

Central Elland

Supplementary Planning Document

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT



APRIL 2008

Calderdale Local Development Framework

| 1 | Non-Technical Summary | 2 |
|---|---|----|
| 2 | Consultation Arrangements | |
| 3 | Introduction | 4 |
| | Background | 4 |
| | Sustainability Appraisal Process | 4 |
| | Replacement Calderdale UDP and Local Development Framework (LDF) | 5 |
| | Sustainable Development | 6 |
| 4 | Key Requirements for SPD Sustainability Appraisal | 7 |
| | National Guidance | 7 |
| 5 | Sustainability Appraisal Framework | 10 |
| | Task B1: Testing the SPD Objectives against the SA Framework | 11 |
| | Task B2: Developing the SPD Options | 13 |
| | Task B3: Predicting the Effects of the Draft SPD | 49 |
| | Task B4: Evaluating the Effects of the Draft SPD | 52 |
| | Task B5: Mitigating Adverse Effects and Maximising Beneficial Effects | 52 |
| | Task B6: Developing Proposals for Monitoring | 52 |
| | Task C1: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report | 53 |
| 6 | The Next Steps | 54 |
| | Task D1: Public Participation on the Draft SPD and SA Report | 54 |
| | Task D2: Appraising of Significant Effects | 54 |
| | SPD Stage 3: Adoption and Monitoring | 54 |
| 1 | List of References | 55 |
| 2 | Glossary | 56 |

1 Non-Technical Summary

1.1 The purpose of this document is to assess the social, economic and environmental effects of the Council's Draft Central Elland Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

1.2 In accordance with the requirements of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been undertaken for this SPD. Undertaking SA during the preparation of Local Development Framework (LDF) documents ensures that sustainability considerations are fully taken into account in their preparation and that the most sustainable options for development are selected. This involves giving consideration to the significant economic, environmental and social effects of plans including a formal assessment through Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) under the requirements of EU Directive 2001/42/EC.

1.3 The SPD sets out a clear and consistent framework for encouraging the regeneration of Central Elland. The SPD supplements various existing policies in the Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan (RCUDP), which was adopted on 26 August 2006. These RCUDP policies are discussed in further detail in section 3.

1.4 This document sets out the methodology and outcomes of undertaking the SA of the draft document. The SA has been produced and undertaken in accordance with the best practice advice contained in 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (ODPM, November 2005) and 'The Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive: Guidance for Planning Authorities' (ODPM, October, 2003).

1.5 The SA demonstrates the positive social, economic and environmental effects of the production of the SPD. The SPD will promote the redevelopment, including improvements to the infrastructure of, Central Elland in a manner that encourages its social, economic and environmental sustainability. The SPD is an area-based document intended to promote a better equipped, more sustainable and inclusive place. Securing this regeneration and long-term sustainability will have benefits for the entire community of the town of Elland. The objective of the SPD is to encourage a Central Elland where people want to live, work and play, providing the facilities people need locally, in a pleasant environment, easily accessible by sustainable means. Reducing the need for car travel, and the need to travel per se, can contribute to the wider goal of creating 'sustainable communities'.

2 Consultation Arrangements

Earlier Consultation on the generic Scoping Report took place between 19 February and 26 March 2006.

The following organisations were consulted on the generic Scoping Report:

- Environment Agency (statutory consultee)
- English Heritage (statutory consultee)
- Natural England (statutory consultee)
- Calderdale Sustainability Forum
- Calderdale Friends of the Earth
- Calderdale Forward the Local Strategic Partnership
- Calderdale Forward the Environment Thematic Delivery Partnership part of the Local Strategic Partnership

Comments received from the above organisations resulted in a number of changes being made to the generic Scoping Report and these are shown in bold type in the final version of the report.

Amongst the amendments made to the Scoping Report were the addition of two further sustainability objectives:

- To protect and enhance the historic environment
- To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change

This Sustainability Appraisal of the Central Elland SPD was issued for consultation in January 2008 alongside the Draft SPD, in accordance with Regulation 17 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Sustainability Appraisal was subsequently revised in accordance with consultation responses.

Copies of the adopted Central Elland SPD and this accompanying Sustainability Appraisal can be acquired from:

Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council Planning Policy Team Planning Services Northgate House HALIFAX HX1 1UN

Tel: 01422 392206

email: planning.policy@calderdale.gov.uk

3 Introduction

Background

3.1 Sustainable Development' was a concept that emerged from the Bruntland Report in 1987, describing it as 'development that meets the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'. It is about ensuring a better quality of life for everyone now and for future generations. The UK government recently updated its own guidance on sustainable development, which contained five principles, these being;

- Living within environmental limits
- Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society
- Achieving a sustainable economy
- Promoting Good Governance and
- Using sound science responsibly.

3.2 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) introduced the responsibility put upon Local Planning Authorities by the Government to produce a Local Development Framework (LDF). The LDF is a portfolio of planning documents prepared by the Council which collectively will deliver the planning strategy for Calderdale, together with the Regional Spatial Strategy produced by the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly.

3.3 The requirement for Sustainability Appraisals (SAs) to be carried out during the preparation of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs), Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) is set down in Section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). Planning Authorities must undertake an SA for each of their Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) as part of an integrated plan-making process.

Sustainability Appraisal Process

The Sustainability Appraisal should ":

- Take a long term view of how the area covered by the SPDs is expected to develop, taking into account social, environmental and economic effects of the proposed plan.
- Providing a mechanism for ensuring that sustainability objectives are translated into sustainable planning policies.
- Reflect global, national and local concerns.
- Provide an audit trail of how the SPDs have been revised to take account of the findings of the SA.
- Form an integral part of all the stages of plan preparation, in accordance with the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC.

3.4 The purpose of the SA process is to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations in the preparation and adoption of planning documents. The process of undertaking SA will help to ensure that the most sustainable options for development are identified in the production of the Central Elland SPD.

3.5 The Planning Act's requirement for SA involves a detailed analysis of the potential social, economic and environmental impacts of any proposed policies and options. Alongside this, the EU directive 2001/42/EC requires any plan that may have significant effects on the environment to be assessed by a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

i

3.6 However, rather than carry out two separate appraisals, the Government has decided that in the UK the two processes are to be combined through one single appraisal process. In order to ensure that the requirements of the EU Directive have been met the SA report must clearly demonstrate how the requirements of SEA have been met. For the purposes of this report, the term 'Sustainability Appraisal' also includes the environmental requirements of the SEA.

Replacement Calderdale UDP and Local Development Framework (LDF)

3.7 The guidance produced by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) on Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents in November 2005 states at Paragraph 4.1.10 that, in most cases, the SA of SPDs will draw extensively on appraisal undertaken at the higher level for policies within the DPD and the need for new work may be limited. Generally due to the nature of a SPD its SA is likely to focus on a more limited range of potentially significant effects. In Calderdale the priority has been the adoption of the Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan (RCUDP) and this has limited the opportunity for work on the LDF. The Council has prepared a general Scoping Report for the purpose of conducting sustainability appraisal of all LDDs. This was published for consultation with interested parties in February 2007 and the comments received informed revisions to the Sustainability Appraisal Framework objectives.

The SPD is linked to the following 'saved policies' in the RCUDP:

- GP1: Encouraging Sustainable Development
- GP2: Location of Development
- GP4: Promotion of Urban and Rural Regeneration and Renaissance
- GT1: Provision of a Sustainable, Safe and Efficient Transport System
- H2: Primary Housing Area
- E1: Primary Employment Area
- E3: New Employment Site
- E4: Mixed Use
- BE18: Elland Conservation Area
- T13: Cycle Corridor
- NE15: Wildlife Corridor
- GS2: Town Centre

T27: Leeds-Bradford Airport Wind Turbine Consultation Zone

3.8 This Plan was the subject of a SA during the course of its preparation. This appraisal was undertaken by AERC and whilst the whole process of SA has moved on since that time this study is of some relevance and worthy of mention here. The above mentioned policies were found to be in line with sustainability objectives.

3.9 There are a number of other plans, programmes and strategies containing social, economic and environmental objectives which will influence the SPD. These contain sustainability objectives, which need to be taken account of in the sustainability report. The generic SA Scoping Report identified many documents of relevance to the documents to be produced for the LDF and these are listed in Appendix 1 to that report. These documents ranged from the international level down to the local level. Those most relevant to the Central Elland SPD are listed below:

3. Introduction

3.10 There are a number of other plans, programmes and strategies containing social, economic and environmental objectives which will influence the SPD. These contain sustainability objectives, which need to be taken account of in the sustainability report. The generic SA Scoping Report identified many documents of relevance to the documents to be produced for the LDF and these are listed in Appendix 1 to that report. These documents ranged from the international level down to the local level. Those most relevant to the Central Elland SPD are listed below:

a) National Planning Policy

- PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
- PPS6 Panning for Town Centres
- PPG13 Transport
- Securing the Future UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy (2005)
- Delivering Sustainable Communities (2005)

b) Regional Planning Policy

- Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber to 2016 (December 2004)
- The Yorkshire and Humber Plan (December 2005) Draft Revised RSS

c) Local Planning Policy

- Calderdale Futures Plan 2006 2016 (Sustainable Community Strategy)
- Local Area Agreement (2006)
- Calderdale Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006)

Sustainable Development

3.11 'Sustainable Development' was a concept that emerged from the Bruntland Report in 1987, describing it as 'development that meets the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'. It is about ensuring a better quality of life for everyone now and for future generations. The UK government has updated its own guidance on sustainable development ⁽⁹⁾, which contained five principles, these being:

- Living within environmental limits;
- Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society;
- Achieving a sustainable economy;
- Promoting good governance; and
- Using sound science responsibly.

3.12 These principles were followed in developing sustainability objectives for Calderdale, ensuring the SA will test the policies and objectives of the LDF for their possible environmental, social and economic impact.

4 Key Requirements for SPD Sustainability Appraisal

National Guidance

4.1 According to the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), the sustainability appraisal should not be done in any more detail, or using more resources than is useful for its purpose. It should focus on the significant sustainability effects of the SPD.

4.2 The government also advises that the SA report clearly identifies how and where the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) have been met. The following table provides information on the compliance with the SEA directive.

Table 4.1 Compliance with Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive

| SEA Directive's Requirements | Where addressed in the SA Report | |
|---|--|--|
| the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives ta | ly significant effects on the environment of implementing aking into account the objectives and geographical bed and evaluated. The information to be given is (Art. | |
| a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes; | Task A1 of the SA Scoping Report and section 'Replacement Calderdale UDP and Local Development Framework (LDF)' | |
| b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme; | Task A2 of the SA Scoping Report and section 4 'Key Requirements for SPD Sustainability Appraisal' | |
| c) The environmental characteristics likely to be significantly affected; | Task A2 of the SA Scoping Report. | |
| d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC; | Task A2 of the SA Scoping Report. | |
| e) The environmental protection objectives, established at international, national or community level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental consideration have been taken into account during its preparation; | Tasks A2 and A4 of the SA Scoping Report. | |
| f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Note: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects); | Section 'Task B4: Evaluating the Effects of the Draft SPD' | |

| g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme; | Sections 'Task B2: Developing the SPD Options', 'Task D2: Appraising of Significant Effects' and 'Task B6: Developing Proposals for Monitoring' |
|---|---|
| h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or a lack of knowledge) encountered in compiling the required information | Section 'Task B4: Evaluating the Effects of the Draft SPD' |
| i) A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Art. 10; | Sections 'Task B6: Developing Proposals for Monitoring' and 'SPD Stage 3: Adoption and Monitoring' |
| j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings; | Section 1 'Non-Technical Summary' |
| The report shall include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment (Art. 5.2). | Sustainability Appraisal Report |
| Consultation: | |
| Authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information to be included in the environmental report (Art. 5.4) | Consultation on Scoping Report Task A5. |
| Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Art. 6.1 & 6.2). | Early community engagement on SPD in July 2007 - August 2007, plus current process of consultation on Draft SPD and this SA Report. |
| Other EU Member States where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country. | N/A |
| Taking the environmental report and the results of the consultation into account in decision-making (Art. 8) | The current appraisal of the SPD together with further review following consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal Report. |
| Provision of information on the decision: When the plan or programme is adopted, under Art. 7 the public shall be informed and the following made available to those so informed: | To be decided upon following consultation and adoption. |
| i. the plan or programme is adopted | |
| ii. a statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental | |

| report pursuant to Art. 5, the opinions expressed pursuant to Art. 6 and the results of consultations entered into pursuant to Art. 7 have been taken into account in accordance with Art. 8, and the reason for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and the measures decided concerning monitoring (Art. 9 and 10) | |
|---|--|
| Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation (Art. 10) | Sections 'Task B6: Developing Proposals for Monitoring' and 'SPD Stage 3: Adoption and Monitoring' |

5 Sustainability Appraisal Framework

5.1 The SA Framework is central to the process of Sustainability Appraisal. It provides a way to describe, analyse and compare sustainability effects of specific documents. The framework consists of sustainability objectives which, where practicable, may be expressed in the form of targets, the achievement of which is measured using indicators. Objectives and indicators can be revised as baseline data is collected and sustainability issues and problems are identified. These can be used in the monitoring and implementation of the SPD.

5.2 Sustainability objectives are distinct from the objectives of the SPD although nature of these may overlap in some cases. The SA objectives provide a measure against which the potential social, environmental and economic effects of the SPD may be tested.

5.3 The Sustainability Objectives as taken from the generic Scoping Report are shown in the table below.

| Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Social | | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | | | |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | | | |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | | | |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | | | |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | | | |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | | | |
| Enviro | onmental | | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | | | |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | | | |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property $^{\scriptscriptstyle (III)}$ | | | |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity. | | | |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the district | | | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | | | |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | | | |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | | | |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | | | |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | | | |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | | | |
| Economic | | | | |

Table 5.1 Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

10

| Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|---|--|--|
| 1 | 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | | |
| 1 | 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | | |

Please note the numbering of the SA objectives differs in the Generic SA Scoping Report.

Task B1: Testing the SPD Objectives against the SA Framework

5.4 The objectives of the Central Elland SPD are set out below. The objectives are tested against the SA Framework as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process.

Table 5.2 SPD Objectives

| SPD Objectives | | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | To provide a framework that ensures the future development of Central Elland, particularly its cohesiveness, transport links and public realm, is socially, economically and environmentally sustainable, and contributes to the area's regeneration. | | | |
| 2 | To provide development briefs for seven key areas in Central Elland, intended to analyse and address potential barriers to the regeneration of these areas and therefore to Central Elland as a whole. | | | |
| 3 | To provide indicative proposals for the redevelopment of seven key areas in Central Elland, intended to inspire the local community and developers about how Central Elland could be developed in future, in a manner that encourages the sustainable regeneration of Central Elland as a whole. | | | |

5.5 The objectives of the SPD set out what the document is aiming to achieve in spatial planning terms and set the context for the development of options of the SPD. These objectives need to follow sustainability principles. The overall aim of the SPD is to provide guidance on the implementation of Policies GP1, GP2, GP4, GS2, GT1, BE18, E1, E3, E4, H2, NE15, T13, and T27 of the RCUDP specifically to Central Elland. This will help to achieve three of the Council's ambitions for Calderdale:

- Where communities are sustainable- economically, socially and environmentally
- With a sustainable local economy where people want to live, learn, work and visit
- With a good accessible transport infrastructure and services, meeting the wide variety of transport needs within the District and with good links between it and other important centres and facilities

(Calderdale Futures Plan 2006-2016).

5.6 It is important that the objectives of the SPD are in accordance with sustainability principles. The objectives are tested for compatibility with SA objectives. This helps to refine SPD objectives as well as in identifying options. The SPD objectives need to be consistent and the SA Framework provides a mechanism for ensuring this. These effects of the SPD objectives against the SA Framework are recorded as set out below:

| Symbol | Result | Overall |
|--------|---------------|------------|
| ++ | Very Positive | Compatible |
| + | Positive | Compatible |
| = | Neutral | No effect |

| Table 5.3 | Sustainability | Matrix Key |
|-----------|----------------|------------|
|-----------|----------------|------------|

5. Sustainability Appraisal Framework

| | | - | Negative | Incompatible | |
|-----------|----------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 12 | | | Extremely Negative | Very Incompatible | |
| SPD) | | Та | ble 5.4 Central Elland SPD Objecti | ives | |
| | SPD Objectives | | | | |
| al Elland | 1 | 1 To provide a framework that ensures the future development of Central Elland, particularly its cohesiveness, transport links and public realm, is socially, economically and environmentally sustainable, and contributes to the area's regeneration. | | | |
| (Central | 2 | 2 To provide development briefs for seven key areas in Central Elland, intended to analyse and address potential barriers to the regeneration of these areas and therefore to Central Elland as a whole. | | | |
| eport ((| 3 | 3 To provide indicative proposals for the redevelopment of seven key areas in Central Elland, intended to inspire the local community and developers about how Central Elland could be developed in future in a manner that encourages the sustainable regeneration of Central Elland as a whole. | | | |

Table 5.5 Testing Central Elland Objectives Against the SA Framework

| Sustainability Appraisal Objective | | Central Elland SPD Objectives | | |
|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Socia | l | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | + | = | = |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | + | = | = |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | + | + | + |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | = | = |
| Environmental | | | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | = | = | = |

| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | + | + | + | |
|------|--|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | + | + | + | |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | = | = | = | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | +/- | +/- | +/- | |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | = | = | = | |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | + | + | + | |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | = | = | = | |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | = | = | = | |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | = | = | = | |
| Econ | Economic | | | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | = | = | = | |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | = | = | = | |
| | | | | | |

Task B2: Developing the SPD Options

5.7 The ODPM guidance ^(*) at Paragraph 4.1.6 states that where the SPD has been prepared on the basis of a DPD or a saved plan policy or policies which have not been subject to SA then, the authority will need to carry out a SA of that policy or policies and report on those. Both the adopted UDP and the Draft Replacement UDP were subject to Sustainability Appraisal. This was undertaken by consultants under the earlier government guidance on Environmental Appraisal of Development Plans (DOE 1993). Since this SPD relates to a saved policy not subject to SEA under the requirements of the SEA Directive or an SA under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the RCUDP policies referenced in Paragraph 3.7 have been appraised against the 19 SA objectives to comply with this advice.

Table 5.6 Sustainability Matrix Key

| Symbol | Result | Overall |
|--------|---------------|------------|
| ++ | Very Positive | Compatible |

iv Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents, ODPM (November 2005)

5. Sustainability Appraisal Framework

SymbolResultOverall+PositiveCompatible=NeutralNo effect-NegativeIncompatible---Extremely NegativeVery Incompatible

Table 5.7 Testing the RCUDP Policy GP1 Against the SA Framework

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GP1 | Overall Assessment | | |
|-------|--|------------|--|--|--|
| Socia | Social | | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | + | The promotion of sustainable development, recognizing the needs of everyone and striving to enhance the environment, would support the development of high quality and sustainable housing. | | |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | ++ | The promotion of development that recognizes the needs of everyone "including safety and security issues". Obvious compatibility with SA objective. | | |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | + | GP1 promotes development recognizing the needs of everyone, and is therefore socially inclusive. The promotion of an enhanced environment could promote good health. | | |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | + | An improvement to public transport links should improve access to culture, leisure and recreation for all. | | |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | ++ | An improvement to public transport links should improve access to services, facilities and employment for all. The promotion of employment opportunities would also enhance access to these. | | |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GP1 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|------------|---|
| Envir | onmental | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | ++ | GP1 advocates the protection and enhancement of the environment and therefore directly supports this SA objective. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ++ | Traffic reduction measures and public transport that makes efficient use of resources would reduce dependence on and use of the car in particular, and motorized transport per se. |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | ++ | GP1 refers to the protection and enhancement of the environment along with the promotion of safe and secure development. |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | ++ | GP1 advocates the protection and enhancement of the environment and therefore directly supports this SA objective. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | ++ | Traffic reduction measures and public transport that makes efficient use of resources would reduce dependence on and use of the car in particular, and motorized transport per se and resultant CO2 emissions. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | + | GP1 advocates the protection and enhancement of the environment and therefore directly supports this SA objective |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | ++ | GP1 advocates "the conservation and efficient use of resources" and therefore directly supports this SA objective. |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | ++ | GP1 advocates "the conservation and efficient use of resources", which would include land resources, and therefore directly supports this SA objective. An |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GP1 | Overall Assessment |
|------|---|------------|--|
| | | | emphasis on public transpor and reducing dependence or the car should also discourage sprawl-like, land-intensive development. |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | ++ | GP1 encourages the conservation and efficient use of resources. The more this is encouraged, the less waste there will be. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | ++ | GP1 advocates the protection and enhancement of the environment and therefore directly supports this SA objective. |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | + | The policy advocates a reduction in car use and motorized traffic per se, in addition to the conservation and efficient use of resources (resources that might lead to the emission of greenhouse gases.) GP1 therefore contributes to attempts to reduce the effects of climate change. |
| Econ | omic | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | ++ | GP1 supports improved employment opportunities, enhanced public transport (access) and development recognizing the needs of everyone. GP1 therefore directly supports the SA objective. |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | + | GP1 advocates improving employment opportunities, which in practice would seen to be synonymous with this SA objective. The policy's objective is to promote sustainable development and make a place where people want to live, work and visit. These objectives are synonymous with the SA objective. |

5.8 This strategic Policy was found to interact in a very positive way with nearly of the sustainability appraisal objectives in all of the categories. There were no negative effects found. Policy GP1 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District.

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GP2 | Overall Assessment | | | |
|-------|--|------------|---|--|--|--|
| Socia | Social | | | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | + | Development is encouraged in sustainable locations, i.e. in urban areas close to amenities and with good public transport links. This reduces the likelihood of housing development that requires car ownership. It says nothing though about the actual quality or affordability of housing. | | | |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | + | Development that is located centrally, in urban areas, should benefit more from natural surveillance and proximity to police services etc. | | | |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | ++ | Development located close to amenities and public transport should enhance accessibility in general and therefore social inclusion. Centrally located and more dense development should enhance the vibrancy of urban areas and encourage walking, and therefore good health. | | | |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | + | This Policy says nothing about the development of such activities in the first instance; but encourages them to be accessible by public transport means if they are developed. Such facilities would therefore be accessible to all. "Availability" might depend on non-planning factors. | | | |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | ++ | The Policy encourages development in urban areas, accessible by public transport and pedestrian means. | | | |

Table 5.8 Testing the RCUDP Policy GP2 Against the SA Framework

5. Sustainability Appraisal Framework

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GP2 | Overall Assessment | | | |
|------|--|------------|--|--|--|--|
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | | |
| Envi | Environmental | | | | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | + | Development on brownfield land should restore derelict land and buildings, introducing new uses and encouraging vibrant places. Quality of built environment should benefit form this policy. | | | |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ++ | Encouraging development in urban areas should reduce distances between origins and destinations, reducing the need to travel, and therefore traffic. Encouragin development near to public transport links should reduc car use and therefore traffic emissions, etc. | | | |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | + | The policy requires development to take place i sustainable locations. | | | |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | ++ | Development in the countryside is discouraged; biodiversity should therefore be protected | | | |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | ++ | Locating development in a manner that reduces the need to travel, and reducing car use in particular, would reduce pollution and carbor footprint. | | | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | + | Development in the countryside is discouraged; natural and semi natural landscapes should therefore be protected. | | | |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | ++ | Locating development in a manner that reduces the need to travel, and reduces intensive use of new land, should encourage more prudent and efficient use of resources. | | | |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GP2 | Overall Assessment |
|------|---|------------|---|
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | ++ | As above |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | + | The Policy calls for development to 'conserve or enhance the character of the area. |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | ++ | A sequential approach to planning development in which development is located such that it reduces the need to travel per se, and in particular, reduces dependence on the car. Attempt is therefore being made to reduce carbon emissions and the effects of climate change. |
| Econ | omic | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | + | Employment opportunities that are created should be more accessible to a greater number of people. |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | + | A more accessible place, in which there is less of a need to travel and therefore, potentially, less traffic, should have a greater chance of attracting investment. |

5.9 This strategic Policy was found to interact in a very positive way with several of the sustainability appraisal objectives in all of the categories. There were no negative effects found. Policy GP2 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District.

Table 5.9 Testing the RCUDP Policy GP4 Against the SA Framework

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GP4 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|------------|---|
| Socia | al | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | + | Various aspects of this strategic level policy imply support for this SA objective. The quality of housing would benefit from the improved provision of accessible facilities, as well as clean and |

| 20 |
|-------------------------|
| rt (Central Elland SPD) |
| Report ((|
| Appraisal Report (C |
| stainability |
| April 2008 Su |

| Sustainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GP4 | Overall Assessment |
|--|------------|--|
| | | attractive environments. Part v) in particular directly supports this SA objective, however, there are no specific provisions available to ensure quality housing is available to everyone. |
| 2 To improve safety and security for people and property | ++ | Part v) of GP4 promotes the creation of "safe and secure" environments. This directly supports the SA objective. |
| 3 To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | ++ | This policy supports the provision of local services, including recreation and open space, in accessible locations. Services of this nature would promote good health, and being highly accessible facilities, will be more socially inclusive. The broad objectives of the policy ("renaissance"), encapsulated in parts i)-ix) are intended to create "vibrant communities." |
| 4 To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | + | GP4 promotes provision of leisure, community and recreation facilities in accessible locations. This policy might ensure that these facilities are accessible to all, but not necessarily "available" to all. "Availability" can be determined by non planning factors. |
| 5 To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | ++ | GP4 promotes creation of services in accessible locations, and economic opportunities, particularly in deprived areas. The policy directly supports the objective. |
| 6 To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | +/= | Provision of local services and community facilities could include education and training. Impossible to say whether would build skills and capacities. |
| Environmental | | |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GP4 | Overall Assessment |
|------|--|------------|--|
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | + | GP4 promotes creation of attractive urban environments. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | Promotion of development in existing settlements should reduce the need to travel and therefore traffic and emissions |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | + | The policy promotes the creation of attractive, safe and secure residential/ urban environments |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | + | GP4 promotes recognition of biodiversity value. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | + | Development in existing settlements, and economic opportunities/facilities/services in "accessible" locations should reduce the need to travel and the associated emissions of utilizing motorized transport. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | ++ | Clean, attractive and safe natural/built environments promoted |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | =/+ | GP4 promotes development reducing the need to travel, which should contribute to energy/resource savings. No direct reference to resource use per se. |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | ++ | GP4 promotes development in existing settlements and on brown field land. |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | =/- | An increase in economic activity may be in conflict with this objective until suitable and accessible waste reduction facilities / technologies are in place. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | =/+ | Clean, attractive and safe built environments promoted. Protection of "historic" environment not directly referred to. |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GP4 | Overall Assessment |
|------|---|------------|--|
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | + | Promotion of accessible development and services should contribute to reduction of traffic, emissions and therefore effects of climate change. |
| Econ | omic | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | ++ | Increasing employment opportunities, particularly in deprived areas, promoted. GP4 therefore directly supports the SA objective. |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | + | This objective relies on numerous non planning factors outside the scope of Policy GP4. The strengthening and broadening of the economic base is promoted and this lends support to the SA objective. |

5.10 The Policy was found to interact in a positive way with most of the sustainability appraisal objectives. Policy GP4 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District

Table 5.10 Testing the RCUDP Policy GT1 Against the SA Framework

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GT1 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|------------|--|
| Socia | l | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | =/- | Safety of pedestrian and cyclist road users promoted. Security of people and property not addressed. |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | + | Vibrancy, good health and social inclusion will all be enhanced by the promotion of non-car borne mobility. |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | + | An improvement in accessibility, by reducing the need to travel generally and reliance on the car in particular, should assist in making services/facilities available to all. |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GT1 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|------------|---|
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | ++ | An improvement in accessibility, by reducing the need to travel generally and reliance on the car in particular, should assist in making services/facilities accessible to all. |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy has no clear influence on this indicator, other than to potentially improve accessibility to education opportunities. |
| Envir | onmental | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | =/+ | Reducing the emphasis placed on roads and car borne transportation should contribute to improved quality of built environment. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ++ | An improvement in accessibility, by reducing the need to travel generally and reliance on the car in particular, should assist in reducing traffic and emissions. |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | + | Whilst there is no specific mention of flood risk, the policy does call for the provision of a safe transport system. |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | =/+ | Biodiversity might be enhanced by a reduction in road-related emissions. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | ++ | Maintaining an accessible provision of quality public transport, pedestrian and cycling infrastructure reduces the propensity for people to travel by car. This reduces car journeys and the resultant CO2 emissions |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | + | Reducing the emphasis placed on roads and car borne transportation should contribute to improved quality of natural and manmade landscapes. |

| 24 |
|-------------------------------------|
| Central Elland SPD) |
| (Central |
| I Report |
| Appraisa |
| Sustainability Appraisal Report (Ce |
| ril 2008 |
| Ap |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GT1 | Overall Assessment |
|------|---|------------|--|
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | + | An improvement in accessibility, by reducing the need to travel and reliance on the car, should assist in reducing resource and energy use. |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | + | Reducing the over all need to travel implies development would be encouraged in accessible (i.e. urban locations and on brown field land.) Land-intensive, car-dependent sprawl would therefore be discouraged. |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | =/- | This policy would contribute to reductions in motor vehicle related waste. Influence on waste production generally negligible. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | + | Reducing the emphasis placed on roads and car borne transportation should contribute to improved quality of historic environment. |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | ++ | An improvement in accessibility, by reducing the need to travel generally and reliance on the car in particular, should assist in reducing traffic and emissions. This policy therefore contributes to a managed response to the effects of climate change |
| Econ | omic | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | + | An improvement in accessibility, by reducing the need to travel generally and reliance on the car in particular, should assist in reducing congestion and make travel more efficient and inclusive. This should have benefits for investment and economic growth. |

| Sustainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GT1 | Overall Assessment |
|------------------------------------|------------|---|
| | | Industries dependent on motor/road transport and its efficiency might not benefit from this policy's approach in the short term |

5.11 The Policy was found to interact in a positive way with several of the sustainability appraisal objectives, in all of the categories. There were no negative effects found. Policy GT1 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District.

Table 5.11 Testing the RCUDP Policy BE18 Against the SA Framework

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy BE18 | Overall Assessment | | |
|-------|--|-------------|---|--|--|
| Socia | Social | | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | =/- | The Policy makes no contribution to this SA objective. A negative impact might accrue from making housing more expensive to build and therefore less "available". | | |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | =/+ | The Policy makes a negligible contribution to this SA objective. Retention of architectural/historic features of an area could have cultural benefits. | | |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| Envir | Environmental | | | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | ++ | The Policy advocates the retention, protection and enhancement of areas in the built environment. | | |

5. Sustainability Appraisal Framework

| 8 To | | | |
|----------|--|-----|---|
| | reduce the effect of traffic on the vironment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| res | reduce the risk of flooding and the ulting detrimental effects on ople and property. | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| | protect and/or enhance diversity | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| | reduce pollution levels including carbon footprint of the District | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| sen | protect and enhance the natural, ni-natural and manmade dscape | + | The Policy advocates the retention, protection and enhancement of areas of manmade landscape. |
| | ensure prudent and efficient use natural resources and energy | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 14 To (| ensure efficient use of land | =/- | The Policy makes a negligible contribution to this SA objective. A conservation area characterized by low density, land-intensive development might promote development that makes inefficient use of land |
| | reduce the amount of waste duced | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| | protect and enhance the historic vironment | ++ | The Policy advocates the retention, protection and enhancement of areas in the built environment of historic and architectural interest. |
| | develop a managed response to effects of climate change | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| Economic | | | |
| | provide good employment portunities for all | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy BE18 | Overall Assessment |
|------|---|-------------|---|
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | +/- | A well managed conservation area might result in an area in which people want to live, work, visit and invest their money. There are potential economic benefits. However, the greater costs of, and time required to, develop land and property might deter investment. |

5.12 The Policy was found to interact in a positive way with several of the sustainability appraisal objectives. These were mainly the environmental objectives. There were some negative effects found, however, these are considered to be only slight negative effects, and tend to be compensated for by the positive effects. Policy BE18 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District's Conservation Areas.

Table 5.12 Testing the RCUDP Policy E1 Against the SA Framework

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy E1 | Overall Assessment | | |
|---------------|--|-----------|---|--|--|
| Socia | Social | | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | =/+ | The Policy makes no clear contribution to health, although the policy refers to accessibility and therefore promotes social inclusion. | | |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | + | Supports employment accessible by public transport, pedestrians and cyclists. | | |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| Environmental | | | | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | + | Supports development relating well in scale and character to locality and | | |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy E1 | Overall Assessment |
|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | having no adverse impact on amenity. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ++ | Supports employment accessible by public transport, pedestrians and cyclists. |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | = | The policy does not make a specific reference to flood risk. |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | ++ | Supports employment accessible by public transport, pedestrians and cyclists. Should contribute to reduced traffic and CO2 emissions. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | + | Supports employment accessible by public transport, pedestrians and cyclists. Should contribute to reduced resource use. There is nothing specific relating to resource use however. |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | + | E1 encourages development consistent with other UDP policies, which includes Policy GP4. GP4 encourages development on brown field land in central locations, discouraging land intensive sprawl. |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | =/- | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | + | Supports development relating well in scale and character to locality and having no adverse impact on amenity. |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy E1 | Overall Assessment |
|------|---|-----------|--|
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | + | Promotes travel by non car borne modes of transport and therefore lower greenhouse gas emissions, thereby contributing to a managed response to the effects of climate change. |
| Econ | omic | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | + | The Policy encourages employment development that is accessible by a range of means. This should contribute to the provision of employment opportunities for all. |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | ++ | The defined Primary Employment Areas allow for employment related development. The availability of these areas directly supports this SA objective |

5.13 The Policy was found to interact in a positive way with several of the sustainability appraisal objectives, particularly in the Environmental and Economic Categories. Policy E1 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District.

Table 5.13 Testing the RCUDP Policy E3 Against the SA Framework

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy E3 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|-----------|---|
| Socia | l | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | + | The Policy proposes designates sites at Century Road and Wistons Lane for |

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy E3 | Overall Assessment |
|--------|--|-----------|--|
| | | | Employment use. Both are centrally located sites and relatively accessible. |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| Enviro | onmental | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | + | The policy advises consistency with other relevant policies. Therefore supports development relating well in scale and character to locality and having no adverse impact on amenity. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | Allocates accessible sites for employment use, which could potentially reduce traffic. |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | + | The policy requires flood risk assessments to be carried out on various sites in Elland. |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | - | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | +/- | Allocates accessible sites for employment use, which could potentially reduce traffic, and therefore CO2 emissions. However, an increase in economic activity may also bring an increase in CO2 emissions. Therefore the impact on this objective is uncertain. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | - | The Policy promotes the use of green field land for employment-related development. Natural/semi natural environments are therefore not being protected. |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | +/- | Allocates accessible sites for employment use, which could potentially reduce |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy E3 | Overall Assessment |
|------|---|-----------|--|
| | | | traffic, and therefore reduced resource use. However, the policy does include Greenfield sites that are in conflict with this objective. |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | - | The Policy promotes the use of green field land for employment-related development. This is a less efficient use of land than development on brown field land. |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | =/- | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective, although there may be a negative impact resulting from an increase in economic activity. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | + | The policy advises compliance with other UDP policies, such as BE18. It can therefore be said that the Policy supports this SA objective. |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | = | Promotes travel by non car borne modes of transport and therefore lower greenhouse gas emissions, thereby contributing to a managed response to the effects of climate change. |
| Econ | omic | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | + | The Policy encourages employment development that is accessible by a range of means. This should contribute to the provision of employment opportunities for all. |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | ++ | The defined Primary Employment Areas allow for employment related development. The availability of these areas directly supports this SA objective |

5.14 The Policy was found to interact in a positive way with several of the sustainability appraisal objectives, particularly in the Economic category. There have been negative effects identified in the Environment category, which relate to the proposed development of two Greenfield sites in Elland. However, these sites are low quality and under utilized Greenfield sites, in very close proximity to existing Primary Employment Areas, and occupy areas characterized by employment uses. It is therefore considered that the economic benefits are worthy of a relatively small environmental sacrifice. Policy E3 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District.

| Susta | inability Appraisal Objective | Policy E4 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|-----------|--|
| Socia | I | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | +/- | Mixed-use developments can contribute to an increase in the choice of housing available, although this may not ensure that the objective is met. Therefore compatibility with the objective is dependent on the specific proposal. |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | + | The provision of open space, well designed landscaping, flood prevention measures can all have an extremely positive impact upon the safety and security of the District's population. |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | + | Good access to local infrastructure facilities has a large impact on where people want to live. Well designed, equipped spaces and places that are inclusive and welcoming contribute to people's quality of life. |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | +/= | Compatibility with this objective is dependent on the mix of uses on each specific proposal. |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | +/= | Facilitating mixed-use developments can contribute to the objective, but again, it is dependent on the specific proposal. |

Table 5.14 Testing the RCUDP Policy E4 Against the SA Framework

32

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy E4 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|-----------|--|
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| Envir | onmental | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | + | Mixed-use developments can make a positive contribution to this objective. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | +/- | Compatibility with this objective is dependent on the location and the measures put in place i.e. Travel Plans, Parking |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | = | The policy makes no specific reference to flood risk concerning sites in Elland. |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | +/- | Impacts are uncertain, as improvements can be secured, but development can have a negative impact on this objective. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | +/- | Allocates accessible sites for employment use, which could potentially reduce traffic, and therefore CO2 emissions. However, an increase in economic activity may also bring an increase in CO2 emissions. Therefore the impact on this objective is uncertain. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | + | The majority of allocations are on previously developed land (including the Elland allocation) and is therefore compatible with this objective. |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | + | By incorporating a number of different uses on the same site, especially on previously developed land (including the Elland |

| 34 |
|--------------------------------|
| (Central Elland SPD) |
| Report |
| y Appraisal |
| April 2008 Sustainability Ap |
| April 2008 |

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy E4 | Overall Assessment | |
|-------|---|-----------|--|--|
| | | | allocation) is compatible with this objective | |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | +/- | The SPD has no direct influence on this objective, although an increase in development can result in an increase in the waste produced. Facilities and technologies are required in order for total compatibility with this objective | |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | + | The policy requires the development to relate well to the character of the area. | |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective.change. | |
| Econ | Economic | | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | + | Mixed use developments provide employment opportunities. | |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | + | Mixed-use developments make a positive contribution to this objective. | |

5.15 The Policy was found to interact in a positive way with several of the sustainability appraisal objectives. There were no negative effects found. Policy E4 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District.

Table 5.15 Testing the RCUDP Policy H2 Against the SA Framework

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy H2 | Overall Assessment | | |
|-------|--|-----------|---|--|--|
| Socia | Social | | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | + | The policy is compatible with this objective in setting out defined housing areas and aiming to improve such areas to meet the needs and aspirations of the people who live or would seek to live in them. | | |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | =/+ | The strategic / allocation nature of the policy does not make explicit reference to meeting this objective, | | |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy H2 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | although improvement of housing areas may contribute. |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | + | The policy provides for a reasonable level of segregation of incompatible land uses. |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | + | The policy acknowledges the primary housing areas require facilities and services and that removal of mixed-use areas is not the intention. |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | + | The policy is compatible with this objective based on the reasons above. |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | +/= | The policy does not have a strong relationship with this objective, although schools are referred to in the justification. |
| Envir | onmental | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | + | Improvements to both private and social housing is compatible with this objective. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | Concentrating development in the established urban areas can help public transport and other sustainable forms of travel become increasingly viable. |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | =/+ | The policy has no clear influence on this objective, although it calls for development to avoid unacceptable environmental problems. |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | + | IThe policy is directing housing development to the existing urban areas. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | + | Similar to objective 8, concentrated development in the established urban area can help secure a viable efficient public |

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy H2 | Overall Assessment | |
|----------|--|-----------|--|--|
| | | | transport service / sustainable modes of trave and therefore reduce CO2 emissions. | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | + | The policy is directing housing development to the existing urban areas. | |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | + | The policy is directing housing development to the existing urban areas, on previously developed land | |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | +/- | The policy is promoting the efficient use of land, although an increase in dwellings may result in an increase in waste. | |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | + | The policy aims to both improve the existing housing stock, and direct development to the established urban areas. | |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | |
| Economic | | | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | |

5.16 The Policy was found to interact in a positive way with several of the sustainability appraisal objectives. Policy H2 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District.

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy NE15 | Overall Assessment | | |
|-------|--|-------------|---|--|--|
| Socia | Social | | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | =/+ | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | + | The policy is compatible with this objective. | | |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| Envir | onmental | | I | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | + | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | The policy may assist in protecting wildlife from highways development | | |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | + | Contributions to nature conservation contributes to vitality of the Districts flora and fauna. | | |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | + | Contributions to nature conservation, open space and landscaping contributes to Calderdale's rich landscapes. | | |

Table 5.16 Testing the RCUDP Policy NE15 Against the SA Framework

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy NE15 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|---|-------------|--|
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | + | The policy may assist in meeting this objective in concentrating development in the urban areas. |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| Econ | omic | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |

5.17 The Policy was found to interact in a positive way with several of the sustainability appraisal objectives.. There were no negative effects found. Policy NE15 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District

Table 5.17 Testing the RCUDP Policy T13 Against the SA Framework

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy T13 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|------------|--|
| Socia | al | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | + | Cycleways can contribute to encouraging a more sustainable, healthier form of travel. |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy T13 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|------------|---|
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | + | The policy can assist in promoting cycling as a recreational activity |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| Envir | onmental | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | + | Retention and provision of infrastructure such as cycleways can make a positive contribution to this objective. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | Retention and extra provision of infrastructure such as cycleways can make a positive contribution to this objective. |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | + | Infrastructure such as cycleways can make a positive contribution to this objective. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | + | Retention and provision of infrastructure such as cycleways can make a positive contribution to this objective through reducing the number of car journeys, although this also requires a co-ordinated approach with other forms of transport and issues such as personal safety. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | + | Contributions to this low impact form of travel can help contribute to this objective. |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy T13 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|---|------------|---|
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | + | A good sustainable transport network, that serves the communities of the District well, contributes to the planning of sustainable communities and can reduce the land take of highways. |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | + | Contributions to this low impact form of travel can help contribute to this objective. |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | + | Through increasing and retaining infrastructure such as cycleways, a positive contribution can be made to this objective. |
| Econ | omic | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |

5.18 The Policy was found to interact in a positive way with several of the sustainability appraisal objectives.. Policy T13 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District.

Table 5.18 Testing the RCUDP Policy GS2 Against the SA Framework

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy GS2 | Overall Assessment | | |
|-------|--|------------|---|--|--|
| Socia | Social | | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | + | Directing development into existing centres can ensure the centres are well populated throughout the day and evening which can increase the feeling of personal safety. | | |

| - | | | |
|--------|--|-----|--|
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | + | Provision of facilities that are accessed by public transport destinations (i.e. town centres) support the social inclusion aspect of this objective. |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | + | Policy GS2 will improve the number of activities available to all, although how affordable they are is uncertain. |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | + | Concentrating development in existing centres supports this objective. |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| Enviro | onmental | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | +/- | The effect on this objective is uncertain as it depends on the design of new development, although it intends to avoid urban sprawl. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | By directing development to town centre sites, public transport can become increasingly viable as a choice of transport. |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | + | By directing development towards town centres, the policy supports this objective, although urban, brownfield sites can also have biodiversity value. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | + | Development within existing centres would aim to reduce the need to travel, especially by private car. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | + | The policy supports this objective by directing development towards the existing townscape. |

5. Sustainability Appraisal Framework

42 April 2008 | Sustainability Appraisal Report (Central Elland SPD)

| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
|------|---|-----|--|
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | + | The policy supports this objective through promoting the use of town centre sites, the majority of which are likely to be brownfield sites. |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | +/- | The effect on this objective is uncertain as it depends on the design of new development, although it intends to avoid urban sprawl. |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | + | The location of development can contribute to this objective, through reducing the need to travel. |
| Econ | omic | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |

5.19 The Policy was found to interact in a positive way with several of the sustainability appraisal objectives. Policy GS2 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District.

Table 5.19 Testing the RCUDP Policy T27 Against the SA Framework

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy T27 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|------------|---|
| Socia | al | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | + | The policy is compatible with this objective, as it contributes to the safety of Air Travel. |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Policy T27 | Overall Assessment |
|-------|--|------------|--|
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| Envir | onmental | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | - | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. |

| Sustainability Appraisal Objective | | Policy T27 | Overall Assessment | | |
|------------------------------------|---|------------|--|--|--|
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| Econ | omic | | | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | = | The Policy makes no clear contribution to this SA objective. | | |

5.20 The Policy was found to interact in a limited way with the sustainability objectives, however, no negative impacts were established. Policy T27 can be expected to promote overall sustainability in the District.

5.21 ODPM Guidance ^(*) states that given the duty under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 on those preparing a SPD to contribute to sustainable development, it is essential for it to set out to improve on the situation which would exist if there were no SPD. It should also aim to improve on the effects of implementing the existing saved UDP policy. In order to test whether the production of the Central Elland SPD would improve on the existing situation two strategic options have been selected as follows:

Issue 1

- 1. Publishing the Central Elland SPD
- 2. Do Nothing Scenario not having an SPD, missing out on the detailed site appraisals and regeneration proposals for key areas, and relying on RCUDP Policies GP1, GP2, GP4, GS2, GT1, BE18, E1, E3, E4, H2, NE15, T13, and T27 and Government Guidance

5.22 In order to determine the merits of different options they need to be sufficiently distinct to highlight the different sustainable implications of each so that meaningful comparisons can be made. Determining the most sustainable strategic approach is achieved by testing the options against the sustainability framework objectives.

5.23 As Table 5.20 'Testing the SPD Alternatives Against the SA Framework' shows, there is very little to choose between the two approaches in terms of achieving the sustainability objectives as they both give similar results. The SPD is likely to assist in implementing Policies GP1, GP2, GP4, GT1, BE18, E1, E3, E4, H2, NE15, T13, GS2 and T27 and lead to a clear framework to encourage and support the regeneration of Central Elland. The SPD is also likely to encourage investment in, and the renaissance of, Central Elland by providing potential investors with useful site analyses and regenerative proposals relating to key sites in Central Elland. No definite adverse sustainability effects were identified as a result of producing the SPD. Overall the SPD will be beneficial in sustainability terms.

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Option 1 : Produce SPD | Option 2: Continue with saved policies GP1, GP2, GP4, GT1, BE18, E1, E3, E4, H2, NE15, T13, GS2 and T27 | Comments |
|-------|--|---------------------------|---|--|
| Socia | l | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | = | = | The saved policies and the SPD make no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | = | = | The saved Policies and the SPD make no clear contribution to this SA objective. |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | ++ | + | Given that the SPD offers more specific guidance relating to the implementation of this principle, the SPD promotes sustainability to a greater degree than the saved policies. The SPD specifically proposes improvements to the area's access arrangements, which include healthy and sustainable means of transport. These proposals also promote social inclusiveness; improving access for those with disabilities and those without access to a car. Proposals to introduce active frontages to the street scene will promote vibrancy and vitality. |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | ++ | + | Both the SPD and the saved policies promote sustainable access |

Table 5.20 Testing the SPD Alternatives Against the SA Framework

Sustainability Appraisal Objective Option 1 : **Option 2:** Comments **Produce SPD Continue with** saved policies GP1, GP2, GP4, GT1, BE18, E1, E3, E4, H2, NE15, T13, GS2 and T27 arrangements, which improve the accessibility of essential services to all. However, given that the SPD offers more specific guidance relating to the implementation of this principle, the SPD promotes sustainability to a greater degree than the saved policies. 5 To improve accessibility to essential Both the SPD and the ++ + services, facilities and employment saved policies promote sustainable access arrangements, which improve the accessibility of essential services to all. However, given that the SPD offers more specific guidance relating to the implementation of this principle, the SPD promotes sustainability to a greater degree than the saved policies would alone. 6 The saved Policies To provide the education and training = = opportunities to build skills and and the SPD make capacities no clear contribution to this SA objective. Environmental 7 To retain, protect and create a quality Both the SPD and the ++ + built environment saved policies promote a quality built environment. However, the SPD offers specific

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Option 1 : Produce SPD | Option 2: Continue with saved policies GP1, GP2, GP4, GT1, BE18, E1, E3, E4, H2, NE15, T13, GS2 and T27 | Comments |
|------|--|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | information and guidance on how this can be achieved. |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ++ | ++ | Both the SPD and the saved policies promote sustainable access arrangements, and alternatives to the use of motorized modes of transport. |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | ++ | + | Whilst the saved policies refer to protecting the environment and the need to undertake flood risk assessments on certain sites, the SPD offers specific guidance on the areas for development. |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | + | + | Both the SPD and the saved policies promote development that would benefit biodiversity. |
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | ++ | + | Both the SPD and the saved policies promote sustainable transport arrangements, which would contribute to lower CO2 emissions. However, given that the SPD offers more specific guidance relating to the implementation of this principle, the SPD promotes sustainability to a |

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Option 1 : Produce SPD | Option 2: Continue with saved policies GP1, GP2, GP4, GT1, BE18, E1, E3, E4, H2, NE15, T13, GS2 and T27 | Comments | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | greater degree than the saved policies would alone. | | | | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | + | + | Both the SPD and the saved policies promote sustainable development and therefore this environmental objective. | | | | |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | ++ | + | Both the SPD and the saved policies promote sustainable transport arrangements, which would contribute to lower use of natural resources. However, given that the SPD offers more specific guidance relating to the achievement of this objective, it promotes sustainability to a greater degree than the saved policies would alone. | | | | |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | + | + | Both the SPD and the saved policies promote sustainable development and therefore this environmental objective. | | | | |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | +/- | +/- | The SPD and saved policies have an uncertain impact on this objective. An increase in economic activity may result in a negative impact, although this can be lessened through | | | | |

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Option 1 : Produce SPD | Option 2: Continue with saved policies GP1, GP2, GP4, GT1, BE18, E1, E3, E4, H2, NE15, T13, GS2 and T27 | Comments |
|------|---|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | measures such as on-site recycling facilities. |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | + | + | Both the SPD and the saved policies promote the achievement of this objective. |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | = | = | Both the SPD and the saved policies promote sustainable development and therefore this environmental objective. |
| Econ | omic | | | |
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | ++ | + | The regeneration of Central Elland would have beneficial effects on the objective. |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | ++ | ++ | Both the SPD and the saved policies promote sustainable development and therefore this environmental objective. |

5.24 The testing of Option 1: Produce an SPD assumes the benefits of Option 2: Policies GP1, GP2, GP4, GS2, GT1, BE18, E1, E3, E4, H2, NE15, T13 and T27 as it is supplementary to the RCUDP Policy. Results show Option 1 to be most beneficial. The benefits of setting out a clear framework for the development of an area, with proposals to tackle the barriers to regeneration, helps to ensure and enhance social, environmental, and economic objectives above and beyond maintaining these as would be the case with Option 2.

Task B3: Predicting the Effects of the Draft SPD

5.25 The purpose of Task B3 is to predict the social, environmental and economic effects of the options being considered in the SPD process. In accordance with the advice at Paragraph 4.3.11 in the ODPM Guide ^(*) these effects are described in terms of their magnitude, geographical scale, the time period over which they will occur, whether they are permanent or temporary, positive or negative, probable or improbable, frequent or rare, and

vi Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents, ODPM (November 2005)

whether or not there are secondary, cumulative and /or synergistic effects. These effects are evaluated, and reported on in table 5.20. Judgments have been made on the potential effects, with reference to the baseline data in the short, medium and long term. Prediction of effects has involved identifying the changes to the sustainability baseline, which are predicted to arise from the SPD.

| Susta | ainability Appraisal Objective | Effect of SPD on Meeting the Sustainability Objectives | Short Term | Med Term | Long Term | | | |
|-------|--|---|---------------|-------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Socia | Social | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To ensure quality housing is available to everyone | Although no initial links, the quality of housing is in part determined by the availability of sustainable transport links connecting it with other land used, part of the SPDs aims. | = | + | + | | | |
| 2 | To improve safety and security for people and property | The SPD has no primary impact on this objective | = | = | = | | | |
| 3 | To create and retain vibrant communities that promote good health and social inclusion | The SPD proposes development and offers advice and guidance on how the town could be developed to enhance its vibrancy | = | + | ++ | | | |
| 4 | To ensure that culture, leisure and recreation activities are available to all | Sustainable means of transportation are proposed enhancing the accessibility of amenities for all. | = | + | + | | | |
| 5 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and employment | Sustainable means of transportation are proposed enhancing the accessibility of amenities for all. | = | ++ | ++ | | | |
| 6 | To provide the education and training opportunities to build skills and capacities | The SPD has no primary impact on this objective | = | = | = | | | |
| Envir | onmental | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To retain, protect and create a quality built environment | The SPD proposes development that would enhance the vitality and vibrancy, and therefore the quality of, the built environment. | = | + | ++ | | | |
| 8 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | The SPD proposes sustainable, non-motorised, transport development. | = | + | ++ | | | |
| 9 | To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects on people and property. | The SPD flags up the flood risk issues on various sites. | + | | + | | | |
| 10 | To protect and/or enhance biodiversity | Reductions in the use of the combustion engine could contribute to a broader (positive) impact on biodiversity | = | + | ++ | | | |

Table 5.21 Predicting the Effects of the Central Elland SPD

50

| Sust | ainability Appraisal Objective | Effect of SPD on Meeting the Sustainability Objectives | Short Term | Med Term | Long Term |
|------|---|---|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| 11 | To reduce pollution levels including the carbon footprint of the District | The SPD proposes sustainable, non-motorised, transport development. | = | + | + |
| 12 | To protect and enhance the natural, semi-natural and manmade landscape | The SPD proposes development that would enhance the vitality and vibrancy, and therefore the quality of, the man made landscape. | = | + | + |
| 13 | To ensure prudent and efficient use of natural resources and energy | The SPD proposes sustainable, non-motorised, transport development. | = | + | ++ |
| 14 | To ensure efficient use of land | The SPD has no primary impact on this objective | = | == | = |
| 15 | To reduce the amount of waste produced | The SPD has no primary impact on this objective, although increased development and economic activity may lead to an increase in waste. Positive contributions to this objective may develop with technology advances and the availability of facilities over the medium to long term. | = | +/- | +/- |
| 16 | To protect and enhance the historic environment | The SPD has the potential to have a primary impact on this objective, particularly as several of the SPD's indicative proposals are within a Conservation Area and in the vicinity of listed buildings. However, the adopted SPD stresses the need for any actual development proposals of this nature to be prepared in accordance with PPG15, especially where demolition of existing structures is considered as an option. The preparation of a Conservation Area Appraisal for Elland is planned by the Council. Once adopted, this appraisal should be read alongside the SPD for guidance on matters relating to development in the Conservation Area. | = | = | = |
| 17 | To develop a managed response to the effects of climate change | The SPD has no primary impact on this objective. | = | = | = |

| Sust | tainability Appraisal Objective | Effect of SPD on Meeting the Sustainability Objectives | Short Term | Med Term | Long Term |
|------|---|--|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| 18 | To provide good employment opportunities for all | The SPD proposes employment development and is therefore compatible with this objective. | = | + | + |
| 19 | To achieve business success, economic growth and continued investment | The SPD's primary objective is to achieve the regeneration and sustainable development of Central Elland, and the creation of a more attractive and vibrant environment. Employment development is also proposed. These objectives are expected to encourage inwards investment. The SPD itself provides useful information about Central Elland that may encourage inward investors to invest in the area. | + | ++ | ++ |

Task B4: Evaluating the Effects of the Draft SPD

5.26 The likely effects of the SPD have been identified in 'Task B3: Predicting the Effects of the Draft SPD'. In order to comply with government guidance an evaluation of their significance is to be made where relevant. The evaluation of the likely effects of the SPD has predicted that outcomes will be predominantly positive or neutral. 'Task B3: Predicting the Effects of the Draft SPD' clearly shows that no negative significant effects against the Sustainability Framework will arise from the Central Elland SPD.

Task B5: Mitigating Adverse Effects and Maximising Beneficial Effects

5.27 'Task B3: Predicting the Effects of the Draft SPD' and 'Task B4: Evaluating the Effects of the Draft SPD' demonstrate that the Central Elland SPD is likely to generate significant beneficial effects. The sustainability appraisal has shown that there are no significant adverse effects of implementing the SPD.

Task B6: Developing Proposals for Monitoring

5.28 Monitoring allows the actual significant effects of the SPD to be tested against those predicted in the SA. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 already requires local planning authorities to publish an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which monitors the implementation of policies in the RCUDP. At the same time the baseline indicators in the SA will need monitoring to determine how successful the SPD is in furthering the sustainability objectives relevant to this SPD. The monitoring procedures will enable the Council to evaluate:

- Whether the SA predictions of sustainability effects were accurate.
- Whether the SPD is contributing to the achievement of the SA objectives.
- If there are any unforeseen adverse effects that are identifiable.
- If so, have they been caused by a change in circumstances?
- Is any remedial action appropriate?

Task C1: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report

5.29 The SA Framework of the SPD is a key output of the Sustainability Appraisal process, presenting information on the effects of the plan on which formal public consultation is carried out. It is likely to be of interest to a wide range of stakeholders including: decision makers; statutory consultees; other planning authorities; non-governmental organisations and; members of the public.

5.30 The SA Report has followed the guidance set out in the by the former Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) in November 2005 ^(vii) and set out the process in task order to meet the requirements of EU Directive 2001/42/EC ^(viii).

vii Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (ODPM, 2005)

viii European Union Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment

6 The Next Steps

Task D1: Public Participation on the Draft SPD and SA Report

6.1 During the public participation stage the SA report must be consulted upon at the same time as the SPD. When involving the public on the SPD and its SA Report, responses should focus on the effects of the SPD.

Task D2: Appraising of Significant Effects

6.2 If significant changes are required to the SPD as a result of the consultation process, it will be necessary for further appraisal to be made in order to ensure that the all potential social, environmental and economic effects of the SPD have been subject to SA.

SPD Stage 3: Adoption and Monitoring

6.3 Once the SPD has been adopted, a statement will be produced which will detail how consultation responses were taken into account and any changes made to the document as a result of the SA process, in accordance with SEA Directive requirements. Monitoring will continue to be undertaken as set out in 'Task B6: Developing Proposals for Monitoring' and further reported in the Council's AMR.

54

Appendix 1 List of References

Our Common Future: The World Commission on Environment and Development, (WCED, 1987)

Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents, (ODPM, 2005)

Securing the Future - delivering UK sustainable development strategy, (HM Government, 2005)

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

The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (S.I. 2004 No. 1633)

A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive, (ODPM, 2005)

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)

Generic Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, (Calderdale MBC, 2007)

Appendix 2 Glossary

AMR: Annual Monitoring Report

The 'Act': The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)

Core Strategy: A local development document which sets out the key strategies and policies for a planning authority

DCLG: Department of Communities and Local Government

DPD: Development Plan Document

EU: European Union

- LAA: Local Area Agreement
- LDD: Local Development Document
- LDF: Local Development Framework
- LDS: Local Development Scheme
- LPA: Local Planning Authority
- ODPM: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (former)
- PPS: Planning Policy Statement

RCUDP: Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan

- RSS: Regional Spatial Strategy
- SA: Sustainability Appraisal

Scoping: The process of deciding the scope and level of detail of a sustainability appraisal

SEA: Strategic Environmental Assessment

SEA Directive: European Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment

SEA Regulations: The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004)

SO: Sustainability Objective

56