**Appendix J: Appraisal of development management policies**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Description** | **Symbol** |
| **Significant Positive Effect** | The option contributes significantly to the achievement of the objective. | **++** |
| **Minor Positive Effect** | The option contributes to the achievement of the objective but not significantly. | **+** |
| **Neutral** | The option does not have any effect on the achievement of the objective | **0** |
| **Minor Negative Effect** | The option detracts from the achievement of the objective but not significantly. | **-** |
| **Significant Negative Effect** | The option detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective. | **--** |
| **No Relationship** | There is no clear relationship between the option and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible. | **~** |
| **Uncertain** | The option has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an appraisal to be made. | **?** |

NB: where more than one symbol/colour is presented in a box it indicates that the appraisal has identified both positive and negative effects. Where a box is coloured but also contains a ‘?’, this indicates uncertainty over whether the effect could be a minor or significant effect although a professional judgement is expressed in the colour used. A conclusion of uncertainty arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect.

### Meeting the challenge of climate change and adapt to its effects

| **SA Objective** | **Policies** | | | | **Commentary** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CC1** | **CC2** | **CC3** | **Cumulative** |
| 1. **1. Housing**   To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Policy CC1 supports the development of energy and water efficiency properties that are designed to emit as few greenhouse gasses as possible, which is considered to support aims to achieve good standards of housing within the district. Policy CC2 supports water efficiency measures in new residential development with the requirement for 110 litres per person per litre and ensures adequate infrastructure and sewage treatment capacity is in place. These measures will support the provision of high-quality new housing development in the district. Policy CC3 would support development of housing in areas that avoid high flood risk thereby supporting development that would be safe over its lifetime.  Overall, the policies are considered to have minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * That the introduction of water efficiency measures does not affect viability of development or lead to less affordable housing.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| 1. **2. Health**   To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Policy CC1 would support energy efficient development and new renewable/low carbon/emission generating development that could support the long-term health of the district’s population and reduce noise and air pollution. CC2 would ensure that development does not negatively affect water quality, thereby supporting health of the reducing the potential for pollution in waterbodies. Policy CC3 would ensure that all development is safe from flooding and protects areas that are important to the flood resilience of their surroundings (such as greenfield sites), thereby supporting the wellbeing of the communities of Ashfield.  Overall, the policies are considered to have minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **3.Historic Environment**  To conserve and enhance Ashfield’s historic environment, heritage assets and their settings. | **-/?** | **~** | **~** | **-/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  CC1 has the potential for negative effects on the historic environment related to the development of renewable energy/low carbon energy generation schemes. However, the policy does seek to avoid development that leads to significant adverse effects on other policy areas (which can be assumed to include those relating to the historic environment). It is considered that policies protecting water quality and seeking to avoid areas of highest flood risk do not have relationship with the achievement of this objective. Policies elsewhere in the plan would ensure that design of any infrastructure, or any other measures, to reduce the risk of flooding would take into account issues relating to the historic environment.  Overall, the policies are assessed as having minor negative effects although there is some uncertainty over the presence, magnitude and extent.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * That other policies in the plan would ensure impacts on the historic environment are considered for renewable/low carbon energy infrastructure.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of wastewater infrastructure and SUDs that may be provided is unknown at this stage. * The location renewable/low carbon energy generation schemes. |
| **4.Community Safety**  To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. | **0** | **~** | **~** | **0** | **Likely Significant Effects**  CC1 is considered to have neutral effects on this objective. It is considered that policies protecting water quality and seeking development to avoid areas of highest flood risk would not impact upon community safety. Overall, the policies are assessed as having a neutral effect on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **5.Social Inclusion Deprivation**  To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield. | **+** | **+** | **~** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  CC1 would support the development of energy efficient and low carbon emitting housing that potentially leads to lower heating and lighting bills for occupants. The policy also supports development that reduces the need to travel, which may increase the accessibility of services, facilities and employment. CC2 seeks the incorporation of the water efficiency measures in new residential development that exceed no more than 110 litres per person per day, alongside ensuring developments have sufficient access to sewage treatment facilities. The implementation of energy and water efficiency measures can support reduced bills which can help the most deprived in the district.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * That the introduction of water efficiency measures does not affect viability of development or lead to less affordable housing.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure**  To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green & Blue Infrastructure | **+/-/?** | **++** | **+** | **++/-/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  CC1 requires the incorporation of green and blue infrastructure, trees and other planting which could support achievement of the objective. However, the policy also supports the development of renewable/low carbon schemes. The policy seeks to avoid significant adverse effects on other policy areas (which includes designated nature conservation/biodiversity assets and protected species) but there may still be localised effects on biodiversity. However, their presence and the magnitude is dependent on the location of development.  CC2 supports the achievement of the Humber River Basin Management Plans and Water Framework Directive in protecting and improving the quality of water bodies and ecological systems. It also specifically seeks that there are no adverse effects on water related environmentally significant sites and seeks to encourage the use of nature-based solutions that are often better for local biodiversity/create biodiversity friendlier places. CC3 supports the development where it enhances biodiversity interest.  Overall, the policies are considered to have a mix of significant positive and minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective although some uncertainty remains.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * That other policies in the plan would ensure impacts on biodiversity and habitats are considered for renewable/low carbon energy infrastructure.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **7.Landscape**  To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield’s landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place. | **-/?** | **0** | **0/?** | **-/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  CC1 seeks to ensure that development of renewable/low carbon technology schemes where there are no significant adverse effects on other policy areas (which can be assumed to include landscape and townscape). However, there may be negative effects on the landscape from such development dependent on location and design.  CC2 and CC3 are considered to have neutral effects on the achievement of this objective. CC2 requires appropriate wastewater treatment capacity to be in place. The development of such infrastructure may have landscape impacts, though the policy does seek to ensure that nature based solutions, which are often more congruent to local landscapes, are considered. CC3 requires the provision of SuDs, which can have an impact on the landscape, but seeks to avoid hard engineering which are more likely to have impacts on landscapes/townscapes. Overall, the policies are considered to have neutral effects on the achievement of the objective. There is some uncertainty for CC3.  Overall, the policies are considered to have the potential for minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective although some uncertainty remains.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * That other policies in the plan (EV10 in particular) would ensure impacts on the landscape are considered.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of wastewater infrastructure and SUDs that may be provided is unknown at this stage. * The location of renewable/low carbon technology schemes. |
| **8.Natural Resources**  To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land. | **+/-/?** | **+** | **+** | **+/-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  CC1 may see the use of greenfield land or brownfield land for renewable energy/low carbon schemes. Many schemes (such as solar energy farms) are likely to be temporary but would still be expected to have an effect on natural resources. The policy specifically seeks energy storage proposals on previously developed and/or industrial sites. CC2 and CC3 both seek to CC2 would ensure that adequate wastewater treatment capacity is in place and indirectly ensure that soils are also protected from contaminants.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * The policy could particularly support the use of brownfield sites for renewable energy schemes.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **9.Air & noise pollution**  To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution. | **+** | **~** | **~** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  CC1 is considered likely to support the reduction in pollution derived from the use of fossil fuels. The policies concerned with water quality and flood risk (CC2, CC3) are not considered to have a direct relationship with this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **10.Water Quality**  To conserve and improve water quality and quantity. | **+** | **++** | **++** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.  The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water resource pressures.  Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021). The policy requirement in CC2 for the achievement of not exceeding water use of 110 litres per person per day reflects this evidence and supports achievement of this SA Objective.  The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield’s Wastewater Treatment Works.  Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that development through these policies would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.  CC2 is the primary policy in the plan for ensuring that water quality in groundwaters and surface waters does not deteriorate. The policy specifically requires development to have regard to the Humber River Basin Management Plan and Water Framework Directive in protecting the quality of water bodies.  CC3 supports the provision of SuDs and seeks to avoid areas of highest flood risk which contributes to sustainable water management. The implementation of effective SuDS can also help protect water quality.  The policies in this section are considered to have significant positive effects on achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **11.Waste**  To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials. | **+** | **+** | **~** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  Policy CC1 states that development should minimise the generation of waste and promote sustainable approaches to waste management, including recycling and reuse construction waste. This is likely to support positive outcomes. Policy CC2 supports water efficiency in new buildings which supports overall objective to reduce waste and recycle materials. Overall, the policies in this section would have minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **12. Climate Change and Flood Risk**  To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment. | **0** | **+** | **++** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2023) identifies that the district has a relatively low risk of flooding from watercourses. Flood risk is mainly away from the urban areas. However, it is recognised that additional water in the River Leen could cause flood issues for Nottingham to the south. Policy CC3 is the primary policy to ensure that development is located in areas of the district with the lowest risk of flooding. The policy would ensure that new development has taken the impact of flood risk into account and does not compromise the flood resilience of its surrounding or important flood resilience land.  Overall, the policies in this section are considered to have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that new renewable/low carbon energy schemes will be subject to site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency**  To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield’s renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources. | **++** | **+** | **~** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  Policy CC1 requires all development proposals to mitigate climate change and contribute towards targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The policy seeks the incorporation of (inter alia) opportunities for natural heating and ventilation, measures to support cooling and shading, water efficiency measures, energy efficiency and decentralised renewable/low carbon technologies, and vehicle charging facilities in new development. Additionally, the policy supports the development of standalone renewable energy/low carbon technology schemes. This is considered to significantly support the objective.  Policy CC2 seeks achievement of no more than 110 litres per person per day in residential development and that business/commercial development should be water efficient. This would support more efficient buildings.  Overall, the policies in this section are considered to have a significant positive effect on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **14.Travel and Accessibility**  To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys. | **+** | **~** | **~** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  Policy CC1 states that (inter alia) development should enable occupants to minimise their need to travel and maximise opportunities for sustainable modes of travel.  The remaining policies would ensure water quality is maintained and areas of highest flood risk avoided. There is no clear relationship and supporting increased travel choice and sustainable modes of transport.  Overall, the policies are assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **15.Employment**  To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District. | **0** | **~** | **+** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  Policy CC3 would ensure that new employment development would not be located in areas of highest flood risk although employment uses are recognised in national policy as being less vulnerable to flood risk. Overall, the policies in this section would have minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of new employment development. |
| 1. **16. Economy**   To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  Policy CC1 supports BREEAM standards in new non-residential development over 1,000m2. CC2 supports water quality and water efficiency measures in new development which can support the provision of high-quality employment developments. Policy CC3 would ensure that development which would support employment growth in locations that would be safe over the lifetime of the development which would help support economic development.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor and significant positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| 1. **17. Town Centres**   Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield’s town centres. | **~** | **~** | **+/?** | **+/?** | **Likely significant effects**  The CC3 would direct development away from areas of highest flood risk. Parts of Hucknall town centre are included within Flood Zone 3 and therefore the aims of the town centre first policy may not be compatible. However, there is some uncertainty of the effect. There are no such issues for Kirkby-in-Ashfield or Sutton in Ashfield where the policy would not potentially counteract town centre first approach.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor and uncertain effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * There is some uncertainty with regards to Hucknall town centre due to the location of areas of highest floodrisk. |

### Protecting and enhancing Ashfield’s character through its natural environment and heritage

| **SA Objective** | **Policy** | | | | | | | | | | | **Commentary** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EV1** | **EV2** | **EV3** | **EV4** | **EV5** | **EV6** | **EV7** | **EV8** | **EV9** | **EV10** | **Cumulative** |  |
| 1. **1. Housing**   To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Policy EV8 would have minor negative effects on this objective. Protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land may have a negative effect on housing supply by restricting land available for housing developments. However, it is recognised that many brownfield opportunities have been redeveloped in recent years. Similarly, the protection of designated nature conservation sites, heritage assets, landscapes, and green spaces may affect housing delivery.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor negative effect through Policy EV8.  **Mitigation**   * The Environment Act requires biodiversity net gain from all development (reflected in EV4).   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of new development. |
| 1. **2. Health**   To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average.  The majority of these policies would have minor positive effects on this objective. Policy EV1 supports appropriate sports facilities in the Green Belt. Policy EV2 supports outdoor sport in the countryside. Policy EV3 supports the re-use of buildings in the countryside for recreational and tourism uses. Policy EV4 seeks to protect and enhance green infrastructure, which can provide opportunities for informal recreation. Policy EV5 seeks to protect recreational facilities. Policy EV7 supports the provision of new allotments and seeks to protect existing allotments. Policy EV8 seeks to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. Policy EV9 seeks to protect the historic environment which includes historic parks and gardens. Policy EV10 seeks to protect landscape character. All of the measures in these policies would help to improve health and wellbeing and have a minor positive effect on this objective.  The other policies would have neutral effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **3.Historic Environment**  To conserve and enhance Ashfield’s historic environment, heritage assets and their settings. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **++** | **++** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The district has a range of heritage assets including scheduled monuments, listed buildings and conservation areas.  Policies EV9 and EV10 are the primary policies for the protection of the historic environment. They would have significant positive effects on this objective. Policy EV9 seeks to protect the historic environment and Policy EV10 seeks to protect *‘the setting of, and views to and from, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas and Historic Parks and Gardens’*.  Policies ENV1, ENV2, ENV3, EV4, ENV5 and ENV6 would have minor positive effects on this objective as they would help to protect the Green Belt, open countryside and protect green spaces which *‘provide the setting for heritage assets’*.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of new development and the opportunities for enhancement of the historic environment. |
| **4.Community Safety**  To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **Likely Significant Effects**  These policies are concerned with the protection of the environment and so have no direct relationship with this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **5.Social Inclusion Deprivation**  To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Ashfield, ranked at 68th out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019).  Green spaces contribute towards quality of life in the district by providing opportunities for formal and informal recreation. Protection of green spaces through Policy EV5 would therefore help to improve social inclusion and have a minor positive effect on this objective. Allotments can provide an important community facility so protection of allotments through Policy ENV7 would help to have a minor positive effect on this objective. The other policies would have neutral effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective through policies EV5 and EV7.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure**  To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green & Blue Infrastructure | **+** | **+** | **0** | **++** | **++** | **++** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **++** | **Likely Significant Effects**  There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District. There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield and there are several tracts of ancient woodland. There are also many Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and six Local Nature Reserves (LNR).  The majority of these policies would have either minor or significant positive effects on this objective. Policies EV4, EV5, and EV6 would have a significant positive effect on this objective. Policy EV4 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity, Green Infrastructure and geodiversity. Policy EV5 seeks to protect green spaces and EV6 trees, woodlands and hedgerows, which will also support carbon sequestration.  Policies ENV1 and 2 are concerned with protecting the Green Belt and countryside. This would also help to protect biodiversity. Policies EV7, EV8, EV9 and EV10 seek to protect allotments, best and most versatile agricultural land, the historic environment and landscape character, all of which would also contribute to protecting biodiversity and Green Infrastructure.  Overall, the policies in this section would have significant positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * The Environmental Act requires biodiversity net gain in all new development (reflected in EV4).   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed new development would not be located on designated conservation sites. * It is assumed that the value of previously developed land is less than greenfield land.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **7.Landscape**  To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield’s landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place. | **++** | **+** | **+** | **++** | **++** | **++** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **++** | **++** | **Likely Significant Effects**  All of the policies in this section would contribute to protecting and enhancing landscape in some way. Policies EV1, EV4, EV5, EV6 and EV10 would have significant positive effects on the achievement of this objective. Policy EV1 supports the strategic function of the Green Belt. Policy EV4 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity, Green Infrastructure and geodiversity. Policy EV5 seeks to protect green spaces and EV6 protects trees, woodlands and hedgerows. Policy EV10 seeks to protect and enhance landscape character. All of these policy measures would have significant positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  Policies EV2, EV3, EV7, EV8 and EV9 would all have minor positive effects on this objective. Policies ENV1 and 2 are concerned with protecting the Green Belt and countryside, Policy EV3 supports the re-use of buildings in the countryside where they would not impact on the openness of the Green Belt or countryside, Policy EV7 seeks to protect allotments, Policy EV8 seeks to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land and EV9 protecting the historic environment. All of the measures in these policies would help to protect and enhance the landscapes of the district and have a minor positive effect.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The specific location of development. |
| **8.Natural Resources**  To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land. | **++** | **++** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **++** | **++** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  There are pockets of Grade 2 (very good) and Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b) land throughout the district.  Policies EV1 and 2 would have significant positive effects on the achievement of this objective. These policies seek to protect the Green Belt and control development in the countryside and would help to avoid loss of greenfield land. Policy EV7 seeks to protect allotments and Policy EV8 the best and most versatile agricultural land, which would also help to avoid loss of greenfield land.  Policies EV4 and EV5 would have minor positive effects on this objective as they seek to protect and enhance biodiversity, green infrastructure and geodiversity and open spaces.  The other policies would have neutral effects.  Overall, the policies in this section would have significant positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The specific location of development. |
| **9.Air & noise pollution**  To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  There are no Air Quality Management Areas in the district.  Policies EV4 seeks to protect and enhance Green Infrastructure which would in turn help to encourage walking and cycling and reduce reliance on the car and associated emissions. Policy EV6 seeks to protect trees, woodland and hedgerows. Trees and woodlands act as carbon sinks so this policy would help to reduce pollution and improve air quality.  The other policies would have neutral effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **10.Water Quality**  To conserve and improve water quality and quantity. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **?** | **0** | **0** | **+/?** | **Likely significant effects**  The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.  The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water resource pressures. Ashfield also sits in an area under serious water stress.  Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021). The policy requirement in CC2 for the achievement of not exceeding water use of 110 litres per person per day reflects this evidence and supports achievement of this SA Objective.  The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield’s Wastewater Treatment Works.  Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that development through these policies would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.  Policies EV4 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity, Green Infrastructure and geodiversity which would contribute to the environmental quality of water. The retention and enhancement of trees and woodlands through Policy EV6 may over the longer term contribute towards improving water quality – trees can help to capture pollutants and minimise overland runoff. These measures will help to have minor positive effects on this objective.  Policy EV8 would have uncertain effects on this objective. This reflects that as the policy relates to protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land from development it could have an indirect minor positive effect on water quality by ensuring that there is more permeable land for surface water percolation. However, there can be pollution from agricultural land management so there is some uncertainty as to the effect. However, measures can mitigate any negative effects of pollution.  The other policies would have neutral effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor positive and uncertain effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies promoting the protection of water quality.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * Protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land from development could have an indirect minor positive effect on water quality be ensuring that there is more permeable land for surface water percolation. However, there can be pollution from agricultural land management so there is some uncertainty. |
| **11.Waste**  To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **Likely significant effects**  These policies are concerned with the protection of the environment and so have no neutral effects on achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **12. Climate Change and Flood Risk**  To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  Retention or replacement of planting and improvements to Green Infrastructure through Policy EV4, protection of open space through Policy EV5, protection of trees and woodlands through Policy EV6 and protection of best and most versatile agricultural land would all help to either reduce flooding (for example vegetation can help to slow flood water) or provide flood attenuation and in turn have a minor positive effect on this objective.  The other policies would have neutral effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policy CC3 will ensure that development avoids areas of highest flood risk.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency**  To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield’s renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  Policy EV4 would have minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective. This policy will help to enhance Green Infrastructure and in turn encourage walking and cycling (carbon neutral means of transport), reduce reliance on the car and the associated emissions. EV6 would support carbon sequestration would support mitigation whilst trees can help adaptation to the effects of climate change. EV10 would support the enhancement of landscape features including trees, woodland and watercourses which can contribute to cooling and supporting adaptation to the effects of climate change. The policy would also help support sustainable patterns of development, reducing energy and emissions associated with transport. EV7 would support local food production and retain soils, which also sequester carbon.  Overall, the policies in this section would have minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective through Policy EV4.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that over the plan period there will be a decarbonisation of the electricity generation mix with renewable energy sources displacing fossil fuels.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **14.Travel and Accessibility**  To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys. | **+** | **+** | **+/-** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+/-** | **Likely significant effects**  Policies EV1, EV2 and EV3 would have minor positive effects. Protecting the Green Belt and the countryside from development will help to concentrate development in existing locations accessible by sustainable modes of transport. Policy EV4 seeks to protect and enhance Green Infrastructure which would help to promote waking and cycling and have a positive effect on this objective.  Policy EV3 promotes the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt and countryside. The reality of development in the countryside is that such locations are often only accessible by car and not by sustainable modes of transport. This policy would therefore have minor negative effects. However, the magnitude of such effects is dependent on the quantum of development and the specific locations involved.  The other policies would have neutral effects on the achievement of this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor positive, negative and neutral effects on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The specific location of development. |
| **15.Employment**  To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District. | **0** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  Policies EV2 and EV3 would have minor positive effects. There is flexibility through Policy EV2 to allow development in the countryside and policy EV3 supports re-use of buildings in the countryside, both of which would help to provide rural employment opportunities.  The other policies would have neutral effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| 1. **16. Economy**   To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy. | **0** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  Policies EV2 and EV3 would have minor positive effects. There is flexibility through Policy EV2 to allow development in the countryside and policy EV3 supports re-use of buildings in the countryside, both of which would help to support the rural economy. The other policies would have neutral effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| 1. **17. Town Centres**   Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield’s town centres. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  Policy EV9 may have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective. This policy would help to protect heritage assets which contribute to the sense of place and the vibrancy of town centres and have a minor positive effect on this objective.  The other policies would have neutral effects.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective through Policy EV10.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |

### Meeting local housing needs and aspirations

| **SA Objective** | **Policy** | | | | | | | | | | **Commentary** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **H1** | **H2** | **H2a** | **H3** | **H4** | **H5** | **H6** | **H7** | **H8** | **Cumulative** |
| 1. **1. Housing**   To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield. | **++** | **++** | **+** | **++** | **++** | **+** | **++** | **+** | **+** | **++** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Housing Needs Assessment identifies the range of housing needs that need to be met within the District. Implementation of these policies would have significant positive effects on this objective in the short, medium and long term.  The policies in this section will support the range of housing needs in the District to help meet the District’s overall housing requirement. H2 would support Gypsy, Traveller and travelling Showpeople in appropriate locations (whilst H2a would support specific Travelling Showpeople allocation), H3 would support provision of affordable housing to meet identified affordable housing needs of specific groups, whilst H4 would support rural exception sites to meet local affordable housing needs in locations adjoining rural settlements. Policies H5 and H7 will support high quality housing developments whilst H8 would appropriate consideration of houses in multiple occupation.    Overall, the policies would have a significant positive effect on achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| 1. **2. Health**   To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **++** | **++** | **+** | **++** | **++** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The policies will support development of diverse housing needs of the District’s population. Living in the right type and quality of housing would have associated positive health benefits. The provision of a range of housing sites (H1) would be considered to have positive effects on health overall. Implementation of Policy H8 would help to control overcrowding, which could otherwise have adverse health impacts, whilst H6 would support mixed and balanced communities and provide for adaptable housing in larger developments. H2 would ensure that the consideration of Gypsy and Traveller provision whilst H3 will support new housing development through the provision open space and recreation areas. H3 would support specialist accommodation which would support housing needs.  Overall, the policies would have a significant positive effect on achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **3.Historic Environment**  To conserve and enhance Ashfield’s historic environment, heritage assets and their settings. | **+/-** | **+** | **0** | **0/?** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **+/-/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The district has a range of heritage assets including scheduled monuments, listed buildings and conservation areas.  New housing development in inappropriate locations or that is poorly designed could have adverse effects on Ashfield’s historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting. However, other policies in the Local Plan would help support appropriate consideration of historic environment issues when new development is considered.  Policy H1 identifies a range of housing allocations. In some locations, negative effects may have been identified for the historic environment which will require mitigation through the planning application process. Policies H7 and H8 reference the need for development to have regard to local character. Policy H2 specifically requires that Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople development does not lead to the loss, or adverse impact on important heritage assets. However, there is some uncertainty due to it being hard to predict how development can affect heritage assets, especially their setting.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of positive and negative effects on the achievement of this objective with some uncertainty.  **Mitigation**   * Policies seeking to conserve and, where possible, enhance cultural heritage assets including by promoting heritage-led development. * Policies promoting high standards of architectural and urban design.   **Assumptions**   * The precise location of development.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of new development is uncertain at this stage. * The form and function of any development will have the potential to enhance or detract from designated heritage and cultural assets and/or their settings. |
| **4.Community Safety**  To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The majority of these policies would have a neutral effect on achievement of community safety.  The provision of Policy H5 would have minor positive effects as the provision of well sited open space can support informal surveillance and support high quality environments that can deter and design out crime.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The design of new development. |
| **5.Social Inclusion Deprivation**  To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Ashfield, ranked at 68th out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019). There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield.  The policies in this section would support the provision of high-quality housing that. H1 would support housing delivery in line with the settlement hierarchy. H2 would support provision for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople who can often be marginalised (whilst H2a would support specific Travelling Showpeople allocation); H3 supports the provision of a mix of affordable housing in major residential development schemes and specialist accommodation for groups with specific needs; H4 would enable affordable housing on the edge of settlements as exceptions; H6 would support an appropriate mix of housing types which would support the needs of Ashfield’s communities; H7 would ensure housing at higher densities close to services and facilities whilst H8 would avoid overconcentration of HMOs. They are considered to have minor positive effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure**  To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green & Blue Infrastructure | **+/-** |  | **+** | **0** | **0** | **+/?** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District. There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield and there are several tracts of ancient woodland. There are also many Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and six Local Nature Reserves (LNR).  H1 identifies a range of sites for housing development. In some locations, negative effects may have been identified for biodiversity which will require mitigation through the planning application process. H2 specifically ensures that development would not lead to the loss, or adverse impact on nature conservation and biodiversity sites. H5 would support the integration of public open space which may support biodiversity and contribute to the Green Infrastructure network although the magnitude of these positive effects is to some extent uncertain at this stage. The remaining policies are considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.  This section would have a minor positive effects mixture of uncertain effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies seeking to avoid negative effects on biodiversity and support enhancement where possible. * Careful consideration should be given to the selection of site allocations to avoid adverse effects on nationally and locally designated sites with mitigation identified. * Local Plan policies supporting a network of green infrastructure assets linked to existing and new development.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed new development would not be located on designated conservation sites.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **7.Landscape**  To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield’s landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place. | **+/-** | **+** |  | **0** | **-/?** | **+/?** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **+/-/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  New housing development would be likely to see the development of greenfield land (given that many brownfield sites have been redeveloped in the District) and could see the loss of Green Belt land in exceptional circumstances, both of which would have negative landscape effects. However, good design would help to mitigate adverse landscape effects. The precise location of development would fully determine landscape effects.  Although some housing sites under H1 will have negative effects on landscape/townscape, a number of sites are on brownfield land which will support potential enhancements to character. Ensuring development density is appropriate to local character would have minor positive effects (H7). H5 would support open space in new developments which would support well designed and high-quality developments. However, this is dependent on the design of such spaces so some uncertainty remains over the magnitude of the effect. H2 would ensure that there is no significant adverse impact on visual amenity in the location of sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. However, there is some uncertainty due to the precise location of development. H4 would support rural exception sites which are likely to be on the edge of rural settlements, may impact on landscape dependent on location and design.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor positive, minor negative effects uncertain effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies supporting high quality design of new development. * Local Plan policies seeking to conserve and enhance the character and quality of the District’s landscapes.   **Assumptions**   * The application of other Local Plan policies (particularly SD1, DS2 and EV10) will mitigate impacts on the District’s landscape.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development and the quality of the receiving landscapes and the proximity of sensitive receptors |
| **8.Natural Resources**  To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land. | **+/-** | **+** | **-** | **0** | **-/?** | **0** | **0** | **+/?** | **+** | **+/-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  There are pockets of Grade 2 (very good) and Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b) land throughout the District which could be impacted by new economic development.  It is likely that greenfield land would be required for new housing development which would have negative effects on this objective, however there would be opportunities for redevelopment of brownfield which would have positive effects. The precise location of all development would fully determine effects on natural resources. However, the sites identified in H1 reflect a mix of greenfield and brownfield land.  H2 specifically requires the avoidance of the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople plots/pitches. Rural exception sites are by definition very likely to be developed on agricultural land on the edge of settlements so there is considered to be a minor negative affect for Policy H4 although the magnitude is dependent on the quantum and location of developments.  H7 would support higher densities which may conserve loss of greenfield land whilst H8 would also support higher density development where appropriate. However, it is recognised to some extent that development would take up greenfield land. However, the magnitude of such effects is dependent on development location and land take.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor positive, minor negative effects uncertain effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies encouraging the effective use of land by re-using previously developed land. * Local Plan policies prioritising the development of brownfield over greenfield land where possible.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **9.Air & noise pollution**  To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution. | **-** | **-** | **-** | **0** | **-** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **-** | **-** | **Likely significant effects**  There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in the District but increased car use may lead to deterioration of air quality an extent that an AQMA may be required.  It is considered that housing development is likely to increase both air and noise pollution both during construction, generated from plant movement and HGVs, and in long term when developments are occupied due to increased vehicle movements.  Development of Gypsy and Traveller provision (H2) and Development rural exception sites (H4) outside settlements where there would be an increase in noise and air pollution although the extent of effects is somewhat uncertain. HG4 may to some extent help alleviate air and noise pollution through the provision of open space in new development. Additionally, the provision of HMOs may also increase noise and air pollution through intensification of use. The negative effects would to some extend be mitigated by policies elsewhere in the plan promoting sustainable modes of transport.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor negative effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies seeking to protect amenity and reduce congestion. * Local plan policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that proposals to ensure no sale of new diesel/petrol engine vehicles after 2035, which will lead to an increased proportion of e-vehicles over time, may benefit air quality over the long-term.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **10.Water Quality**  To conserve and improve water quality and quantity. | **-** | **-/?** | **-/?** | **0** | **-/?** | **+/?** | **0** | **0** | **-/?** | **+/-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  New housing development would increase demand for water resources overall. However, such effects will be mitigated through use of policies such as draft Policy CC2 ‘Water Resource Management’.  The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes. The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water resource pressures.  Ashfield sits in a n area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021). The policy requirement in CC2 for the achievement of not exceeding water use of 110 litres per person per day reflects this evidence and supports achievement of this SA Objective. This would apply to new residential development.  The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield’s Wastewater Treatment Works.  New housing development will put pressure on water resources although the provisions of draft Policy CC2 and wider measures such as those set out in the WMRP highlighted above, and the fact that any improvements to water efficiency / quality can only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage means that there is some uncertainty.  Policies H1, H2, H4 and H8 would support new or appropriate intensification of development which would put pressure on water resources although the magnitude of effects is uncertain and may be very limited. H4 would provide opportunities for the integration of SuDS within open space which may support effective water management.  Overall, the policies in this section would have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective, reflecting that development through these polices would increase water use and increase pressure on water resources but that WRMP’s would help to mitigate.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies supporting water efficiency measures (particularly CC2), the implementation of SuDs, and wastewater treatment capacity enhancements where necessary.   **Assumptions**   * New development will increase water use. * The Council will continue to liaise with Severn Trent Water on infrastructure requirements.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **11.Waste**  To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials. | **-** | **-/?** | **-/?** | **0** | **-/?** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **-/?** | **-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  New development will result in increased resource use and the generation of waste in both the short-term during construction and in the longer term once development is complete. However, the specific impacts will depend on arrangements made for recycling and composting. Conversely, new development also provides opportunities to increase recycling and sustainable construction techniques but is still considered to make use of resources through construction.  Development through these policies will increase waste generation and have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective. However, the magnitude of effects is dependent on construction techniques and usage of dwellings over their lifetime so there is some uncertainty.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies supporting re-use/recycling of waste.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Joint Waste Local Plan will make sufficient waste infrastructure provision available.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact scale of waste associated with new development is unknown at this stage. |
| **12. Climate Change and Flood Risk**  To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment. | **0/?** | **0/?** | **0** | **0** | **0/?** | **+/?** | **0** | **0** | **0/?** | **0/?** | **Likely significant effects**  The SFRA 2023 identifies that the District has a relatively low risk of flooding from watercourses. Flood risk is mainly away from the urban areas. However, it is recognised that additional water in the River Leen could cause flood issues for Nottingham to the south.  The loss of any greenfield land as part of development through policies H1, H2 and H4 could lead to an increased risk of flooding (as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces). However, it can be reasonably assumed that new development proposals which may result in an increase in flood risk will be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA) and incorporate suitable flood alleviation measures thereby minimising the risk of flooding. H5 could support the integration of SuDS as part of the open space provision which would support the objective.  There may be opportunities as part of new development proposals to enhance existing, or incorporate new, Green Infrastructure which could potentially have a positive effect on this objective by providing space for flood waters to flow through and additional areas for future flood storage.  Overall, these policies would have neutral effects on the achievement of this objective. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on the location of development.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies seeking to avoid development in areas of flood risk (i.e. flood zones 2 and 3). * Local Plan policies seeking to provide a network of green infrastructure assets to provide opportunities for flood storage where appropriate. * Local Plan policies should seek to promote as close to greenfield runoff rates as possible.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that FRAs will accompany development proposals where appropriate. * New development will be considered against policy CC3.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency**  To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield’s renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources. | **-** | **0/-/?** | **0** | **0** | **0/-/?** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0/-/?** | **-** | **Likely significant effects**  Minor negative effects climate change from new housing arise from the embodied carbon in construction and emissions to air during occupation. However, the provision of new development provides the opportunity for more energy efficient houses and buildings (with more efficient boilers, insulation, and possible low carbon energy generation) which could mean that carbon generation per dwelling or person would be lower than for existing, older housing stock.  H1 is considered likely to have a negative effect overall, given the embodied carbon in construction and the emissions arising during occupation of new dwellings. Policies H2, H4 and H8 are considered likely to have a neutral effect or minor negative effect although the magnitude of negative effect is uncertain given the likely scale of development associated with these policies. It is not considered that the scale of development that may come forward through these policies would have a positive effect on this objective.  The remaining policies are considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies are considered to have a minor effect on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should seek the integration of low carbon technologies in new residential development.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that over the plan period there will be a decarbonisation of the electricity generation mix with renewable energy sources displacing fossil fuels.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of development. |
| **14.Travel and Accessibility**  To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys. | **+/-** | **+/-/?** | **0** | **0** | **-/?** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+/-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  New housing development is likely to increase transport movements both during construction and occupation of dwellings. The extent to which development contributes to increases in traffic is linked to the location of development and the ability of the development to support sustainable modes of transport.  H4 would allow rural exception sites which could add to traffic movements on the edge of settlements where there may be an existing reliance on the private car. H2 would strictly limit development away from settlements and seeks developments in locations that have safe access to the highway network but may encourage developments that increase travel. H7 specifically seeks to locate higher density development in locations that are well served by local transport and have good accessibility to local facilities by sustainable modes of transport.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor positive, minor negative and uncertain effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies encouraging the preparation of green travel plans. * Local plan policies supporting walking and cycling within new developments. * Local plan policies aligning with Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 3. * Draft Policy H2 could make specific reference to locating development in locations that are in close proximity to support services and facilities.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **15.Employment**  To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District. | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  These policies would help to support investment within the district, through construction activities in the short term and through providing housing for workers in jobs in the district.  H1 would support the delivery of a range of housing sites, which would support employment opportunities in construction. The construction of rural exception sites (H4) would be expected to generate some employment during construction phase. H7 would support higher densities in locations close to local facilities and major public transport nodes, which would support employment areas.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The extent to which new housing can support job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. * The precise location of development. |
| 1. **16. Economy**   To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy. | **+** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **~** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  Policies H3 and H4 would support the provision of housing for members of the community who may otherwise not be able to enter the housing market and support local employment, services and facilities adding to the District’s economy.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. * The precise location of development. |
| 1. **17. Town Centres**   Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield’s town centres. | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **~** | **~** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **Likely significant effects**  The policies set out within this section are considered to have a neutral or negligible effect on this objective. Any development associated with policies H2, H2 or H8 may help support town centres dependent on location. H1 includes some sites close to town centre locations.  Overall, the policies are considered to have a neutral effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * The policies in the Local Plan would support residential development in locations that would support access to town centre facilities.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |

### Building a strong economy which provides opportunities for local people

| **SA Objective** | **Policy** | | | | | | **Commentary** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EM1** | **EM2** | **EM3** | **EM4** | **EM5** | **Cumulative** |
| 1. **1. Housing**   To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The policies would support the provision and retention of employment land within the district. The policies would not directly help to meet housing needs. Overall, the policies in this section would therefore have a neutral effect on the achievement of this objective through.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| 1. **2. Health**   To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities. | **+/-** | **+/-** | **+/-** | **+/-** | **+/-** | **+/-** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average. The policies in this section would all help to increase job opportunities and consequentially increase wealth levels and living standards subject to jobs being filled locally. This is considered to have a minor positive effect on this objective.  However, there is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes within the district. Effects may include, for example, stress related to disturbance, noise and vibration and respiratory problems exacerbated by construction traffic emissions and dust. There would inevitably be an increase in car use and emissions associated with economic development. It is therefore considered that these policies would also have minor negative effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Good construction management practices. Promotion of the use of sustainable modes of transport.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **3.Historic Environment**  To conserve and enhance Ashfield’s historic environment, heritage assets and their settings. | **0/?** | **+/-** | **0/?** | **+/?** | **0/?** | **+/-/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The district has a range of heritage assets including scheduled monuments, listed buildings and conservation areas. New economic development has the potential to adversely affect the character of historic assets both in the short term during associated construction activities (e.g. as a result of vibrations) and in the longer term once development is complete (e.g. due to the built form of new development affecting the setting of the historic asset). Development may have a direct impact on cultural heritage features where it involves the loss of, or alteration to, assets or indirect adverse effects on their settings. EM2 has therefore been assessed as having a mix of effects. Good design would help to mitigate any potential adverse effects on the historic environment.  The precise location of development would fully determine effects on the historic environment and so it is considered that there would be mixed neutral and uncertain effects on this objective. There is potential for Policy EM4 to have minor positive effects through the conversion of rural buildings, which could see historic buildings brought back into use.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of positive and negative effects on the achievement of this objective with some uncertainty.  **Mitigation**   * Policies seeking to conserve and, where possible, enhance cultural heritage assets including by promoting heritage-led development. * Policies promoting high standards of architectural and urban design.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of new development is uncertain at this stage. * The form and function of any development will have the potential to enhance or detract from designated heritage and cultural assets and/or their settings. |
| **4.Community Safety**  To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **Likely Significant Effects**  None of these policies would have any direct effects on community safety and therefore effects on this objective would be neutral. However, it is acknowledged that these policies would help to increase wealth levels and there can be links between poverty and crime so these policies could have limited positive effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have neutral effects on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. |
| **5.Social Inclusion Deprivation**  To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Ashfield, ranked at 68th out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019). There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield. New economic development would help to provide new job opportunities and increase wealth levels which would help to address deprivation, subject to the location of development and so policies EM1, EM2, EM3 and EM5 would have a minor positive effect on this objective.  Policy EM4 promotes rural business development and provides support for agricultural, forestry or horticultural or other land use development subject the criteria in this policy. Similarly, this policy would be unlikely to have any effects on social inclusion and deprivation.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure**  To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green & Blue Infrastructure | **0/?** | **+/-** | **0/?** | **0/?** | **0/?** | **+/-** | **Likely Significant Effects**  There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District. There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield and there are several tracts of ancient woodland. There are also many Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and six Local Nature Reserves (LNR).  Policies EM1, EM3 and EM5 support new economic development and education skills and training. Such development could have negative effects on biodiversity, subject to the precise location of development, but would also provide biodiversity enhancements such as new or improved infrastructure green infrastructure. These policies are assessed as having a mix of neutral and uncertain effects. EM2 identifies a range of sites for development. In some locations, negative effects may have been identified which will require mitigation through the planning application process.  Policy EM4 supports rural business development. Such development could also have negative effects on biodiversity subject to the location of development and that it would be likely to see development on greenfield land. However, there may be limited opportunities to provide biodiversity enhancements.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of neutral and uncertain effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies seeking to avoid negative effects on biodiversity and support enhancement where possible. * Careful consideration should be given to the selection of site allocations to avoid adverse effects on nationally and locally designated sites with mitigation identified. * Local Plan policies supporting a network of green infrastructure assets linked to existing and new development.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed new development would not be located on designated conservation sites. * It is assumed that the value of previously developed land is less then greenfield land.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **7.Landscape**  To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield’s landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place. | **0/?** | **+/-** | **0/?** | **+** | **0/?** | **+/-/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  New economic development would be likely to see the development of greenfield land and could see the loss of Green Belt land in exceptional circumstances, both of which would have negative landscape effects. However, good design would help to mitigate adverse landscape effects. The precise location of development would fully determine landscape effects. Policies EM1, EM3 and EM5 are assessed as having neutral and uncertain effects on this objective.  Policy EM4 supports the development of the rural economy. The development of the rural economy both through the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings would help to integrate development into the countryside and have minor positive landscape effects. The policy supports rural development where *‘it can be demonstrated that the scale and character of development is designed and operated so as to cause no detriment to the character and appearance of the countryside’.* This policy requirement would have minor positive landscape effects.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor positive and negative effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies supporting high quality design of new development. * Local Plan policies seeking to conserve and enhance the character and quality of the District’s landscapes.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development and the quality of the receiving landscapes and the proximity of sensitive receptors |
| **8.Natural Resources**  To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land. | **+/-/?** | **+/-** | **+/-/?** | **-** | **0/-** | **+/-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  There are pockets of Grade 2 (very good) and Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b) land throughout the district which could be impacted by new economic development.  It is likely that greenfield land would be required for new economic development which would have negative effects on this objective, however there would be opportunities for redevelopment of brownfield which would have positive effects. The precise location of development would fully determine effects on natural resources. Policies EM1 and EM3 would have a mixture of minor positive, minor negative effect and uncertain effects. EM4 would be likely to see development of greenfield land which would have minor negative effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor positive, minor negative and uncertain effects on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies encouraging the effective use of land by re-using previously developed land. * Local Plan policies prioritising the development of brownfield over greenfield land where possible.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **9.Air & noise pollution**  To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution. | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **Likely significant effects**  There are no Air Quality Management Areas in the district.  The reality of economic growth is an increase in car use and in turn an increase in emissions and so policies EM2, EM3, EM4 and EM5 would have minor negative effects on this objective. This would be mitigated to an extent by policies elsewhere in the plan promoting sustainable modes of transport.  Policy EM1 supports business and economic development. The policy requires that *‘business and economic development proposals should be directed towards existing town centres (where appropriate), employment sites, and employment allocations.’* Directing development to existing town centres would help to take advantage of public transport and reduce the need to travel. However, there would still be an increase in car use and the associated emissions so there would be a minor negative effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor negative effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies seeking to protect amenity. * Local plan policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport and reducing congestion.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that proposals to ensure no sale of new diesel/petrol engine vehicles after 2035, which will lead to an increased proportion of e-vehicles over time, may benefit air quality over the long-term.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **10.Water Quality**  To conserve and improve water quality and quantity. | **-/?** | **-/?** | **-/?** | **-/?** | **-/?** | **-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.  The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield’s Wastewater Treatment Works. The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water resource pressures. Ashfield also sits in an area under serious water stress.  Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that development through these policies would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.  Overall, the policies in this section would have minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective, reflecting that development through these polices would increase water use and increase pressure on water resources but that WRMP’s would help to mitigate. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on how measures could be implemented to increase water efficiency.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies supporting water efficiency measures, the implementation of SuDs, and wastewater treatment capacity enhancements where necessary.   **Assumptions**   * New development will increase water use. * The Council will continue to liaise with Severn Trent Water on infrastructure requirements.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. * The implementation of water efficiency measures. |
| **11.Waste**  To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials. | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **Likely significant effects**  New development will result in increased resource use and the generation of waste in both the short-term during construction and in the longer term once development is complete. However, the specific impacts will depend on arrangements made for recycling and composting.  Development through these policies will increase waste generation and have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies supporting re-use/recycling of waste.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact scale of waste associated with new development is unknown at this stage. |
| **12. Climate Change and Flood Risk**  To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment. | **0/?** | **0/?** | **0/?** | **0/?** | **0/?** | **0/?** | **Likely significant effects**  The SFRA 2023 identifies that the District has a relatively low risk of flooding from watercourses. Flood risk is mainly away from the urban areas. However, it is recognised that additional water in the River Leen could cause flood issues for Nottingham to the south.  The loss of any greenfield land as part of development through these policies could lead to an increased risk of flooding (as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces). However, it can be reasonably assumed that new development proposals which may result in an increase in flood risk will be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA) and incorporate suitable flood alleviation measures thereby minimising the risk of flooding.  There may be opportunities as part of new development proposals to enhance existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure which could potentially have a positive effect on this objective by providing space for flood waters to flow through and additional areas for future flood storage.  Overall, these policies would have neutral effects on the achievement of this objective. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on the location of development.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies seeking to avoid development in areas of flood risk (i.e. flood zones 2 and 3). * Local Plan policies seeking to provide a network of green infrastructure assets to provide opportunities for flood storage where appropriate. * Local Plan policies should seek to promote as close to greenfield runoff rates as possible.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that FRAs will accompany development proposals where appropriate. * New development will achieve greenfield run off rates.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency**  To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield’s renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources. | **0/-/?** | **0/-/?** | **0/-/?** | **0/-/?** | **0/-/?** | **0/-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  Minor negative effects climate change from new employment development arise from embodied carbon in construction and during occupation. However, the provision of new development provides the opportunity for more energy efficient buildings (with more efficient boilers, insulation, and possible low carbon energy generation) which could mean that carbon generation would be lower than for existing, older employment buildings. The policies that support employment development are considered likely to have a neutral effect or minor negative effect although the magnitude of negative effect is uncertain.  Overall, the policies are considered to have a mixed minor and neutral effect on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should seek the integration of low carbon technologies in new development.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that over the plan period there will be a decarbonisation of the electricity generation mix with renewable energy sources displacing fossil fuels.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of development. |
| **14.Travel and Accessibility**  To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys. | **-** | **-** | **0/-** | **-** | **0/-** | **-** | **Likely significant effects**  The reality of economic growth is that there is often an accompanying increase in car use and so all of these policies would see an increase in car use to some extent, particularly so for those policies (EM4) supporting the rural economy where there is greater reliance on the car. This would have negative effects on this objective. However, there would be opportunities to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, and to secure development contributions to public transport improvements and new walking and cycling links, all of which would help to mitigate the negative effects associated with an increase in car use.  Any development in or in close proximity to Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield and Hucknall may support greater connectivity through rail transport. This would support accessibility of Nottingham. Any development in or near Hucknall would be able to benefit from the Nottingham tram network and rail transport.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor negative and uncertain effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies encouraging the preparation of green travel plans. * Local plan policies supporting walking and cycling within new developments. * Local plan policies aligning with Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 3.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. |
| **15.Employment**  To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District. | **++** | **++** | **++** | **++** | **++** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  These policies would help to support investment within the District, through construction activities in the short term and through the provision of new jobs in the District associated with new economic development.  The majority of employment in the District is located in Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield and the Sherwood Business Park off Junction 27 of the M1. More limited employment opportunities are found to the west of the M1 (Selston, Jacksdale, Underwood and Bagthorpe). These policies would help to support these centres and also to support the rural economy. Policies EM1, EM2 and EM3 would support investment in employment opportunities across the District. EM4 would support employment opportunities in the rural economy.Several schools in with Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield and Hucknall are at, or above, capacity. The District suffers from poor educational attainment and so policy EM5 would help to have significant positive effects in addressing school capacity and educational attainment.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. * The precise location of development. |
| 1. **16. Economy**   To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy. | **++** | **++** | **++** | **++** | **++** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  The District’s main employment centres are Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield. Policies EM1, EM2 and EM3 would help to support these centres through the provision of new economic development and opportunities for investment in the District’s most sustainable locations and protection of existing employment land. EM4 would support the rural economy whilst EM5 would support investment in skills and training to enable a competitive and well-trained workforce.  All of these policies would help to support and grow the economy of the District, including the rural economy, help address school capacity issues and have significant positive effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. * The precise location of development. |
| 1. **17. Town Centres**   Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield’s town centres. | **++** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  Policy EM1 supports business and economic development. This would help to increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield’s town centres which would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective. The other policies would have neutral effects.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective through Policy EM1.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. * The precise location of development. |

### Placing vibrant town and local centres at the heart of the community

| **SA Objective** | **Policy** | | | | | **Commentary** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SH1** | **SH2** | **SH3** | **Cumulative** |  | |
| 1. **1. Housing**   To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield. | **+** | **+/?** | **~** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Residential uses in town centres are encouraged through Policy SH1 which would help to have a minor positive effect on this objective enabling housing within town centre locations where there is no harm to the vitality and viability of the town centre. The policy specifically supports residential development above ground floor spaces. SH2 would allow residential development where certain criteria is met.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective through Policy SH1.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| 1. **2. Health**   To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities. | **+** | **+** | **~** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average. Policies SH1 and SH2 support town centres and local centres and appropriate food and drink development. Concentrating development in existing centres may help to encourage walking and reduce reliance on the car, which would have positive health benefits.  Policy SH3 is concerned with improvements to shopfronts and has no direct relationship with this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| **3.Historic Environment**  To conserve and enhance Ashfield’s historic environment, heritage assets and their settings. | **0** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The district has a range of heritage assets including scheduled monuments, listed buildings and conservation areas.  Policy SH3 is concerned with improvements to shopfronts. The policy states that the Council will *‘resist the removal of shopfronts of architectural or historic interest.’* The policy also requires high quality design for shopfronts and for any canopies or blinds to be appropriate to the character of the shopfront. These policy requirements would help to conserve and enhance the historic environment of the district and have a minor positive effect on this objective.  By focussing growth in existing town centres the other policies have potential to promote and retain the urban fabric and identity of towns. Overall effects of these retail policies are considered to be neutral given that the role of existing centres will be strengthened and that new out of centre retail will be limited unless in very specific circumstances. These measures will help to limit the amount of new retail development and limit opportunities for any such development to have adverse effects on the district’s historic environment.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective through Policy SH3.  **Mitigation**   * Policies seeking to conserve and, where possible, enhance cultural heritage assets including by promoting heritage-led development. * Policies promoting high standards of architectural and urban design.   **Assumptions**   * The precise location of development.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of new development is uncertain at this stage. * The form and function of any development will have the potential to enhance or detract from designated heritage and cultural assets and/or their settings. | |
| **4.Community Safety**  To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. | **0** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Policy SH4 is concerned with improvements to shopfronts and requires that *‘Inset entrances on shopfronts should be glazed and well lit, to contribute to the attractiveness, safety and vitality of shopping areas and avoid blank frontages’.* This requirement would help to improve safety in shopping areas in the district and have a minor positive effect on this objective. The other policies would have neutral effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective through Policy SH3.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| **5.Social Inclusion Deprivation**  To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Ashfield, ranked at 68th out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019). Policies SH1 and SH2 and SH3 support town centres and local centres. Concentrating development in existing centres will help to sustain and support these centres and the role that they play in providing goods and services for local communities. They would all have a minor positive effect on this objective. Policy SH2 supports community uses in local centres where a shop has been vacant for a long time which would also help to have a minor positive effect on this objective. Policy SH3 would also support equal access for all.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| **6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure**  To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green & Blue Infrastructure | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Retail development could have adverse effects on local biodiversity depending on its location and proximity to conservation sites. However, the town centre first approach would direct most development away from more sensitive locations. Effects are therefore considered to be neutral.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies should ensure that habitats and species are conserved and enhanced. * Any adverse effects can be mitigated by other policies in the plan or at the detailed planning application stage.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of development. | |
| **7.Landscape**  To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield’s landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place. | **0** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Policy SH1 supports proposals for main town centre development that is *‘well designed and enhances or complement the street scene’*. This would help to protect landscapes and townscapes. Policy SH3 supports improvements to shopfronts which would help to improve the visual appearance of shops and have a minor positive effect on this objective. Focusing development in town centres and existing locations (under SH1 and SH2) could also help reinforce the existing townscape character but impacts would be dependent on location. Policies SH1 and SH2 would have neutral effects on this objective but some uncertainty remains.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies supporting development that reflects the character of the surrounding area.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location and design of development. | |
| **8.Natural Resources**  To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land. | **+** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  There are pockets of Grade 2 (very good) and Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b) land throughout the district. Policy SH1 and SH2 supports the development of town centres and local shopping centres and parades. This would help to reduce the need for development of greenfield land outside of these centres and have a minor positive effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should support the development of brownfield land where appropriate.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| **9.Air & noise pollution**  To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution. | **+/0** | **+/0** | **~** | **+/0** | **Likely significant effects**  There are no Air Quality Management Areas in the District.  These policies are concerned with town centres, local centres, food and drink and shopfronts. Aside from policy SH3 which has no direct relationship with this objective, these policies will all see an increase in car use and associated emissions to access goods and services in town and local centres. However, development in town and local centres would be likely to be in sustainable locations accessible by public transport or walking or cycling which would be likely to reduce reliance on the car as primary means of transport.  Policy SH2 requires that all retail and leisure development proposals *‘should not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of existing residents through noise, odour, litter or disturbance’.* These policy measures would help to reduce pollution and have a minor positive effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have mixed minor positive and neutral effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| **10.Water Quality**  To conserve and improve water quality and quantity. | **0** | **0** | **~** | **0** | **Likely significant effects**  These policies are concerned with town centres, local centres, food and drink and shopfronts and therefore have no direct relationship or neutral effects on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| **11.Waste**  To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials. | **0/-** | **0/-** | **~** | **0/-** | **Likely significant effects**  These policies are concerned with town centres, local centres, and shopfronts. These policies will all see the generation of waste. However, development in these centres would be able to take advantage of existing waste collection services and recycling facilities which would help to reduce waste generation and support sustainable waste management practices. Policies SH1 and SH2 are therefore assessed as having mixed neutral and minor negative effects. Policy SH3 is concerned with shopfronts and therefore has no direct relationship with this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of neutral and minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies supporting opportunities to reduce/recycle waste.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| **12. Climate Change and Flood Risk**  To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment. | **0** | **0** | **~** | **0** | **Likely significant effects**  These policies are concerned with town centres, local centres, and shopfronts. The effects on flood risk would be dependent on the location of development. However, it is assumed that the application of local plan policies to avoid areas of highest flood risk would ensure that development would not add to the risk of flooding in the district.  **Mitigation**   * Local plan policies seeking to avoid development in areas of flood risk (i.e. flood zones 2 and 3). * Local Plan policies seeking to provide a network of green infrastructure assets to provide opportunities for flood storage where appropriate. * Local Plan policies should seek to promote as close to greenfield runoff rates as possible.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that FRAs will accompany development proposals where appropriate. * New development will be considered against policy CC3.   **Uncertainties**   * The precise location of development. | |
| **13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency**  To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield’s renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **Likely significant effects**  These policies are concerned with town centres, local centres, food and drink and shopfronts and therefore have no direct relationship with this objective. Effects are therefore neutral.  Overall, the policies in this section  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| **14.Travel and Accessibility**  To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys. | **++** | **+** | **~** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  Aside from policy SH3 which has no direct relationship with this objective, these policies will all see an increase in car use and associated emissions. However, development in town and local centres would be likely to be in sustainable locations accessible by public transport or by walking or cycling which would be likely to reduce reliance on the car as primary means of transport and support linked trips for other town centre services and facilities. These policies would help to ensure that residents of the district access their shopping needs in one location and avoid multiple journeys. Policy SH1 would therefore have significant positive effects on this objective and Policies SH2 would have minor positive effect.  Policy SH4 is concerned with improvements to shopfronts and therefore has no direct relationship with this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor positive and significant positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| **15.Employment**  To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District. | **+** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **Likely significant effects**  These policies are concerned with town centres, local centres, food and drink and shopfronts. Aside from Policy SH4 on shopfronts, all of these policies would help to create new employment opportunities and would therefore have a positive effect on this objective.  Policy SH4 supports improvements to shopfronts and has no direct relationship with this objective and so effects from this policy are neutral.  Overall, the policies in this section would have minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. | |
| 1. **16. Economy**   To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy. | **++** | **+** | **0** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  Policies SH1 and SH2 would all have a positive effect on this objective. Policy SH1 one would have a significant positive effect as it supports development proposals which enhance the vitality and viability of Centre in Ashfield and supports appropriate economic and commercial development. Policy SH2 supports local centres. These policies will help to grow the economy of the district. Policy SH3 supports improvements to shopfronts and though it may help support high quality retail environments the effects on the economy of Ashfield are considered neutral.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor and significant positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. | |
| 1. **17. Town Centres**   Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield’s town centres. | **++** | **0** | **+** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  Ashfield’s main town centres are Sutton in Ashfield, Kirkby-in- Ashfield and Hucknall. The Retail & Leisure Study (2016) identified that Sutton town centre is relatively healthy and performing moderately well in terms of vacancies and that Kirkby performs an important role and has seen a decline in the number of vacant retail units in recent years. Hucknall has a 13.1% vacancy rate, and this has increased since 2011 but that significant rebuilding and redevelopment within the town centre is attributable to these vacancies. The Council is currently in the process of updating the retail study.  Policy SH1 and SH3 would all have positive effects on this objective. Policy SH1 would have a significant positive as it supports development proposals which enhance the vitality and viability of Primary Shopping Areas and Local Shopping Centres across Ashfield including setting out the town centre first approach for main town centre uses. Policy SH3 supports improvements to shopfronts, both of which would help to increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield’s town centres.  Policy SH2 is concerned with local centres and therefore has no direct effects on town centres and so effects from this policy are neutral.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of minor and significant positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |

### Achieving successful development through well designed places

| **SA Objective** | **Policy** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Commentary** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SD1** | **SD2** | **SD3** | **SD4** | **SD5** | **SD6** | **SD7** | **SD8** | **SD9** | **SD10** | **SD11** | **SD12** | **SD13** | **Cumulative** | |  | |
| 1. **1. Housing**   To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield. | **0** | **++** | **+** | **+** | **++** | **++** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **++** | | **Likely Significant Effects**  Housing delivery in the district has declined in recent years with total net completions in 2017/18 (397) and 2018/19 (300) well below those experienced in 2015/16 (558) and 2016/17 (544).  Policy SD2 would have a significant positive effect on this objective as it sets out good design considerations for development which would help to ensure the delivery of well-designed new housing developments to meet local needs.  Policies SD5 and SD6 would have significant positive effects on this objective through infrastructure provision and developer contributions and allowing flexibility with viability. Flexibility with viability may help to ensure that some housing development is still realised even if there are viability issues that impact on the ability to meet all plan requirements.  Policies SD3 and SD4 would have a positive effect on this objective by protecting amenity and ensuring provision of refuse and recycling facilities. Policies SD10 and SD11 would have a positive effect on this objective as they would help to improve access to housing and ensure appropriate provision of parking, which would help to ensure well designed new housing developments and may in turn increase local demand for housing.  Policy SD9 does seeks to ensure new development has to mitigate the potential effects from neighbouring existing development, helping to ensure new housing development is not compromised by the existing built environment of Ashfield. A minor positive effect is therefore identified.  The remaining policies would have a neutral effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| 1. **2. Health**   To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **++** | **?** | **0** | **++** | **++** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **++/?** | | **Likely Significant Effects**  The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average.  Policies SD5, SD8 and SD9 would have significant positive effects on this objective. Policy SD5 sets out requirements for new infrastructure provision and developer contributions which could include for example new open space or walking and cycling routes. Policy SD8 would help to ensure the contaminated land is remediated and does not pose a health risk and policy SD9 by reducing exposure to different forms of pollution.  Policy SD13 would have a significant positive effects on this objective through the provision and protection of health facilities.  Policies SD2 would help to address issues of crime, which can support community wellbeing. SD1 would also support the achievement of social value. Both policies would therefore generate minor positive effects.  Policies SD2 and SD3 would have a minor positive effect on this objective through requirements for good design considerations for new development and protection of amenity. Policy SD10 would also have a minor positive effect on this objective as it would help to reduce the need to travel by car and the associated emissions.  The remaining policies would have a neutral effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have significant positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of new development. * There is uncertainty over the extent to which developer contributions would deliver affordable housing as it would depend upon the viability of a development and what the priorities are for the area in question by way of S106 contributions. | |
| **3.Historic Environment**  To conserve and enhance Ashfield’s historic environment, heritage assets and their settings. | **+** | **++** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+** | | **Likely Significant Effects**  The district has a range of heritage assets including scheduled monuments, listed buildings and conservation areas.  Policy SD2 would have a significant positive effect on this objective. The policy sets out good design considerations for new developments including historic landscape features and heritage assets which would help to protect these, and more widely, good design would help to avoid adverse effects on the historic environment.  Policy SD3 would have minor positive effects as the policy requires that new proposals are appropriate in terms of appearance, scale and siting, which positively supports consideration of the historic environment.  Policies SD7, SD9 and SD12 would also have a minor positive effect on this objective. Policy SD7 permits telecommunications infrastructure where *‘the significance, appearance, character and setting of heritage assets are conserved’.* Policy SD9 seeks to reduce air, noise and light pollution which may have a positive impact in relation to the conservation and enjoyment of heritage assets. Policy SD12 supports advertisements where they *‘preserve or enhance the special character of conservation areas, and does not have an adverse on listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other heritage assets or their setting.’* SD1 would (inter alia) support conservation of the environment.  Policy SD5 seeks to ensure that development conserves and enhances the historic environment near to development through developer contributions and good design, generating minor positive effects.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of new development. | |
| **4.Community Safety**  To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. | **+** | **++** | **++** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++** | | **Likely Significant Effects**  Policies SD2 and SD3 would have significant positive effects on this objective. Policy SD2 includes requirements to reduce crime and the fear of crime as part of good design and SD3 includes requirements to help minimise the risk of crime. SD1 would support community resilience, which is likely to have positive effects on this objective.  The remaining policies would have a neutral effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The extent to which Local Plan policies can reduce crime is uncertain as this is dependent upon a number of socio-economic factors. | |
| **5.Social Inclusion Deprivation**  To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield. | **+** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **++** | **?** | **++** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **++** | | **Likely Significant Effects**  Ashfield, ranked at 68th out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019). There are pockets of deprivation within the District.  Policies SD5, SD7 and SD13 would have a significant positive effect on this objective. New infrastructure provision and developer contributions would help to provide new facilities and services and in turn help to improve social inclusion. SD7 supports new communications infrastructure and improvements to broadband whilst SD13 supports provision and protection of health of health facilities, both of which would in turn help to improve social inclusion and reduce deprivation.  Policy SD3 would have a minor positive effect on this objective as it seeks to safeguard amenity. SD1 would also support community resilience and ensure social value is achieved in major developments.  Policy SD6 would provide some uncertainty over the extent of improvements as that would depend upon what the priorities are for the area in question by way of S106 contributions.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective although some uncertainty remains.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * There is uncertainty over the extent to which developer contributions would deliver affordable housing as it would depend upon the viability of a development and what the priorities are for the area in question by way of S106 contributions. * The location of new development. | |
| **6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure**  To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green & Blue Infrastructure | **+** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **++/?** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++/?** | | **Likely Significant Effects**  There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District. There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield and there are several tracts of ancient woodland. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and four Local Nature Reserves (LNR).  Policy SD5 would have a significant positive effect on this objective as it includes new and improved open space and green infrastructure which would help to conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels. However, the extent of delivery is uncertain.  Policies SD2, SD8 and SD9 would have minor positive effects on this objective. SD2 requires development proposals to take account of green infrastructure assets, SD8 requires that issues to be addressed in remediating/developing contaminated and unstable land include avoiding having an adverse effect upon natural habitats and/or ecosystems and SD9 seeks to control various forms of pollution.  The remaining policies would have a neutral effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies that specifically seek to conserve and enhance designated nature conservation sites and protected species.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of new development. * Any benefits for green infrastructure could only be determined at the detailed planning application and so it is uncertain at this stage the extent of any positive effects that there may be. | |
| **7.Landscape**  To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield’s landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place. |  | **++** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **++** | | **Likely Significant Effects**  Policy SD2 would have a significant positive effect on this objective. The policy sets out good design considerations for new development and that development proposals should take account of a number of factors including the character of the area, landscape features, existing landforms, the local pattern of development, the scale, shape and form of existing buildings and local landmarks. All of these requirements would help to protect the landscape of the district and manage landscape/townscape character.  Policies SD3, SD4, SD5, SD7, SD8, SD9 and SD12 would all have a minor positive effect on this objective. Policy SD3 seeks to protect amenity. Policy SD3 requires the impacts on visual amenity of waste and recycling facilities to be considered, Policy SD5 details developer contributions requirements and these include new areas of open space and improving quality and access to green and blue infrastructure and Policy SD7 seeks to mitigate the visual impact of telecommunications. Policy SD8 would help to see the redevelopment of contaminated land, Policy SD9 would help to minimise light pollution and Policy SD12 seeks to ensure that advertisements would not have negative visual effects. All of these policy measures would help to protect and enhance the landscape of the district.  Overall, these policies would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of new development. * Any benefits for green infrastructure could only be determined at the detailed planning application and so it is uncertain at this stage the extent of any positive effects that there may be. | |
| **8.Natural Resources**  To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **~** | **0** | **++** | | **Likely significant effects**  Policy SD8 would have a significant positive effect on this objective. The policy sets out requirements for addressing issues related to contaminated land and unstable land, Policy SD9 would ensure that development safeguards and utilise on-site soil resources thereby supporting the policy objectives.  The rest of the policies would have a neutral or negligible effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective through policy SD8.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should encourage the use of brownfield land where possible.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The specific location of new development. | |
| **9.Air & noise pollution**  To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution. | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **+/?** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **+** | **0** | **~** | **0** | **++/?** | | **Likely significant effects**  There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) within Ashfield.  Policy SD9 would have a significant positive effect on this objective as it seeks to limit different forms of pollution, including air and noise pollution.  Policies SD3 and SD10 would have a minor positive effect on this objective. Policy SD3 seeks to protect amenity and avoid the potential for pollution including air quality. Policy SD10 would help to reduce travel by car and the associated vehicle emissions and seeks to promote sustainable modes of transport.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of significant positive and uncertain effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that proposals to ensure no sale of new diesel/petrol engine vehicles after 2035, which will lead to an increased proportion of e-vehicles over time, may benefit air quality over the long-term.   **Uncertainties**   * There is uncertainty over how developer contributions may increase traffic levels and in turn emissions and negatively affect air quality. * The specific location of development. | |
| **10.Water Quality**  To conserve and improve water quality and quantity. | **+** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **?** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **~** | **0** | **+** | | **Likely significant effects**  The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.  The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030) with draft WRMP 2024 providing an updated approach between 2025 and 2085 to address water resource pressures. The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield’s Wastewater Treatment Works. The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water resource pressures. Ashfield also sits in an area under serious water stress.  Policies SD3 and SD8 would have minor positive effects. Policy SD2 seeks to protect amenity and avoid the potential for pollution, including groundwater or surface water. Policy SD8 requires that in proposals for remediating contaminated land, developers should address how they would avoid the contamination of any watercourse, water body, groundwater or aquifer.  Policy SD6 would have uncertain effects. This policy sets out viability considerations for new development. The overall priorities in terms of developer contributions would determine the extent to which water efficiency may be achieved as part of new development.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * Water efficiency measures are implemented in new development (in accordance with Local Plan Policy CC2).   **Uncertainties**   * uncertainty around what developer contributions there may be and how this would affect water efficiency. | |
| **11.Waste**  To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++** | | **Likely significant effects**  Policy SD4 requires all new development to take full account of the location and design of recycling and refuse provision. This would help to minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials and have a significant positive effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective through Policy SD4.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact scale of waste associated with new development is unknown at this stage. | |
| **12. Climate Change and Flood Risk**  To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment. | **+** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **~** | **0** | **+** | | **Likely significant effects**  Policies SD2 and SD5 would have a minor positive effect on this objective. Policy SD2 requires new development to *‘be adaptable to the evolving effects of climate change’* and policy SD5 includes requirements for developer contributions – whilst there are only small pockets of flood zones 2 and 3 in the district there could be requirements for flood risk mitigation for certain sites which would have a positive effect on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective through policies SD2 and SD5.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should ensure that assessment of flood risk informs development proposals.   **Assumptions**   * Development sites will be subject to site specific Flood Risk Assessments (FRA)   **Uncertainties**   * None. | |
| **13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency**  To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield’s renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources. | **+** | **+** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **0** | **~** | **0** | **+** | | **Likely significant effects**  Policies SD2, SD4 and SD10 would have a minor positive effect on this objective. Policy SD2 requires new development to *‘be adaptable to the evolving effects of climate change’*. Policy SD4 would help to increase rates of recycling and reduce emissions associated with landfill of waste and a reduction in energy used for processing waste. SD1 would ensure responding to climate change is considered as part of the approach to demonstrating social value.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a minor positive effect on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **U0ncertainties**   * None. | |
| **14.Travel and Accessibility**  To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys. | **0** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **?** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **0** | **~** | **+** | **++/?** | | **Likely significant effects**  Policies SD5 and SD10 would have a significant positive effect on this objective. Policy SD5 sets out infrastructure requirements including facilitating accessibility to facilities and services by a range of transport modes. It also requires developers to meet all reasonable costs associated with the infrastructure required and to actively consider potential cumulative infrastructure improvement possibilities.  Policy SD10 sets out transport infrastructure requirements. The measures in both of these policies would help to improve travel choice, sustainable modes of transport, and reduce the need to travel.  Policies SD2 and SD13 would have a minor positive effect on this objective. Policy SD2 sets out good design requirements for new development including in relation to movement, including effective pedestrian and cyclist routes and public transport links. Policy SD13 seeks to ensure provision of health facilities close to needs which would help to reduce the need to travel.  Policy SD6 would have uncertain effects. This reflects uncertainty around what developer contributions there may be and how this would affect travel and accessibility.  The rest of the policies would have neutral effects.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of significant positive and uncertain effects on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * There is uncertainty around what developer contributions there may be and how this would affect travel and accessibility. | |
| **15.Employment**  To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District. | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **?** | **++** | **0** | **-** | **0** | **0** | **~** | **0** | **++/-** | | **Likely significant effects**  Policies SD5 and SD7 would have significant positive effects. New infrastructure provision and communications infrastructure will help to create new employment opportunities.  Policy SD9 would have minor negative effects on this objective. The policy seeks to ensure that there are compatible neighbouring uses and minimises the effects on the environment. It may therefore have an indirect minor negative effect on the local economy and in turn employment opportunities by restricting new development.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * There is uncertainty around what developer contributions there may be and how this would affect employment. | |
| 1. **16. Economy**   To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy. | **+** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **++** | **?** | **++** | **+** | **-** | **+** | **+** | **~** | **+** | **++/-** | | **Likely significant effects**  The District’s main employment centres are Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield.  Policies SD5 and SD7 would have significant positive effects. Provision of new infrastructure and developer contributions for new telecommunications infrastructure will help to support increased economic activity.  Policies SD1, SD8, SD10, SD11 and SD13 would have positive effects on this objective. Remediating contaminated and unstable land will help to bring about new development opportunities which could include new economic development. New transport infrastructure will help to ensure efficient movement of goods and people and boost the economy. Provision and protection of health and community facilities will help to ensure a healthy workforce and provide new employment opportunities, both of which will boost the economy of the district.  Policy SD6 would have uncertain effects reflecting uncertainty around what developer contributions there may be and how this would affect the economy.  Policy SD9 would have minor negative effects on this objective. The policy seeks to ensure that there are compatible neighbouring uses and minimises the effects on the environment. It may therefore have an indirect minor negative effect on the local economy by restricting new development where neighbouring uses may be incompatible.  The other policies would have neutral effects on this objective.  Overall, the policies in this section would have a mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * There is uncertainty around what developer contributions there may be and how this would affect the economy. | |
| 1. **17. Town Centres**   Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield’s town centres. | **+** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **?** | **+** | **0** | **0** | **+** | **+** | **+** | **0** | **+** | | **Likely significant effects**  Policies SD2, SD5, SD7 and SD10 to SD12 would have a minor positive effect on this objective through various measures in these policies including good design considerations for new development, infrastructure provision and developer contributions for town centres.  Policy SD6 would have uncertain effects reflecting uncertainty around what developer contributions may be possible, subject to viability and how this would affect town centres.  Overall, the policies in this section would have positive effects on the achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * None.   **Assumptions**   * None.   **Uncertainties**   * There is uncertainty around what developer contributions there may be and how this would affect town centres. | |