions? • Development that protects sites valued for their geological characteristics? 	<p>The NPPF requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (among other things), protecting and enhancing geological conservation interests and soils, and preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil pollution or land instability. It states that Planning policies should also ensure that the site is suitable for its new use taking account of</p>

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
		<p>ground conditions and land instability.</p> <p>Land contamination All of the SUE site options are mostly greenfield, therefore it is assumed that the location of the SUEs would have no effect on this part of the SA objective.</p> <p>Land instability The Technical Paper on Ground Instability⁴ states that there are areas across Northamptonshire that are prone to ground instability issues due to their underlying geological and geomorphological makeup. The combination of the Northampton Sand overlying Upper Lias Clay can cause the formation of landslides particularly where slopes have angles greater than seven degrees.</p> <p>Maps were prepared by the WNJPU which identify five categories of instability, categories A and B include areas where slope instability problems are either not thought to occur or not likely to occur. Category C includes areas where slope instability problems may be present or anticipated, and it is recommended that site investigation at the planning application stage should consider specifically the slope stability of the site. Category D includes areas where slope instability problems are likely to be present or have occurred in the past, and Category E covers areas where slope instability problems are almost certainly present and may be active. This category is considered to be a significant constraint on land use. Therefore, sites in the higher categories could have a negative effect on preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from land instability, and the following assumptions have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites that include areas of Categories D and E Ground Instability could have a significant negative (--) effect. • Sites that include areas of Category C Ground Instability could have to have a minor negative (-) effect. • Sites that are in Categories A and B are likely to have a negligible

⁴ West Northamptonshire Ground Instability – Technical Paper (February 2011). West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit.

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
		<p>(0) effect.</p> <p>There is uncertainty attached to the negative effects however, as more detailed ground instability investigation would need to be undertaken at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Soil quality and quantity Where sites would involve development on high quality (grade 1, 2 or 3) agricultural land there would be a negative effect on preserving soil quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites that are mainly or entirely on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land are likely to have a significant negative (--) effect. • Sites that are mainly or entirely on grade 3 agricultural land are likely to have a minor negative (-) effect. • Sites that are not on grade 1, 2 or 3 agricultural land are likely to have a negligible (0) effect. <p>In addition, which may lead to mixed effects with the above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites that are mainly or entirely on brownfield land would have a minor positive effect (+). • Sites that are mainly or entirely on greenfield land would have a minor negative (-) effect. <p>Geological quality and quantity Local Geological Sites (formerly RIGS) are selected for their educational, historical and/or aesthetic value. Development sites that include a Local Geological Site are assumed to have a minor negative (-) effect as there is potential to lose or obscure the geological value, unless design of the SUE took its location and visibility into account. Where this is the case, a mixed effect will be recorded in relation to the geological quality and soil quality/quantity effects. If the development site does not include a Local Geological Site, no effect will be recorded against this element of the SA objective.</p> <p>Some areas of West Northamptonshire have been designated as Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas in the Northamptonshire Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan (January 2013). These are known locations of specific minerals resources that need to be safeguarded from</p>

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
		sterilisation by non-mineral development. This does not mean that development cannot occur in these locations, but that the County Council will need to be consulted to determine whether prior extraction of the mineral resource is required before development. As such, no effect is recorded in relation to safeguarding geological quantity.
14. Waste		
<p>a) To reduce waste generation and disposal, increase recycling and achieve the sustainable management of waste.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicitly set out to reduce the amount of waste generated by development and land use change? • Explicitly encourage development to use re-cycled materials and make provision for recycling / composting in all new development? • Make positive provision for appropriate sites for waste management facilities including waste to energy generation, with landfill being the least favoured option? • Encourage the reduction in the production and movement of hazardous waste? 	<p>The location development will not have a significant effect on this objective as the location of development will not influence the amount of waste produced from within that development once it is operational. However where sites include brownfield areas, there may be more opportunities to re-use existing building materials during construction which could have a minor positive (+?) effect on this objective although there is uncertainty attached as specific opportunities will not be known until detailed development proposals are put forward.</p> <p>Greenfield sites would have a negligible (0) effect on this objective, as potential effects would be influenced by the design and use of the development and the incorporation of sustainable waste management measures, rather than by the location of the development.</p>
15. Water		
<p>a) Maintain and continue to improve the ecological and chemical quality of groundwater and surface waters.</p> <p>b) Reduce risk of flooding.</p> <p>c) Improve efficiency of water use.</p> <p>d) Identify opportunities to implement strategic flood risk management options/measures to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development where adequate water supply, foul drainage, sewage treatment facilities and surface water drainage is available? • Water efficient design and reduction in water consumption (e.g. rainwater recycling/grey water reuse and BREEAM/EcoHomes Excellent Standard)? • Development which supports and corresponds with Water Framework Directive, the NPPF, Technical Guidance to the NPPF and the flood risk management policies of the EA? • Development likely to affect the ecological status of groundwater and surface water and the ability of receiving water to accept additional flows? • Development that results in increased spills 	<p>Ground and surface water quality</p> <p>Effects on water quality will depend on the capacity of existing sewage treatment works to accommodate additional demand from new development, something that cannot be determined at this stage on the basis of the location of individual development sites.</p> <p>Flood risk</p> <p>It is recognised that new development in any location may offer good opportunities to incorporate SuDS; however development on sites that are within high risk flood zones could have negative effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites that are entirely or mainly within flood zones 3a or 3b and/or include flood storage areas are likely to have a significant negative (--) effect. • Sites that are either entirely or mainly within flood zone 2 or that

SA Objective	Appraisal questions. Will the plan/option lead to...?	SA Assumptions
<p>reflect the objectives in the River Nene and Great Ouse CFMPs.</p>	<p>from combined sewer outlets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The incorporation of the flood risk management policies set out in the River Nene CFMP and the Great Ouse CFMP? • Safeguarding of flood storage areas identified in the Nene and Great Ouse CFMPs? • Development which incorporates SUDS (including their long-term maintenance), to ensure there is no increase in flood risk (and where possible lead to a reduction in flood risk)? 	<p>are partly within flood zone 3 (but where the majority of the site is outside of high flood risk areas) are likely to have a minor negative (-) effect. Sites that include a very small part of a flood storage area would also have a minor negative effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites that are outside of flood zones 2, 3a or 3b and do not include flood storage areas are likely to have a negligible (0) effect. <p>Water quantity</p> <p>It is assumed that all new SUE development will be built to high standards of water efficiency, as such, no effect is recorded in relation to safeguarding water resources.</p>