



Mansfield District Council
Creating a District where People can Succeed

Interim Sustainability Appraisal

Mansfield District Local Plan
(Consultation Draft)

February 2016

Contents

1. Introduction	4
1.1 Introduction	4
1.2 Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment	4
1.3 Equality Impact Assessment	4
1.4 Purpose and Structure of the Interim SA Report	5
2. Background to the Local Plan	7
2.1 Background to the Local Plan	7
3. Our approach to the SA and the work completed so far	10
3.1 Overview	10
3.2 Stages and Tasks	10
3.3 Methodology	12
3.4 Consultation Response to the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report	13
3.5 Respondents	13
3.6 Summary of Responses	13
4. Key Sustainability Issues and the SA Framework	18
4.1 Key Sustainability Issues	18
4.2 The SA Framework	20
5. Appraisal of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives	22
5.1 Local Plan Vision and Objectives (Draft)	22
5.2 Very compatible objectives	24
5.3 Very incompatible objectives	26
6. Appraisal of Plan Policies	28
6.1 Introduction	28
6.2 The Strategy	29
6.3 Mansfield	51
6.4 Warsop Parish	72
6.5 Sustainable Transport	80
6.6 Climate change	84
6.7 Natural environment	88
6.8 Built environment	98
6.9 Infrastructure delivery and planning obligations	102
7. Cumulative and Synergistic Effects	104
7.1 Cumulative Effects	104
8. Equality Impact Assessment	113
8.1 Equality Impact Assessment	113
9. Next Steps	115
9.1 Next Steps	115

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 Mansfield District Council is producing a Local Plan which will set out the long term spatial vision for the district and include the planning policies required to deliver that vision over the period up to 2033.
- 1.1.2 This Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report has been prepared as part of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Local Plan (Consultation Draft). The Final SA Report will be published alongside the Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan (Publication Draft).
- 1.1.3 The Sustainability Appraisal process assesses the potential social, economic and environmental effects that may arise from the implementation of the Local Plan.
- 1.1.4 A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) is also being undertaken and the emerging findings of that assessment will be available separately within a HRA Progress Report.

1.2 Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 1.2.1 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a statutory requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 1.2.2 It is designed to ensure that the plan preparation process maximises the contribution that a plan makes to sustainable development and minimises any potential adverse impacts. The SA process appraises the likely social, environmental and economic effects of the strategies and policies within a plan (in this case the Mansfield District Local Plan) from the outset of its development.
- 1.2.3 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is also a statutory assessment process, required under the SEA Regulations (Statutory Instrument 2004, No 1633). The Regulations require the formal assessment of plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment, and set the framework for future consent of projects requiring Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) under EU Directives 85/337/EEC and 97/11/EC concerning EIA. The purpose of SEA, as defined in Article 1 of the SEA Directive is "to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans....with a view to promoting sustainable development".
- 1.2.4 SEA and SA are separate processes but have similar aims and requirements. SEA focuses only on the likely environmental effects of a plan whilst SA includes a wider range of considerations, extending to social and economic effects. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), which was published in 2014, states that SA meets all of the requirements of the SEA Regulations and ensures that potential environmental effects are given full consideration alongside social and economic issues. As such a separate SEA should not be required. This report has been prepared on this basis and the abbreviation "SA" should therefore be taken to refer to both SA and SEA.

1.3 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.3.1 An equality impact assessment (EIA) is a method that helps us to consider a policy in terms of how it might affect different groups of people protected in law (the Equality Act 2010). This helps to ensure our policies are fair for all people within the district.
- 1.3.2 Whilst not a part of the SA or SEA process, we have carried out an EIA of the preferred local plan policies against all equality dimensions to enable us to identify and reduce the potential for discrimination of all kinds. A summary is provided in **Section 8** of this report.

1.4 Purpose and Structure of the Interim SA Report

- 1.4.1 This interim SA Report follows on from the Scoping Stage (Stage A) of the process which was undertaken in 2009, and which established the framework for undertaking the appraisal. It highlights the options that were presented for consultation in the Issues and Options Report and, following their appraisal, states whether, and how far, they work towards or against the SA objectives. Any additional options that emerged following the consultation period on the Issues and Options Report were also appraised in order to help the council move forward towards determining its approach for the Local Plan Consultation Draft.
- 1.4.2 The report then demonstrates how this work has moved on and how the Local Plan (Consultation Draft) has been established, along with an appraisal of each preferred policy and alternative approach, and each site (and each reasonable alternative site) that is under consideration to be allocated to meet the development requirements of the district over the plan period.
- 1.4.3 Although there is no requirement to formally produce, or consult on, an interim SA Report at this stage it is considered important to verify with stakeholders that the approach taken to the council's strategic policies is appropriate (in light of SA findings).
- 1.4.4 It should be noted that this report did not pre-judge which of the options were chosen to be preferred policies. The appraisals were used to inform decisions, and help ensure the policies were as sustainable as possible. Therefore, at this stage the main purpose of the interim SA Report is:-
- to place objective information before consultees so that they are fully aware of the predicted impacts of the different options; and
 - to demonstrate clearly what information is being input into the decision making process, and how this has been arrived at.
- 1.4.5 It is intended that this interim SA Report will provide useful background information for those wishing to get involved in the consultation on the Local Plan. In addition, it will help to inform the Sustainability Appraisal Report which must be published as an accompanying document in the consultation on the Publication version of the Local Plan at a later stage in the plan process.
- 1.4.6 This introductory section (Section 1) provides background information regarding the preparation of the Mansfield district Local Plan and explains the requirement to undertake SA. The remainder of the main body of this report is structured as follows:
- Section 2 outlines the purpose and status of the Local Plan.
 - Section 3 sets out the purpose and stages of SA, the approach taken by Mansfield district council, assumptions made and difficulties encountered.
 - Section 4 states how the SA has met the requirements to review other relevant plans and programmes and which reviews key changes to planning policy.
 - Section 5 outlines the key issues identified through the work carried out at the Scoping Stage and presents the framework of SA Objectives.
 - Section 6 sets out the findings of the SA of the Local Plan Consultation Draft, including alternatives considered; and cumulative effects are identified in Section 7.
 - The Equality Impact Assessment undertaken (as a separate process) is summarised in Section 8.
 - Section 9 sets out the 'next steps'.
 - The main body of this SA report is supported by Appendices A to F which contain detailed appraisal information, background data and methodologies.

1.4.7 This is not a full SA Report (*which is essentially what Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations relate to when setting out the requirements for an Environmental Report*). However, the following table sets out how this Interim SA Report has been prepared to ensure compliance with Schedule 2, Regulation 12(3) of the SEA Regulations.

Table 1.1: Summary of the requirements of the SEA Directive and where these have been addressed in this SA Report

Schedule 2 requirements	Evidence
<i>An outline of the contents and main objectives of the plan or programme, and of its relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.</i>	Section 2 of this Interim SA Report.
<i>The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme.</i>	Appendix A to this Interim SA Report
<i>The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.</i>	Appendix A to this Interim SA Report
<i>Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds(a) and the Habitats Directive.</i>	Appendix A to this Interim SA Report Appendix B to this Interim SA Report
<i>The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation.</i>	Appendix B to this Interim SA Report
<i>The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects.</i>	<i>The appraisal of policies set out within Section 6, with a cumulative assessment of the plan ‘as a whole’ set out in Section 7. Appendix C appraises issues and options Appendix D appraises policies in full Appendix F appraises site options Appendix G appraises site options</i>
<i>The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme.</i>	Recommendations have been summarised under each plan policy in Section 6
<i>An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information.</i>	<i>The process of considering and appraising alternatives has been summarised for each plan ‘issue’ or policy within Section 6 Methodologies (including limitations) are presented in Section 3, Section 4 and Appendix D (for site appraisals)</i>
<i>A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with regulation 17.</i>	To be outlined in the full SA Report accompanying Regulation 19 consultation.
<i>A non-technical summary of the information provided under paragraphs 1 to 9.</i>	Separate document prepared.

2. Background to the Local Plan

2.1 Background to the Local Plan

- 2.1.1 The 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act introduced the Local Development Framework (LDF) system of plan making which was intended to guide future development in the district through a series of 'Development Plan Documents' (DPDs) that were to be prepared in stages.
- 2.1.2 At the time, the Mansfield Core Strategy was envisaged to be the first DPD the council would prepare. It would set out spatially the vision, strategic objectives, the overarching strategy and core policies for the area together with a monitoring and implementation framework. The document would focus on matters of strategic importance and aim to cover the long-term i.e. up to 2033. As such a Core Strategy Issues and Options Report was published for public consultation in June 2010. It considered the major issues facing the district and set them in context. It also considered various options open to the council to address the issues and posed a series of questions to assist public debate.
- 2.1.3 Before the Core Strategy DPD was progressed any further, the Localism Act of 2011 was given Royal Assent. This Act sought to further improve the planning system and allow much more local discretion by removing the regional tier of planning policy. It also removed much of the process that was associated with the LDF system and started to refer to a 'Local Plan'.
- 2.1.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was then published in March 2012, and along with bringing together most Government Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes into a much shorter, single document, it also did not refer to the term Local Development Framework but preferred to use the term 'Local Plan'.
- 2.1.5 Planning officers decided that the best course of action would be to rebrand the existing Core Strategy work as 'Part One' of the Local Plan, and to seek agreement of the work and the new approach by the council, before following on with 'Part Two' which would include detailed development management and land allocation policies. A formal decision to adopt this approach was made by Mansfield district council on 30 July 2013.
- 2.1.6 As the document has progressed, it has been decided to include detailed policies where they make most sense, rather than breaking the document down into two parts. Therefore, although the Local Plan Consultation Draft has been written in two parts, it is presented as one document, with strategic and detailed policies.
- 2.1.7 The Local Plan Consultation Draft comprises a vision, objectives and the policies listed below. Each policy is summarised briefly before the relevant summary of SA findings in Section 6.

Our Strategy

- S1 – Sustainable development
- S2 – Scale of new development
- S3 – Settlement hierarchy
- S4 – Distribution of new development
- S5 – Affordable housing
- S6 – Specialist housing
- S7 – Custom and self-build dwellings
- S8 – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and travelling show people
- S9 – Development in the countryside
- S10 – Employment areas
- S11 – Retail areas
- S12 – Neighbourhood parades
- S13 – Local shops and community facilities
- S14 – Hot food takeaways

Mansfield

- M1 – Urban regeneration
- M2 – Infrastructure and environmental resources
- M3 – Allocations for new homes in Mansfield urban area
- M4 – Allocations for employment land in Mansfield urban area

- MCA1 – Mansfield central area
- MCA2 – Town centre improvements
- MCA3 – Accessing the town centre
- MCA4 – Town centre mix of uses
- MCA5 – Primary shopping area
- MCA6 – Mansfield cultural hub

- MWDC1 – Mansfield Woodhouse district centre mix of uses
- MWDC2 – Mansfield Woodhouse district centre improvements
- MWDC3 – Allocations for retail at Mansfield Woodhouse district centre

Warsop Parish

- W1 – Warsop Parish
- W2 – Allocations for new homes in Warsop Parish
- W3 – Allocations for employment land in Warsop Parish

- WDC1 – Market Warsop district centre mix of uses
- WDC2 – Market Warsop district centre improvements
- WDC3 – Allocations for retail sites at Market Warsop district centre

Sustainable Transport

- ST1 – Protecting and improving our sustainable transport network
- ST2 – Encouraging sustainable transport
- ST3 – Impact of development upon the highway network
- ST4 – Parking provision

Climate Change

- CC1 – Climate change and new development
- CC2 – Standalone and community-wide energy generation
- CC3 – Flood risk
- CC4 – Impact of development on water

Natural Environment

- NE1 – Landscape character
- NE2 – Green infrastructure
- NE3 – Protection of community open space
- NE4 – Protection of allotments
- NE5 – Protection of local green space
- NE6 – Protection of trees
- NE7 – Biodiversity
- NE8 – Protection of designated biodiversity and geodiversity sites
- NE9 – Air quality
- NE10 – Land contamination
- NE11 – Statutory nuisance

Built Environment

- BE1 – Protection of the historic environment
- BE2 – Development within conservation areas
- BE3 – Development affecting listed buildings
- BE4 – Scheduled monuments and archaeology
- BE5 – Registered parks and gardens
- BE6 – Non designated local heritage assets
- BE7 – Design of new buildings and neighbourhoods
- BE8 – Comprehensive development
- BE9 – Home extensions and alterations
- BE10 – Advertisements and signposting

Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations

- ID1 – Infrastructure delivery
- ID2 – Planning obligations
- ID3 – Local employment and skills initiatives

3. Our approach to the SA and the work completed so far

3.1 Overview

- 3.1.1 The council's approach to undertaking SA is in accordance with relevant sections of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) which was published in 2014 and replaced the SA guidance sections within the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Plan Making Manual. The PAS guidance had itself replaced the previous Government guidance document: Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (2005). The guidance is designed to ensure compliance with the requirements of the SEA Directive.
- 3.1.2 In accordance with section 3.1.10 of the 2005 guidance, the SA objectives were originally based upon those used in the process of appraising the East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP), also known as the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS).
- 3.1.3 The EMRP has now been revoked (as a consequence of the Localism Act). However, following updates to the scope of the SA, it is considered that the SA Objectives are still relevant and appropriate in the context of the emerging Local Plan.

3.2 Stages and Tasks

- 3.2.1 There are five iterative stages of carrying out an SA (according to the NPPG). These are set out in Table 3.1 below, along with the relevant plan making stages. This interim SA Report covers Stage B of the process, whilst the 2009 Scoping Report covered Stage A¹.
- 3.2.2 In Nottinghamshire, a partnership was formed to carry out the work required for the initial stage of SA. The partnership comprises all local planning authorities in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire and the main objective of this joint approach was to simplify the process of collecting, and then annually updating, the baseline information. A 'common' Scoping Report template was also developed for use by each of the local planning authorities in the partnership. This was used as a starting point to help guide the collection of relevant information at the scoping stage of SA.

¹ It is important to note that SA is an iterative process, and so stage A has been revisited periodically to ensure that the scope of the SA remains focused on the correct issues.

Table 3.1 Stages of Sustainability Appraisal (Source: NPPG)

SA Process	Local Plan preparation
<p>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</p> <p>1: Identify other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives</p> <p>2: Collect baseline information</p> <p>3: Identify sustainability issues and problems</p> <p>4: Develop the SA Framework</p> <p>5: Consult the consultation bodies on the scope of the SA report</p>	<p>Evidence gathering and engagement</p>
<p>Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects</p> <p>1: Test the Local Plan objectives against the SA Framework</p> <p>2: Develop the Local Plan options including reasonable alternatives</p> <p>3: Evaluate the likely effects of the Local Plan and alternatives</p> <p>4: Consider ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects</p> <p>5: Propose measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan</p>	<p>Consult on Local Plan in preparation (Reg. 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012) Consultation may be undertaken more than once if the Local Planning Authority considers necessary.</p>
<p>Stage C: Prepare the SA report</p>	<p>Prepare the publication version of the Local Plan</p>
<p>Stage D: Seek representations on the SA report from consultation bodies and the public</p>	<p>Seek representations on the publication Local Plan (Reg. 19) from consultation bodies and the public</p>
<p>Stage E: Post adoption reporting and monitoring</p> <p>1: Prepare and publish post-adoption statement</p> <p>2: Monitor significant effects of implementing the Local Plan</p> <p>3: Respond to adverse effects</p>	<p>Submit draft Local Plan and supporting documents for independent examination</p> <p>Outcome of examination Consider implications for SA/SEA compliance</p> <p>Local Plan adopted</p>

3.3 Methodology

3.3.1 This section describes how each of the stages detailed in Table 3.1 has been carried out during the SA of the Local Plan (Consultation Draft).

Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope

A SA Scoping Report on the Mansfield district Core Strategy (now renamed Local Plan) was produced in house, and consulted on in September 2009. The scoping stage involved the following tasks.

Identification other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives

A review was undertaken of other plans, policies and programmes that are considered to be relevant to the Local Plan at the international, national, regional and local levels. An updated review is provided at **Appendix B**

Collect baseline information

Baseline information for Mansfield district was presented in the SA Scoping Report (2009). An update to the baseline position has been undertaken to ensure that the scope of the SA remains appropriate. This update is presented in **Appendix A**. Further updates to the baseline position will be undertaken as the plan progresses and this information will be presented in the final SA Report.

Identify sustainability issues and problems

Drawing on the review of plans, policies and programmes and the baseline information, a series of key sustainability issues have been identified (including environmental concerns, as required by the SEA Directive). These issues are presented in Section 5 of this report. The issues remain largely unchanged from those identified in the 2009 Scoping Report.

Develop the sustainability appraisal framework

Mansfield (and the other Nottinghamshire authorities) decided to use the SA objectives established through the appraisal of the East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP) as a starting point in establishing an SA Framework for Mansfield. The EMRP has now been revoked (as a consequence of the Localism Act), however the SA Objectives are still considered to be relevant as they are supported by the findings of scoping.

The conclusions drawn from the review of other policies, plans and programmes, baseline information and sustainability issues, helped to refine the SA objectives for Mansfield, as well as establishing 'decision making criteria' (collectively known as the SA Framework).

This SA Framework is used to appraise the policies and proposals (and alternatives) within the plan. The SA Framework is presented in **Section 4** of this report. We have noted how the example topics listed in the SEA Directive are addressed through the SA Framework.

The Council consulted Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency on the scope of the SA for five weeks between 24 September 2009 and 28 October 2009. The suitability of the SA Framework was explored through this consultation.

In order to keep the public informed of the process the Council also notified relevant authorities and stakeholders with an interest in the plan area, and made the document available on their website, at the council offices (Civic Centre) and at the three main libraries within the district (Mansfield, Mansfield Woodhouse and Market Warsop).

3.4 Consultation Response to the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report

- 3.4.1 As stated above, the Scoping Report for the Core Strategy DPD was published for consultation on 24 September 2009. Its purpose was to set out the findings of the first stage of the process (Stage A) for the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy DPD.
- 3.4.2 It was sent to the three statutory consultation bodies (Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage) for comment as required by the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive. In addition, letters and emails, accompanied by a non-technical summary leaflet were also sent to all other stakeholders and interested parties on the Council's database explaining where the Scoping Report could be viewed or obtained.
- 3.4.3 The consultation ran for a five-week period until 28 October 2009.
- 3.4.4 Specific consultation questions were included, both within the report at the end of each section, and on a separate form, to assist consultees with their responses. The document was also placed on the council's web site and online comments could be made through the council's Consultation Portal.
- 3.4.5 The Scope of the SA will be refreshed (and confirmed with the three statutory bodies) prior to the final SA report being published. An initial scoping update has been undertaken to support this stage of the SA to ensure that it remains focused on the correct issues. This is presented in **Appendix A** (baseline position) and **Appendix B** (contextual review), with the key sustainability issues and SA Framework presented in **Section 4** of this interim report.

3.5 Respondents

- 3.5.1 47 individual representations (from 10 consultees) were received during the consultation period on the SA Scoping Report. A full list of the comments received, together with the council's response is set out in Appendix H.
- 3.5.2 All comments received were generally supportive and included a number of constructive comments which have been taken into account in refining the SA Framework and preparing for the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report. A summary of the main points is set out below.

3.6 Summary of Responses

- 3.6.1 There were two important elements of the Scoping Report on which comments were sought:
- A set of draft sustainability objectives, and indicators for the plan (the basis against which the plan will be assessed); and
 - A draft list of the most significant issues arising from background research so far, other plans, policies and programmes (including national guidance) and matters arising from informal discussions with council officers within other departments, Members and key stakeholders.
- 3.6.2 The responses to the SA Scoping Report were used to help refine the SA Framework.
- 3.6.3 A number of respondents identified further documents which should have been considered under the assessment of plans, policies and programmes (PPP's). These documents were added and reviewed to establish any further implications which the plan needs to consider.

- 3.6.4 To ensure the list remains up to date, new relevant documents will be considered as they emerge, although the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework has meant that a number of documents on the list of PPP's have been removed as part of the update presented in **Appendix B**.

SA Framework - Objectives and Indicators

- 3.6.5 There were a number of suggestions made regarding the SA Framework in order to help ensure that the sustainability objectives are appropriate.

- 3.6.6 This included changes such as:

- rewording SA8 to make it clear that this objective aims to deal with flooding and water quality issues as well as management of water resources; and
- rewording SA7 to ensure the objective seeks to restore natural assets that may have been lost or degraded in the past, as well as protecting and enhancing the assets we currently have.

In addition, amendments were also suggested to the draft decision-making criteria in attempt to give greater clarity as to how the SA objectives would be considered through the appraisal process.

- 3.6.7 The list of suggested sustainability indicators attracted useful responses which will assist in establishing appropriate monitoring measures when the SA Report is being prepared and published (i.e. alongside Regulation 19 consultation on the Local Plan).

Key Sustainability Issues

- 3.6.8 A number of additional key messages and sustainability issues were raised during the consultation period, such as the need to recognise the importance of Mansfield's coal mining legacy in terms of land stability and public safety.

Stage B: Developing and refining alternatives and assessing their effects

In developing the Local Plan (Consultation Draft), we have taken account of the following SA work which has run alongside the policy development process:

- SA Scoping Stage – Scoping Report published September 2009.
- SA of Issues and Options – Core Strategy Issues and Options Report - June 2010 onwards.
- SA of Alternative Housing Targets – appraisal of 4 housing targets, consultation January 2012
- SA of the preferred policies and any reasonable alternatives (i.e. the policies in the Local Plan (Consultation Draft))

Section 6 of this report sets out how the appraisal process has considered the sustainability effects of the alternative policy options considered by Mansfield District Council in arriving at those set out in the Local Plan (Consultation Draft).

Test the Local Plan objectives against the SA framework

The Council tested the Local Plan 'Core Objectives' against the SA framework in order to ensure they were in accordance with their sustainability principles. The extent to which they are compatible is shown in **Section 5**.

Develop the Local Plan options including reasonable alternatives

At the Issues and Options stage of the plan production, Planning Officers considered a range of options to address the issues that the district was facing. Where appropriate these options (and any further options that were suggested through public consultation) were appraised against the SA framework. This work has helped to inform the policies within the Local Plan (Consultation Draft). However as the plan has progressed, some policy areas have been added which were not included within the Issues and Options stage. This is particularly true of the Development Management and Site Allocation policies. In these cases, Planning Officers have been mindful of the need to test the policy and any reasonable alternatives.

Evaluate the likely effects of the Local Plan and alternatives

As stated above a range of options have been tested in the SA including:

Relevant options presented in the 'issues and options document'
Options suggested as part of public consultation in 2010
Options generated after the public consultation in response to emerging evidence.

The appraisal of options (see the example table 3.3. below) was carried out by members of the Planning Policy team and later reviewed by independent consultants AECOM.

The method of appraisal involved recording the predicted effects of each option over time, considering the short term (ST) (first five year period of the plan), medium term (MT) (middle 10 year of the plan); and long term (the last five years of the plan and beyond). A commentary was provided to explain the reasoning behind each predicted effect (having regard to Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations), and to ensure the process is as transparent as possible.

Table 3.3 Example of policy appraisal (including reasonable alternatives)

SA Objective	EP1 A	Summary & Mitigation	EP1 B	Summary & Mitigation	etc
SA1	ST:	_____	ST:	_____	
	MT:	_____	MT:	_____	
	LT:	_____	LT:	_____	
SA2 etc...	ST:	_____	ST:	_____	
	MT:	_____	MT:	_____	
	LT:	_____	LT:	_____	

Effects have been classified as follows:-

Table 3.4 Classification of Effects

	Likely effect on the SA Objective
+	Significant Positive Effect
	Positive Effect
	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine
+	Significant Negative Effect
	Negative Effect
	Neutral / No significant effect / No clear link

Site appraisals

A separate, site specific framework was developed for the assessment of potential site allocations. This included specific thresholds to ensure consistency. Please see Appendix D, which contains the site appraisal framework in full. Appendices E and F summarise the appraisals whilst Technical Appendix A contains the detailed appraisal sheets for each site option considered in the SA.

Consider ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects

The system employed was not intended to “score” options in order to produce an overall ranking due to the generalised nature of the options themselves, and the dangers of ‘false precision’. Instead, the appraisal records the reason for each decision. The value of the process is to identify the need for, and implications of, mitigation which may be required to reduce the extent of any adverse impacts. The process can also help identify ways in which options may be modified to reduce any significant negative effects.

Propose measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Local Plan

As each appraisal has been undertaken, consideration has been given to how the significant effects of the preferred policies could be monitored. The starting point has been the indicators from the baseline information, which the Council continue to monitor through the Nottinghamshire SA Partnership. Monitoring measures will be proposed in the final SA Report.

Stage C: Prepare the SA Report

This Interim SA Report details the process that has been undertaken so far in relation to the appraisal of the Local Plan (Consultation Draft) and sets out the findings of the appraisals. The Council have not yet reached Stage C, which involves the preparation of the full SA Report.

Stage D: Seek representations on the SA report from consultation bodies and the public

The SA Scoping Report went through a consultation period from September to October 2009. The scoping report and appendices are available to download from Mansfield District Council's website.

Mansfield District Council is inviting representations on the Local Plan (Consultation Draft) in accordance with Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Interim SA Report is also published for consultation. We have not yet reached Stage D, which will involve consultation on a full SA Report (prepared alongside the draft Plan [Regulation 19]).

Stage E: Post adoption reporting and monitoring

Stage E will take place following adoption of the Local Plan. Consideration will be given to the development of an appropriate monitoring framework at Stage C.

4. Key Sustainability Issues and the SA Framework

4.1 Key Sustainability Issues

4.1.1 Table 4.1 below lists a series of key sustainability issues that have been identified through the scoping process. The issues have been organised according to broad topic areas covering the full range of relevant sustainability factors.

Table 4.1: Key sustainability issues drawn from scoping

Topics	Key issues
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to deliver housing to meet identified needs. • There are imbalances in the housing stock with smaller numbers of homes at the lower and upper ends of the housing ladder.
Health and Wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor health and health inequalities exist in parts of the District. • There are pockets of multiple deprivation within the District.
Green space and culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to protect and enhance green infrastructure.
Community safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime rates are higher than the average for Nottinghamshire.
Social capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to protect and enhance community cohesion and social capital.
Biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district contains a rich diversity of biodiversity that could come under pressure from development.
Built and natural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are areas of local landscape value though should be protected and enhanced. • There is a need to protect and enhance the condition and setting of heritage assets.
Natural resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High and increasing pressure on water resources and related infrastructure. • Parts of the Mansfield Central Area (which are priorities for regeneration and development) fall within areas at risk of flooding.

Topics	Key issues
Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a need to reduce waste and increase recycling, reuse and composting.
Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opportunity areas have been identified for the delivery of decentralised energy schemes.• There is a need to reduce energy consumption, improve efficiency and use more low carbon energy sources.
Transport and accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a need to support sustainable transport patterns and ensure good access to jobs and services.
Employment, economy and infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are pockets of high and hidden unemployment and low skills / levels of educational attainment.• There is a lack of good quality employment sites.• There is a shortage of high quality jobs.

4.2 The SA Framework

4.2.1 The SA framework contains a series of objectives and sub-criteria to guide the appraisal of the Plan. The framework has been established drawing upon the key issues identified through scoping.

Table 4.2: The SA Framework

Sustainability appraisal objectives		Sub criteria	SEA 'topics'
SA1	To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups? • Will it reduce homelessness? • Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? 	Population Material Assets ²
SA2	To improve health and wellbeing, and reduce health inequalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce health inequalities? • Will it improve access to health services? • Will it increase the opportunities for recreational physical activity? 	Population Human Health
SA3	To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the district's green spaces and culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it provide new open space? • Will it improve the quality of existing open space? • Will it help people to increase their participation in sport and recreation and cultural activities? • Will it allow better access to the green infrastructure network? 	Population Material Assets Cultural heritage
SA4	To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it provide safer communities? • Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime? • Will it contribute to a safe, secure and stable built environment? 	Population
SA5	To promote and support the development and growth of social capital across the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve access to, and resident's satisfaction with community facilities and services? • Will it encourage engagement in community activities? 	Population
SA6	To increase biodiversity levels across the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it help protect / restore / improve biodiversity and in particular avoid harm to protected species? • Will it help protect / restore / improve habitats? • Will it increase / maintain / provide opportunities for improving / enhancing sites designated for their nature conservation interest / value? • Will it maintain / restore / enhance woodland cover and management? • Will it help achieve local BAP targets? • Will it help to avoid / reduce the loss of / decline in semi-natural habitats, agricultural habitats and urban habitats? • Will it conserve species and protect the district's overall biodiversity? • Will it expand and enhance the green infrastructure network? 	Biodiversity Fauna Flora

² 'Material Assets' is not defined in the SEA Directive or the Regulations. We have assumed 'Material Assets' to include resources such as water, minerals and waste, as well as built infrastructure, including transport and waste infrastructure, but also economic and employment infrastructure and interests.

Sustainability appraisal objectives		Sub criteria	SEA 'topics'
SA7	To protect, enhance and restore the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environmental and archaeological assets of the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it protect / enhance existing cultural assets? • Will it protect / enhance the historical and archaeological environment? • Will it protect / restore / enhance the landscape character and sense of place? 	Cultural Heritage Biodiversity Landscape Fauna Flora
SA8	To manage prudently the natural resources of the district including water (and associated flooding and quality issues), air quality, soils and minerals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve or ensure no deterioration to, water quality? • Will it minimise flood risk? • Will it improve air quality? • Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials? • Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques? • Will it minimise the loss of soils to development? • Will it maintain and enhance soil quality? 	Soil Water Air Material Assets
SA9	To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling and composting of waste materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce household waste? • Will it increase waste recovery, re-use and recycling? • Will it reduce hazardous waste? • Will it reduce waste in the construction industry? 	Material Assets
SA10	To minimise energy usage and to develop the district's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve energy efficiency of new buildings? • Will it support the generation and use of renewable energy? 	Climatic Factors
SA11	To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to ensure that all journeys are undertaken by the most sustainable mode available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it utilise and enhance existing transport infrastructure? • Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment? • Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternative modes of transport? 	Population Material Assets
SA12	To create high quality employment opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs? • Will it reduce unemployment? • Will it increase average income levels? 	Material Assets Population
SA13	To develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it increase levels of qualification? • Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors? 	Material Assets Population
SA14	To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure, including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses? • Will it improve the diversity of jobs available? 	Material Assets

5. Appraisal of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives

5.1 Local Plan Vision and Objectives (Draft)

- 5.1.1 The objectives that the Local Plan policies seek to achieve were developed through engagement with key stakeholders, local councillors, the public and other interested parties. It is important for these objectives to be in accordance with sustainability principles; and therefore a compatibility assessment was undertaken between the draft Plan objectives and the SA objectives (see table 5.3).

Table 5.1: Local Plan draft objectives

Local Plan Objectives
Objective 1 - To encourage population growth particularly within Mansfield urban area, to support growth in the local economy.
Objective 2 - To raise the performance of the local economy by encouraging and supporting investment within the urban areas which: stimulates viable job opportunities; helps develop a stronger local economy, and assists in tackling deprivation through education, training and job creation.
Objective 3 - To ensure that residents, visitors and workers have good access to a range of facilities within the town, district and other centres, which provide high quality health, education, shopping, recreation, heritage, culture and tourism facilities, to enable a good quality of life.
Objective 4 - To increase the range and choice of housing throughout the urban areas and villages, particularly in areas that suffer from low demand and poor quality housing.
Objective 5 - To ensure that the district is safe, clean, green and of a high quality, with the built and natural environment conserved and enhanced for the enjoyment of all.
Objective 6 - To ensure that all new development achieves a high standard of design which supports regeneration, and in particular helps to improve the image of Mansfield.
Objective 7 - Ensure sustainable construction techniques, energy efficiency measures and the generation of energy via renewable sources are deployed in appropriate locations within the district to address environmental issues such as climate change, flooding, and air and water pollution.
Objective 8 - To maximise opportunities to locate new homes, jobs and services within the Mansfield urban area, making efficient use of existing buildings, or previously developed land, to support regeneration of the town, (including the district's most deprived areas) whilst seeking to minimise the loss of greenfield land and mitigate against environmental issues.
Objective 9 - To support improvements to accessibility so everyone can move around, across and beyond the district easily, by a range of affordable and sustainable transport options, including walking and cycling.
Objective 10 - To protect the identity and setting of the villages by safeguarding important areas of open land and supporting key community facilities and services.

Table 5.2: SA Objectives

SA Objectives
SA Objective 1 - To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the district
SA Objective 2 - To improve health and wellbeing, and reduce health inequalities
SA Objective 3 - To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the district's heritage
SA Objective 4 - To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime
SA Objective 5 - To promote and support the development and growth of social capital across the district
SA Objective 6 - To increase biodiversity levels across the district
SA Objective 7 - To protect, enhance and restore the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environmental and archaeological assets of the district
SA Objective 8 - To manage prudently the natural resources of the district including water (and associated flooding and quality issues), air quality, soils and minerals
SA Objective 9 - To minimise waste and increase the re-use, recycling and composting of waste materials
SA Objective 10 - To minimise energy usage and to develop the district's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources
SA Objective 11 - To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to ensure that all journeys are undertaken by the most sustainable mode available
SA Objective 12 - To create high quality employment opportunities
SA Objective 13 - To develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation
SA Objective 14 - To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure, including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies

Table 5.3: Objectives Vs Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

	O1	O2	O3	O4	O5	O6	O7	O8	O9	O10
SA1				+						
SA2			+							
SA3			+							
SA4										
SA5										
SA6					+					
SA7	+				+	+				+
SA8	+				+		+			
SA9							+			
SA10							+			
SA11		+	+					+	+	
SA12		+								
SA13		+								
SA14										

Table 5.4: Classification of compatibility

+	Very compatible
	Compatible
	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine
+	Very incompatible
	Incompatible
	Neutral / No clear link

- 5.1.2 Given the broad nature of objectives, it is difficult to accurately predict ‘significant effects’, through a comparison of objectives. Therefore, the appraisal identifies whether objectives are broadly or very compatible (or not).
- 5.1.3 The comparison of objectives revealed that most of the effects of the Local Plan objectives were compatible, with some being very compatible (discussed further below).

5.2 Very compatible objectives

- 5.2.1 Objective 2, which aims to raise the performance of the local economy by supporting investment in the urban areas, was found to be very compatible with SA objective 11 (which seeks efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, reduction in the use of the car, improved accessibility to jobs and for all journeys to be as sustainable as possible). The urban areas, especially Mansfield, have relatively good public transport links and it is considered that encouraging investment and job creation here could significantly impact upon the travel choices that are made.
- 5.2.2 When considered against SA objective 12, which seeks to create high quality employment opportunities, plan objective 2 was also found to be very compatible. This is due to the emphasis on developing a stronger local economy through education, training and job creation. For this reason, Local Plan objective 2 was also found to be very compatible with SA objective 13. It is considered that the emphasis on education and training should lead to an increase in qualification levels and therefore meet the objective to develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation.

- 5.2.3 Local Plan objective 3 aims to ensure that there is good access to a range of facilities within the town, district and other centres, which provide high quality health, education, shopping, recreation, heritage, culture and tourism facilities, to enable a good quality of life. This was found to be very compatible with SA objectives 2, 3 and 11. When considered against SA objective 2, which aims to improve health and wellbeing, and to reduce health inequalities, it was found that ensuring people have good access to high quality health facilities, and other facilities to help enable a good quality of life, should have a strong effect on health and wellbeing. Similarly, having good access to a range of recreation, heritage, culture and tourism facilities was considered to be very compatible with SA objective 3 which aims to provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the district's heritage. As mentioned above, SA objective 11 seeks efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure. It is considered that good access to a wide range of facilities will significantly assist in reducing the need to travel by car, and encourage a modal shift towards public transport, walking and cycling.
- 5.2.4 Local Plan objective 4 seeks to increase the range and choice of housing throughout the urban areas and villages, particularly in areas that suffer from low demand and poor quality housing. This objective is considered to have a significant positive effect upon SA objective 1 which aims to ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the district. Policies in the plan which address Local Plan objective 4 will include housing mix and affordability.
- 5.2.5 Local Plan objective 5 aims to ensure that the district is safe, clean, green and of a high quality, with the built and natural environment conserved and enhanced for the enjoyment of all. The appraisal found this to be very compatible with SA objectives 6, 7 and 8. SA objective 6 is concerned with increasing biodiversity levels, therefore policies which deliver plan objective 5 by conserving and enhancing the environment are considered to also meet SA objective 6.
- 5.2.6 Local plan objective 6 was found to be very compatible with SA objective 7. As mentioned above, the aim of SA objective 7 is to protect, enhance and restore the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environment and archaeological assets of the district. Local Plan objective 6 will meet this by ensuring that all new development is of a high design standard, and through policies on protecting and enhancing the historic environment.
- 5.2.7 Local plan objective 7 seeks to ensure environmental issues such as climate change, flooding and pollution are addressed, where appropriate, through sustainable construction techniques, energy efficiency measures and renewable energy generation. This was found to be very compatible with SA objectives 8, 9 and 10, which all aim to minimise the effects of development on the environment.
- 5.2.8 Local Plan objective 8 focuses on maximising opportunities for development within the Mansfield urban area (as the most sustainable location within the district) through making efficient use of previously developed land, supporting regeneration schemes and seeking to minimise the loss of greenfield land. This demonstrates a very compatible link with SA objective 11 which seeks efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure. It is considered that focusing development in the most sustainable part of the district, which well served by public transport and where there is good access to a wide range of facilities, will significantly assist in reducing the amount of journeys undertaken by car and encourage more use of public transport, walking and cycling.
- 5.2.9 Local Plan objective 9 is also very compatible with SA objective 11. This is because both objectives seek to achieve efficient use of the existing transport network, and encourage the use of sustainable transport options. This Local Plan objective is also compatible with most other SA objectives.
- 5.2.10 Local Plan objective 10 seeks to protect the identity and setting of the rural villages around Market Warsop by safeguarding important areas of open land, as well as supporting key services within the villages. This is considered to be very compatible with SA objective 7 which aims to protect, enhance and restore the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environment and archaeological assets of the district. This includes landscape character and sense of place, which is what Local Plan objective 10 seeks to protect.

5.3 Very incompatible objectives

5.3.1 There were only (two) instances recorded where objectives were found to be very incompatible.

5.3.2 Sustainable development is all about balancing environmental, social and economic interests, therefore it is inevitable that an objective which places such a strong emphasis on growth (Local Plan objective 1) will have implications for the environment. The particular objectives upon which this objective is very incompatible with are SA objectives 7 and 8. These relate to:

- protecting, enhancing and restoring the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environment and archaeological assets of the district; *and*
- managing prudently the natural resources of the district, including water (and associated flooding and quality issues), air quality, soils and minerals.

5.3.3 As discussed above, Local Plan objectives 5, 6 and 10 are all very compatible with SA objective 7, and Local Plan objectives 5 and 7 are very compatible with SA objective 8. The policies that have been developed in order to meet these Local Plan objectives are likely to mitigate any negative effects that Local Plan objective 1 could have as far as is possible.

5.3.4 **Table 5.5** outlines how this is likely to be achieved. Following the table is a list of the draft strategic policies and the Local Plan objectives which they meet/support.

Table 5.5 Mitigation of Significant Negative Effects

	-ve	+ve	Summary
SA7	O1	O5, O6, O10	Strategic policies that help to meet / support Local Plan objectives 5, 6, and 10 include an overarching policy on sustainable development and what that means for Mansfield district, and policies on settlement hierarchy, green infrastructure, transport, design and the historic environment. There are also spatial policies in relation to the Mansfield urban area, Mansfield central area and Warsop Parish, and a policy which requires planning contributions to be made in certain circumstances. The intention of these policies is to minimise the impact of development by directing it to the most sustainable locations, ensuring that it is accessible by a number of transport modes, that it is designed well and with low impact upon the environment, and that our most valuable assets are protected and / or enhanced. So whilst Local Plan objective 1 aims for high levels of growth, these policies will ensure that it is not at the expense of a high quality environment.
SA8	O1	O5, O7	As above, strategic policies that help to meet / support Objectives 5 and 7 include an overarching policy on sustainable development, and policies on green infrastructure, transport, design and the historic environment. There are also spatial policies in relation to the Mansfield urban area, Mansfield central area and Warsop Parish, and a policy which requires planning contributions to be made in certain circumstances. The intention of these policies is to minimise the impact of development by directing it to the most sustainable locations, ensuring that it is accessible by a number of transport modes, that it is designed well and with low impact upon the environment, and that our most valuable assets are protected and / or enhanced. So whilst Objective 1 aims for high levels of growth, these will ensure that it is not at the expense of a high quality environment.

Strategic Policy Areas / Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sustainable development	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Settlement hierarchy	√		√	√						√
Scale of new development	√	√	√	√				√		
Distribution of development				√				√		
Strategic green infrastructure			√		√			√	√	
Transport			√		√	√				
Design			√		√	√	√	√	√	
Historic environment			√		√				√	
Mansfield urban area	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
Mansfield central area		√	√		√			√	√	
Warsop parish		√	√	√	√	√				√
Planning contributions			√	√	√		√		√	

6. Appraisal of Plan Policies

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 The following sections provide a breakdown of the policies in the Local Plan and their associated summary appraisal. For each policy the following information is presented.

- Issues and options stage – *a description of options considered through the SA and summary of appraisal undertaken at this stage.*
- Consultation Draft stage
 - Alternatives considered
 - Summary of the SA
 - Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)
 - Recommendations

Appendix C presents appraisals of options in the SA at ‘Issues and Options’ stage.

The full appraisal for each policy (including reasonable alternatives) within the Consultation Draft Plan can be found in **Appendix D**.

6.2 The Strategy

S1 Sustainable Development

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.1 This policy area was not included as part of the Issues and Options report, but the policy has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the consultation draft of the Local Plan).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.2 Planning to achieve sustainable development is the fundamental aim of the NPPF, and this must be carried through into Local Plans. The proposed policy option sets a broad framework for achieving sustainable development, which is then built-upon by more detailed Plan policies. There are no distinct reasonable alternatives identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.3 Although the policy provides a positive framework for development, the principles included are already established at national level through the NPPF and NPPG. The policy provides limited local interpretation of these principles and therefore the effects are not predicted to be significant. Having said this, it is acknowledged that further plan policies provide this detail.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.2.4 It was considered that an overarching policy would give the issue of sustainable development significant emphasis and would set out the council's definition clearly for developers.

6.2.5 Whilst being in accordance with national guidance, the policy also emphasises the council's commitment to attracting people, businesses and investment to the area to provide housing, commercial and retail development, and sets out what sustainable development means to Mansfield district.

6.2.6 The criteria of the policy give a broad approach to sustainability considerations, from the general locational issues and the hierarchy of centres, to energy efficiency and sustainable construction. The criteria also cover green infrastructure, heritage assets, and the way in which the development provides for the needs of the community and supports a positive image of the district by providing for economic growth and community cohesion.

Recommendations

6.2.7 No recommendations were made at this stage.

S2 Scale of new development

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.2.8 At the Issues and Options stage the East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP) was in place and set the district's dwelling requirement up until 2026. Therefore the council did not consider any options in relation to dwelling requirements, focusing rather on the distribution of dwellings. However, the council decided to produce a supplement to the Issues and Options Report, called 'Setting a Long-Term Dwelling Requirement' when it became clear that the Government intended to revoke Regional Plans through the Localism Act. This document and its evidence base was used to identify a range of options for a locally agreed figure and was subject to public consultation for 6 weeks during December 2011 and January 2012.

6.2.9 The options appraised were:

- Base level - 4,413 dwellings (221 per annum);
- Low level - 5,643 dwellings (282pa);
- Medium level - 7,828 dwellings (391 pa);
- High level - 11,100 dwellings (555 pa)
- Business as usual (EMRP figure) - 10,600 dwellings (530 pa).

6.2.10 What was clear from the SA on the dwelling options was that in general terms the higher the dwelling requirement, the greater impact it will have upon the natural environment due to the additional land required through each option. Land to be allocated for development ranged from 68.5ha under the 'base option' to 291.4 ha under the 'high option'. Although mitigation against land take up could be to raise densities, such an approach could be applied to any of the options. Although 'greenfield land' take-up would be higher under the high level option, opportunities for developer contributions either through a Community Interest Levy (CIL) or through section 106 agreements would be greater should a higher requirement be delivered. An example maybe that farmland which has limited recreational benefits would be developed for residential purposes, however new green infrastructure and formal recreational facilities could be included within the new development, increasing public access to new quality open space. In contrast to any environmental impacts of the options, economically, a higher dwelling requirement provides greater opportunities for developers to deliver greater numbers of dwellings, which potentially house a greater workforce. Should the projected increase in jobs take place, having a greater resident workforce is vital to prevent unsustainable in-commuting. Equally if potential employers see that the district offers only a limited workforce, then they may decide not to locate here in the first place.

6.2.11 In relation to the scale of employment development, this was appraised at the Issues and Options stage. The options were:

- Option A - Use a low figure of 24 ha net to plan for future employment land provision;
- Option B - Use a high figure of 38 ha net to plan for future employment land provision;
- Option C - Seek to avoid setting employment land figures but rely on a criteria based policy approach to future employment land provision; or
- Business as usual (rely on remaining allocations within the 1998 Local Plan).

Summary of sustainability appraisal

6.2.12 The SA found that all options, regardless of the quantum of employment development proposed, would have either significantly negative, negative or uncertain effects upon the environmental objectives (SA 6-10) due to the pressure that development puts upon biodiversity and natural resources, and its effect upon waste generation and energy use. However the SA has also highlighted that there is potential for

these effects to be mitigated through the use of measures such as renewable energy, combined heat and power, sustainable urban drainage systems and habitat creation / enhancement. Generally Option C (using a criteria-based approach rather than adopting a specific target) was considered to be able to offer the best method of ensuring that mitigation measures are appropriate, as they would be related to particular sites that are promoted. However this approach is likely to have a negative effect in terms of creating high quality employment opportunities (SA12) as relying on a criteria-based policy rather than making site allocations may indicate that no employment development is required over the plan period and mean that proposals are less likely to be forthcoming. This may also affect the soundness of the plan. This approach also performed badly against providing the physical conditions for a modern economic structure (SA14) as it would put emphasis on the development of brownfield sites, whereas greenfield sites adjoining of the urban boundary (such as land close to the MARR) are likely to be the most deliverable in terms of providing the type of land and buildings required by modern businesses. However, by not making land allocations, these types of sites are unlikely to be contained within a revised urban boundary and therefore remain contrary to policy. Options A and B both performed well against the economic objectives (Objectives SA 12-14) although it needs to be recognised that allocating enough land for employment purposes is unlikely to raise educational attainment levels.

6.2.13 The scale of retail and leisure provision was not directly dealt with at the issues and options stage, as the requirement for new floorspace needed to be defined by the Retail and Leisure Study, which was not completed until 2011. The SA therefore did not address the impact of different levels of provision.

Consultation Draft Stage

6.2.1 During the preparation of the Consultation Draft, it became apparent that the evidence base was becoming out of date. As such, new studies were commissioned in order to reflect the most current needs of Mansfield district. These included:

- Nottingham Outer Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 (SHMA)
- Nottingham Core HMA and Nottingham Outer HMA Employment Land Forecasting Study 2015 (ELFS) and
- Mansfield Retail and Leisure Study – 2014 Addendum.

6.2.2 Taking account of this new evidence base and also the previous options and the consultation responses to 'Setting a long term dwelling requirement', the approach taken in the Consultation Draft is for a single policy which states that the plan will deliver:

- 7,520 dwellings between 2013 and 2033
- 42 hectares of industrial land and 26,000 sqm of office floorspace between 2011 and 2033
- 25,200sqm net comparison retail floorspace, 3,900 sqm net convenience retail floorspace and 2,300 sqm net leisure floorspace for the period 2014 - 2031.

Alternatives considered

6.2.3 In relation to the housing figure within the policy, this was the recommended Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) figure within the SHMA. The other options that were considered but then disregarded were:

- Set a housing target lower than the OAN
- Set a housing target higher than the OAN

6.2.4 Individual districts can, in exceptional cases, request that other authorities within the same housing market area take some of their housing need due to severe environmental constraints. In order for this option to be credible, Mansfield district would need to demonstrate that it is so severely constrained by

sensitive areas of the countryside that it would be totally unacceptable to develop at the level of the OAN. While development of the countryside is a sensitive issue, the district does not have any Green Belt or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) constraining it, and no statutory areas of protected countryside would need to be lost in order to meet the OAN figure. There is therefore considered to be no justification for setting a figure lower than the OAN.

- 6.2.5 In terms setting a higher target than the OAN (which is normally justified on the basis of creating more jobs), the SHMA has evidenced that the OAN figure of 376 dwellings per year is higher than the amount of housing needed to meet either the Experian job forecasts or the more optimistic 'Policy on' job growth figures based upon the Local Enterprise Partnership / NLP figures. There is therefore no evidence that adopting the OAN figure as the housing target would stifle job creation. A higher figure is also considered to unrealistic as it would set a target that would be highly unlikely to be delivered
- 6.2.6 In relation to the employment target, this is split into industrial (B1(c), B2 and B8), and office (B1 (a/b)). Various scenarios were looked at within the ELFS, as set out below.

Industrial

- 6.2.7 Experian baseline (These figures are a policy neutral starting point i.e. what levels of job growth may be seen in the future based on how well various economic sectors are doing now and how they might be expected to perform in the future. For industrial sectors this scenario indicates just over 35 hectares would be needed over the plan period, rising to nearly 40 hectares with a flexibility factor added)
- 6.2.8 D2N2 Policy on: (This scenario is based on the assumption of higher job growth than the Experian baseline and is linked to the priority projects in the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). Not surprisingly it produces slightly higher figures of just under 38 hectares rising to just under 42 hectares with a flexibility factor added. It should be seen as a minimum level of job demand that if failed to plan for may stifle economic growth and be at odds with the aspirations of the LEP in the SEP.)
- 6.2.9 Labour Supply: (This scenario provides a contrasting approach that estimates the growth of the local labour supply based on the objectively assessed housing need in the SHMA. It considers how many jobs and in turn how much employment space would be needed to broadly match the forecast growth of the district's employed population taking account of economic activity rates and future pension age changes, and assuming the pattern of commuting continues. It produces figures that co-relate very closely with the LEP policy on scenario, just over 38 hectares rising to just over 42 hectares with the flexibility factor added).

Office

- Experian baseline (just under 20,000 sqm rising to nearly 24,000 sqm with a flexibility factor added)
 - D2N2 Policy on (just under 21,500 sqm rising to just over 26,000 sqm with the flexibility factor added)
 - Labour Supply (just over 20,500 sqm rising to just under 25,500 sqm with the flexibility factor added).
- 6.2.10 It is considered that local plan needs to allocate enough land to meet employment space requirements identified under the labour supply / LEP policy on scenarios in order to meet business needs and the district's workforce in the future. Therefore the Experian baseline scenario has not been taken forward in the Consultation Draft.
- 6.2.11 Turning to the retail and leisure targets, the evidence base provided two scenarios for both comparison (non-food) shopping and convenience (food) shopping. These were:
- static retention which assumes that current patterns of shopping / levels of spending within Mansfield district will remain unchanged throughout the study period

- increasing retention which assumes a modest uplift in the levels of spending within Mansfield district by the end of the study period.
- 6.2.12 Just one scenario was modelled for leisure floorspace. This is the static retention scenario and assumes that the current spending pattern will continue over the study period.
- 6.2.13 It is intended that the local plan should allocate enough land to meet the static retention (lower) figures for comparison and leisure floorspace, and the increasing retention (higher) figures for convenience floorspace in order that the district's retail and leisure development requirements can be met. This is on the basis that shopping habits are changing and the most successful town centres will be the ones that adapt and move away from solely being shopping destinations to those which offer a broad range of uses.
- 6.2.14 The higher figures were selected for convenience shopping on the basis that planned improvements and additional stores have now been completed. It was assumed likely within the evidence base that these developments may have already improved the retention rate.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.2.15 In summary, this appraisal has found that the amount of development proposed would have a significantly positive effect upon housing (SA1) as the policy requires enough land to be allocated to meet the district's housing needs, and includes a contribution towards affordable housing from all sites over 10 units. The policy would also have a positive effect upon health (SA2) due to improvements to health facilities, open space and accessibility that are likely to be made as part of housing developments. Whilst these improvements would be primarily to meet the additional demands of those living in new homes, it is more than likely that the existing communities would also benefit. There were also positive effects found in relation to the economic objectives (SA12-14) as the policy allows opportunities for land to be used for a wide range of economic uses including high knowledge sectors, although it needs to be recognised that allocating enough land for economic purposes is unlikely to raise educational attainment levels. Finally, the appraisal found that there could be negative effects upon environmental objectives (SA 6-7). This is due to the fact that greenfield land will be required to be developed in order to meet the level of development needed, and the pressure that this puts upon biodiversity (SA6), built and natural assets and natural resources (SA8). However the SA has also highlighted that there is potential for these effects to be mitigated through the use of measures such as sustainable urban drainage systems and habitat creation / enhancement. In terms of community safety (SA4) sites in need of regeneration may be overlooked (as these are generally more problematic) and therefore create a negative image, and allow opportunities for anti-social behaviour. This can be mitigated through phasing of sites, to prioritise the redevelopment of brownfield land.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

- 6.2.16 The scale of new development (particularly in terms of dwelling numbers) needs to reflect the council's clear growth agenda, in order to achieve Objective 1 (to encourage population growth). It is recognised that sustainable growth is not solely dependent upon the number of dwellings anticipated to be constructed in the district, but also the creation of job opportunities, and providing thriving retail and commercial areas to serve the needs of the existing and forecast population, and therefore this policy also deals with the scale of employment and town centre uses.
- 6.2.17 The housing figure is the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) which is set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The preferred approach to employment provision is to set a target which takes a realistic approach to widening opportunities for new employment and allowing existing businesses to grow, and through distribution policies and site specific allocations, ensuring that locations are selected that will be viable in terms of providing jobs for the local community. The scale of new provision requires a realistic approach to those areas that may currently be in employment use, but are likely to be lost to other uses, for a variety of reasons, such as outdated premises, poorer transport links, impact on residential amenity etc.

6.2.18 The scale of retail and leisure provision has been taken directly from the Retail and Leisure Study 2014 Addendum, which forms part of the Local Plan evidence base. This study looked at the future demand for new convenience and comparison retail floorspace, as well as leisure floorspace, drawing upon expected increases in population, available income and shopping habits. The most realistic figures were put forward into the Consultation Draft.

Recommendations

6.2.19 None identified.

S3 Settlement Hierarchy

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.20 The settlement hierarchy was not considered at Issues and Options stage as it was set out in the now revoked East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP). However in order to inform the Consultation Draft work, relevant areas from the Issues and Options Report which related to the location of development were considered. These were:

- EP1 - Strategic Distribution of Development;
- EP5 - Location of New Employment Sites.

Summary of sustainability appraisal

6.2.21 In relation to the strategic distribution of development (Issue EP1) it was found that concentrating development within the Mansfield urban area would make the best use of the existing transport infrastructure and provide good access to jobs and services (SA11), as well as providing opportunities for greater levels of development contributions to be sought and reinvested in the area to counteract loss of greenfield land (SA8) and pressure on facilities. The appraisal also highlighted that directing the majority of housing to Mansfield (and meeting the housing needs of this larger area (SA1)), would mean that there would be less sites identified in Warsop to meet the future housing needs there. However, this is considered appropriate as large scale development at Warsop would not be particularly sustainable, could encourage more car-borne journeys into Mansfield and / or Shirebrook (in Bolsover) for jobs and services, and could undermine the rural character of villages within the area.

6.2.22 In terms of the location of new employment sites (Issue EP5), the SA approach highlighted that focusing development at a strategic urban extension is likely to be the most economically advantageous option, as it is likely to provide land that is attractive to the market and able to incorporate necessary infrastructure to meet the technological needs of a modern economic structure. However the SA also highlighted that this would limit employment opportunities elsewhere, especially Mansfield Town centre which is the most accessible location. This could also impact upon the council's urban renaissance agenda. Other impacts include potential loss of biodiversity (SA6). All options had negative impacts in terms of management of natural resources (SA8), waste generation (SA9) and pressure on non-renewable energy sources (SA10); however the location of employment uses within urban extensions was found to have the best opportunity to mitigate against these impacts as part of a large, comprehensive development.

Consultation Draft Stage

6.2.23 In terms of the settlement hierarchy, the previous approach taken followed that of the Northern Sub-Regional Strategy, within the EMRP. An SA of this was carried out as part of the EMRP's production.

6.2.24 Although the EMRP has now been revoked by the Localism Act it is considered that the settlement hierarchy which was previously set out is correct for Mansfield district. In relation to the SA for this issue, the appraisal of options for EP1 and EP5 (described above) have been combined and revised as follows in order to generate alternative options:

Table 6.1 - Combination of previous Issues and Options to form Settlement Hierarchy Options

Previous EP1 - Strategic Distribution of Development	Previous EP5 - Location of New Employment Sites	Settlement Hierarchy
A - Maximise development around the sub-regional centre of Mansfield and safeguard the rural settlements	C - Focus employment land provision on new strategic employment sites as part of mixed use sustainable urban extensions to the Mansfield urban area.	A - Mansfield Urban Area to be the focus of all housing and employment development.
B - Strengthen the role of Market Warsop while maintaining a development focus in and around the Mansfield urban area	B - Seek to allocate employment land at Market Warsop urban area with the remainder concentrated on new strategic employment sites as part of mixed use sustainable urban extensions to the Mansfield urban area	B - Focus the majority of housing and employment development at and around the Mansfield Urban Area, whilst supporting growth at Market Warsop Urban Area.
C - Providing limited growth in and around Market Warsop and the settlements	A - Seek to allocate new employment sites in locations which maximise accessibility for the local population Alternative 1 - Combine options EP5 A and EP5 C	C - Focus housing and employment development at Mansfield Urban Area, followed, at a lesser scale, by Market Warsop Urban Area, followed by limited development in the Villages.
D - Business as usual (out of date plan)	D - Business as usual (out of date plan)	

Alternatives considered

- Option B - Focus the majority of housing and employment development at and around the Mansfield Urban Area, whilst supporting growth at Market Warsop Urban Area.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.25 This appraisal has found that both the policy options have very similar effects upon the SA Framework. The only difference was found in relation to housing (SA1) where there was a negative effect in relation to meeting the housing needs of communities living in the rural villages within Warsop Parish. The appraisal has found a significantly positive effect upon making efficient use of existing transport infrastructure (SA11) as the settlement hierarchy policy would be directing / allowing development (both allocations and windfall sites) which is within the main urban areas and therefore already connected to the transport network and easily accessible by public transport. There were no significantly negative effects.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

- 6.2.26 The preferred approach is to have policies which set out both a settlement hierarchy and a hierarchy for town centre uses (see Retail Areas).
- 6.2.27 The settlement hierarchy will define Mansfield urban area as the main location for the residential and employment development which is central to the delivery of the district's planning strategy, whilst ensuring that development needs within the Market Warsop urban area, and surrounding rural villages are met.
- 6.2.28 The policy will set the context for the overall distribution of development and the identification of development sites in the Local Plan.

Recommendations

- 6.2.29 The preferred approach had no significant negative effects, mainly because the policy does not allocate sites or set development requirement levels, therefore no mitigation is required.
- 6.2.30 The significant positive effect upon SA11 (efficient use of existing transport infrastructure and reducing the need to travel by car) needs to be monitored through use of future census data on travel to work preferences.

S4 Distribution of development

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

- 6.2.31 Alternative approaches to the distribution of development were explored through two key issues in the Issues and Options Consultation document:

EP1 - The Strategic Approach to Development

- EP1 A - Maximise development around the sub-regional centre of Mansfield and safeguard the rural settlements.
- EP1 B - Strengthen the role of Market Warsop while maintaining a development focus in and around the Mansfield urban area.
- EP1 C - Providing limited growth in and around Market Warsop and the settlements

EP5 - Location of new employment land.

- EP5 A - Seek to allocate new employment sites in locations which maximise accessibility for the local population.
- EP5 B - Seek to allocate employment land at Market Warsop urban area with the remainder concentrated on new strategic employment sites as part of mixed use sustainable urban extensions to the Mansfield urban area.
- EP5 C - Focus employment land provision on new strategic employment sites as part of mixed use sustainable urban extensions to the Mansfield urban area.
- EP5 Alternative 1 - Combine options EP5 A and EP5 C.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.2.32 The appraisal of this issue found that concentrating development within the Mansfield urban area (Option EP1 A) would make the best use of the existing transport infrastructure and provide good access to jobs and services, as well as providing opportunities for greater levels of development contributions to be sought and reinvested in the area to counteract loss of greenfield land and pressure on facilities.
- 6.2.33 The appraisal also highlighted that directing the majority of housing to Mansfield (and meeting the housing needs of this larger area), would mean that there are less sites identified in Warsop to meet the future housing needs there. However, should more development be directed to Warsop, it would not be particularly sustainable and could encourage more car-borne journeys into Mansfield and / or Shirebrook (in Bolsover) for jobs and services.

- 6.2.34 Strengthening the role of Market Warsop (Option EP1 B) is considered to be more favourable in terms of reducing the need to travel, compared to allowing development within the surrounding villages (Option EP1 C).
- 6.2.35 Although all options would help generate developer contributions towards improvements to open spaces, increased development levels would put pressure on the natural environment.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

- 6.2.36 Building upon the work undertaken at Issues and Options stage, the Council identified three 'reasonable alternatives' for the distribution of development.
- Reasonable Alternative 1 - Urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites only.
 - Reasonable Alternative 2 - Mix of urban (brownfield and greenfield) sites, and sites adjoining the urban boundary.
 - Reasonable Alternative 3 - Mix of urban (brownfield only) and sites adjoining the urban boundary.
- 6.2.37 Whilst these alternatives are fairly broad in nature, the appraisal was informed by the assessment of a range of site options (detailed under policies M3/M4 and W2/W3) that could be available to deliver each approach.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.2.38 This appraisal has found that the preferred approach would have significant positive effects upon housing (SA1) as it would allow for a good range of brownfield and greenfield sites to be developed in the urban areas as well as allowing for controlled growth at the urban boundary. Alternative 3 would have similarly positive effects, but alternative 1 (urban containment) would not have significant positive effects on housing as it would restrict the choice and flexibility of housing sites, which might be difficult to achieve housing targets.
- 6.2.39 Each alternative would focus development on areas that are already connected to the transport network and served by public transport (SA11), with alternative 1 being the most positive approach in this respect.
- 6.2.40 The preferred approach could have significant negative effects upon green space/open spaces (SA7), however this could be mitigated through the use of planning obligations which require a contribution towards new or upgraded spaces.
- 6.2.41 The preferred approach has the potential for negative effects upon biodiversity (SA6) and landscape character (SA7-8) due to the release of urban boundary sites. However, these are not predicted to be significant as mitigation measures ought to be secured.
- 6.2.42 Alternative 3 is predicted to be the most negative against these SA objectives as it would see the greatest amount of development on the urban boundary. Alternative 1 would be the most desirable for biodiversity and landscape as it would avoid development on the rural/urban fringe.
- 6.2.43 Alternative 1 is the most positive in respect of transport (SA11) as it would locate development in areas with good access to jobs and services by sustainable modes. Alternatives B and C would be less beneficial given that a proportion of development would occur on the urban boundary which is generally less well connected.
- 6.2.44 With regards to the economy (SA12-14), the preferred approach is predicted to be the most positive, as it would support development in areas that are attractive to blue chip/national businesses.

- 6.2.45 Overall, the preferred approach performs poorer than Alternative 1 with regards to environmental objectives such as biodiversity (SA6), landscape and green space (SA7-8). However, the preferred approach performs better in terms of housing (SA1) and economy (SA12-14). Given the need to achieve housing targets and match economic aspirations, Alternative 2 is perhaps the most balanced approach (providing that negative effects upon the environment can be avoided). A number of policies in the Local Plan that seek to protect and enhance the environment should ensure that significant negative effects upon the environment are avoided.
- 6.2.46 Whilst Alternative 3 performs similarly to the preferred approach on housing (SA1) and economy (SA12-14), it performs the poorest of all three alternatives in respect of environmental objectives, whilst also being the least beneficial for accessibility (SA11) and natural resources (SA8).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of the alternatives)

- 6.2.47 The Councils preferred approach (outlined below) is broadly in-line with 'reasonable alternative 2'. It seeks to maximise development in the urban area on a mix of brownfield and under-utilised greenfield sites but recognises that the release of sites adjoining the urban boundary is necessary to achieve the housing target over the plan period. The distribution is set out as follows:

Development relating to Mansfield urban area

- 90% of the Dwelling requirement (6,800 dwellings)
- 95% of the Employment (industrial) requirement (40 hectares)
- 100% of the Employment (office) requirement (26,000 square metres)
- 95% of the A1 Comparison goods floorspace requirement to Mansfield Town Centre (24,000 square metres)
- 2.5% of the A1 Comparison goods floorspace requirement to Mansfield Woodhouse District Centre (600 square metres)
- 95% of the A1 Convenience goods floorspace requirement to Mansfield Town Centre (3,700 square metres)
- 2.5% of the A1 Convenience goods floorspace requirement to Mansfield Woodhouse District Centre (100 square metres)
- 95% of A3, A4, A5 (Food and drink leisure) floorspace requirement to Mansfield Town Centre (2,900 square metres)
- 2.5% of A3, A4, A5 (Food and drink leisure) floorspace requirements to Mansfield Woodhouse District Centre (80 square metres)

Development relating to Warsop Parish

- 10% of the Dwelling requirement (720 dwellings)
- 5% of the Employment requirement (2 hectares)
- 2.5% of A1 Comparison goods floorspace to Market Warsop District Centre (600 square metres)
- 2.5% of A1 Convenience goods floorspace requirement to Market Warsop District Centre (100 square metres)
- 2.5% of A3, A4, A5 (food and drink leisure) floorspace requirements to Market Warsop District Centre (80 square metres)

- 6.2.48 The distribution of the dwelling and retail/leisure requirements were based on recommendations within the relevant evidence base studies. The employment distribution was made on the basis of site availability and deliverability in each location.

Recommendations

- 6.2.49 None identified.

S5 Affordable Housing

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.2.50 At issues and options stage issue SC1 covered the 'distribution of affordable housing'. A range of alternatives were identified and appraised at this stage as follows.

- SC1 A - Apply a single percentage requirement for all sites (over a given threshold) throughout the district.
- SC1 B - Seek to increase percentages of affordable housing in areas that are in greatest need.
- SC1 C - Seek to maximise percentages of affordable housing where financial viability suggests higher levels can be provided.

6.2.51 In addition, three more alternatives were suggested during public consultation. These were:

- Alternative 1 - Allow exception sites on the edge of smaller settlements and villages.
- Alternative 2 - Use both a % target and viability testing
- Alternative 3 - Require off-site provision and commuted sums

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.52 The appraisal highlighted that the use of commuted sums to improve existing affordable housing stock would have a significant positive effect upon community safety as it would encourage the refurbishment of empty / poor quality housing which often attracts crime and anti-social behaviour. It was acknowledged that although on site affordable housing provides more certainty as to how many affordable units will be provided, it does little to improve existing areas of poorer housing, which contributions may help improve through the use of monies that otherwise would not be available. On a negative side however it could result in less affordable homes being provided in the short to medium term due to the need to pool sufficient funds to undertake improvements.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.53 Affordable housing was revisited during the preparation of the Consultation Draft.

6.2.54 With regards to reasonable alternatives, it was considered that the provision of affordable housing ought to be determined through a consideration of needs (established through a SHMA) and balanced against viability factors. Unviable housing targets would not be deliverable and are thus considered to be unreasonable.

6.2.55 Having said this, the policy development process was mindful of the appraisal findings at issues and options stage (although it should be noted that these options were not all mutually exclusive, so it was possible to combine several approaches when developing the policies on affordable housing).

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.56 The policy approach is likely to have a significant positive effect on the baseline with respect to housing needs (SA1). No other significant effect is recorded, though there ought to be knock on positive effects in terms of health and wellbeing (SA2).

6.2.57 On-site provision of affordable housing may assist with community integration and thus have a minor positive indirect effect on community wellbeing and cohesion (SA5).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.2.58 The policy approach taken was considered the most reasonable way of ensuring affordable housing is provided over the plan period, bearing in mind the impact this can have on viability. The percentages of affordable housing to be provided on sites were informed by the Whole Plan Viability Study which forms part of the local plan evidence base.

Recommendations

6.2.59 Further text could be inserted in the supporting text to identify the likely appropriate split between social or affordable rented and intermediate tenures that will be sought, as identified by the SHMA - recognising that this will change over time, and thus the split that will be sought will be informed by the latest SHMA at the time the policy is being applied.

6.2.60 The council consider that the most appropriate course of action will be to add the detail when potential changes from the Housing Bill are clearer.

S6 Specialist Housing

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.2.61 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.62 No reasonable alternatives identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.63 The policy is likely to contribute a positive effect on the baseline with respect to housing needs (SA1). No other significant effect is recorded, though there ought to be knock on positive effects in terms of supporting older and vulnerable groups (SA2).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.2.64 There is a need to plan for the delivery of a wide choice of high quality homes and a mix of housing based on the demographic trends, in order to meet the future needs of different groups within Mansfield District's communities.

6.2.65 The SHMA shows a clear need to plan for the development of housing that is suitable to meet the needs of elderly and vulnerable residents.

Recommendations

6.2.66 None identified at this stage.

S7 Custom and self-build dwellings

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.2.67 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.68 None identified. Specific policy area with no strategic alternatives.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.69 The policy is likely to lead to a positive effect overall in terms of housing (SA1); as allowing a percentage of sites for custom builds ought to be beneficial for housing choice and community development.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.2.70 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.2.71 None identified.

S8 Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and travelling show people

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.2.72 At issues and options stage, the provision of accommodation for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople was covered by issue SC2. Two options were presented in the consultation document as follows.

- SC2 A - In consultation with the Gypsy and Traveller community, identify a broad location within the district for a permanent authorised site.
- SC2 B - In consultation with the Gypsy and Traveller community, identify a specific area of the district in which to provide a permanent authorised site.

6.2.73 The following alternatives were suggested during public consultation:

- Alternative 1 - Investigate a range of potential sites including unauthorised sites and those with a previous planning history.
- Alternative 2 - Take a more specific approach and identify a site as early as possible in the plan making process.

6.2.74 Whilst these options are useful for engaging with the public, it is not considered that these constitute reasonable alternatives in the context of SA. These options are 'procedural', and without detail about where sites might be located, neither option provides the detail required to undertake a meaningful appraisal of discrete options.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.75 The decision to allocate sites in the Plan is driven by evidence on accommodation needs. This issue was considered further following the revocation of the EMRP during the preparation of the Consultation Draft. Further evidence on the need for permanent pitches was obtained, which highlighted there is no requirement for the district. Therefore, at this stage, the evidence suggests that a criteria based policy is sufficient.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.76 The policy ought to have a minor positive effect on the baseline in relation to addressing housing (SA1) and health inequalities (SA2), however this is only likely if a need is identified and such a site is developed in the future. The latest evidence (Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment and Strategy - April 2015) suggests there is no current need for such a site to be developed and hence the effects are not significant when considered against the overall housing needs of the district, especially as a site would only benefit a few individuals.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.2.77 It was necessary to develop a policy to establish the criteria to be used to assess proposals if such a requirement is identified in the future.

Recommendations

6.2.78 A potential negative effect on community groups was identified at a draft stage of policy appraisal. This was because the draft policy required accommodation to demonstrate that it would be meeting needs of people with an existing significant and long standing family, educational or employment connection to the area.

6.2.79 The policy was subsequently amended to ensure that identified needs also take account of anticipated levels of migration and temporary accommodation requirements (i.e. this policy clause was removed). Consequently, this potential negative effect was mitigated.

S9 Development in the Countryside

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.2.80 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.81 No alternatives identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.82 The policy is likely to have positive effect on rural communities by limiting development to acceptable small scale uses. This should protect the character of rural settlements (SA7), whilst ensuring that local needs for housing (SA1) can be met as well as supporting appropriate economic activity. Generally, restricting development in the countryside ought to reduce the number of dwellings located in poorly accessible areas (SA11).

6.2.83 The policy seeks to strengthen this principle by promoting new tourism development close to the urban area wherever possible. The policy is broadly positive, but could be improved with respect to climate change/energy by including low carbon energy schemes as potentially suitable uses in the countryside and encouraging developments to connect to mains gas and electricity where this is possible (SA10).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.2.84 Not applicable.

Recommendations

6.2.85 Recommendations identified below were made whilst the policies were being drafted. The policy was amended in line with these recommendations, which negated a potential negative effect against minimising energy use (SA10).

- Redeveloped properties that are not connected to the main's gas and electricity network ought to be connected if possible and make use of low carbon technologies.
- Low carbon energy schemes could be suitable uses of land in the countryside provided that they meet the requirements of other plan policies such as CC2.
- *Recommended wording addition* - New tourism development should be located as close to the urban areas as realistically feasible and/or accessible by sustainable modes of transport.

S10 Employment Areas

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.2.86 At issues and options stage, the protection of existing employment land was covered by issue EP4. Three options were presented in the consultation document as follows.

- EP4 A - Identify and protect all existing sites for continued employment use.
- EP4 B - Identify and protect the best sites for continued employment use whilst at the same time adopting a more flexible approach to other existing employment sites.
- EP4 C - Adopt a flexible approach in deciding which existing employment sites are kept and released for employment purposes.

Summary of Sustainability appraisal

6.2.87 The SA highlights that *Option EP4 A* would have a negative effect upon a range of factors. This option could lead to a number of unsuitable sites for employment lying vacant, which would have negative effects with regards to community safety (SA4) and built heritage (SA3). It would also prevent alternative uses on such sites, which would have negative effects upon housing (SA1) and accessibility (SA11). Under this approach, the portfolio of sites would also be less suited to current and future requirements and as a result could lead to negative effects upon the economy (SA12-14). Conversely, Options EP4 B and EP4 C would be more likely to have positive effects on these factors by allowing housing on unsuitable sites, encouraging remediation and regeneration and supporting a more balanced and fit for purpose portfolio of employment sites.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.88 The policy was influenced by SA findings at issues and options stage, with Option EP4B being taken forward for further development at the Consultation Draft Stage. No further reasonable alternatives were identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.89 The policy ought to have a significant positive effect on economic objectives (SA12-14) by protecting the most accessible, higher quality employment sites from other development. Allowing for the flexible re-use of other employment sites (though not explicitly stated in the policy) should also help to reduce the pressure of development on greenfield land, which would have positive implications for landscape (SA7), biodiversity (SA6) and environmental quality and help to reuse derelict land and buildings (SA7-8).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.2.90 Not applicable at this stage.

Recommendations

6.2.91 The policy was amended in light of SA recommendations to allow for a flexible approach to the reuse of lower quality employment sites that are not defined on the policies map.

S11 Retail

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.92 Issue SC6 from the Issues and Options Report set out options for the best approach towards defining an appropriate retail hierarchy, as follows:

- Option SC6 A - Amend the existing retail hierarchy to include a range of new centres in the most sustainable locations, in accordance with national guidance;
- Option SC6 B – Amend the existing retail hierarchy by reclassifying a number of centres and focusing new development in these locations to enable a wider range of shops and services. (This may include physical expansion of the retail areas);
- Option SC6C – Amend the existing retail hierarchy by combining options A and B;

One new option was added to this list post consultation at issues and options stage.

- Option SC6D – Only make changes which are recommended by a retail study and therefore evidence based.

Summary of sustainability appraisal

6.2.93 The SA of these options highlighted that amending the existing hierarchy by including new centres in sustainable locations, and reclassifying some existing centres (Option SC6C) would have the most advantages. This includes allowing for development to be focused on existing centres to ensure they remain fit for purpose and continue to meet the needs of their catchments, but where required (due to large number of new homes etc.), new centres would be allocated. Whilst this has negative impacts on environmental objectives, mainly due to pressure on natural resources (SA8) and generation of waste

(SA9) and pressure on non-renewable energy sources (SA10), this can be balanced against the fact that the sustainable location of shops and facilities which provide for the daily needs of their catchments would reduce the need to travel (SA11). There are mitigation measures that could be used to reduce negative impacts, such as waste recycling schemes and the incorporation of sustainable design / generation of renewable energy into new developments.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.94 The preferred policy option has been influenced by the SA, as well as the Mansfield Retail and Leisure Study evidence base document which was produced in 2011 and updated in 2014. The policy most closely resembles Option SC6(C) above, but in addition to reclassifying and adding centres to the hierarchy, the policy also introduces a size threshold for when proposals in locations outside of designated centres would need to have an impact assessment submitted alongside the planning application.

6.2.95 Three options were identified for this element of the policy. They were:

- Option A – Apply the national default floor space threshold of 2,500 sqm before requiring an impact assessment on out-of-centre and edge-of-centre development of main town centre uses;
- Option B – Apply a locally agreed threshold; and
- Option C – Apply a lower threshold for development that would impact upon centres other than the town centre.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.96 This appraisal predicted that the policy would have a significant positive effect upon the efficient use of the existing transport network and reducing the need to travel by car (SA11). Other positive effects relate to the provision of health (SA2) and other community facilities close to the communities they serve, and in relation to community safety (SA4). Negative effects are predicted for SA12, due to the fact that any jobs created are likely to be in the retail and service sector, rather than the 'high quality jobs' which SA12 seeks to achieve.

6.2.97 The appraisal of the options (*for the impact assessment element of the policy*) found that there is unlikely to be a significant effect upon the baseline for the SA objectives. All options had very similar results; which means that whichever threshold is used to trigger the requirement for an impact assessment, the effect is likely to be the same. The main difference between the options is that the lower the threshold is, the more applications there will be that need to be scrutinised through the impact assessment process.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.2.98 As set out in the previous section, the preferred approach is to have a retail hierarchy which reflects the strategy set out in the settlement hierarchy, with the largest concentration of shops and other town centre activities in Mansfield town centre (as defined in the NPPF). This will be followed by two district centres, six local centres, and 19 neighbourhood parades (which are covered by a separate policy). Any development proposals for main town centre uses which are outside of these centres shall be subject to sequential assessment, and depending on the size of the unit/s proposed, an impact assessment. The reason for this policy is to ensure that these types of developments are sustainably located in the heart of communities and accessible to as many people as possible by being close to public transport hubs. The policy also aims to support the vitality and viability of the district's retail centres. The overall approach taken is consistent with government guidance on planning for town centres.

6.2.99 The designation of centres has changed slightly since the 1998 Local Plan. Reflecting the number of shops provided there, Nottingham Road has been re-designated as a local centre, and Fulmar Close at

Forest Town has been added. Other changes include the designation of a number of small neighbourhood parades (although these are now covered by a separate policy).

6.2.100 Oak Tree has been de-designated as a district centre based on the findings of the Retail and Leisure Study. This better reflects its role as an out of centre shopping centre which serves a wider than local catchment area.

6.2.101 Following the consideration of options for impact assessment thresholds; the policy was amended to include a 2,500sqm impact assessment threshold for proposals which may affect the town centre, and a 500 sqm threshold for developments that may affect other designated centres.

6.2.102 The table below highlights the changes to the retail hierarchy.

Table 6.2 Hierarchy for Town centre Uses

Centre (1998 Plan)	Centre (Preferred Option)	Centre Type	Role and Function
Mansfield	Mansfield	Sub- Regional centre (Town centre)	Town centres are retailing centres which include a primary shopping area and secondary areas of predominantly leisure, business and other main town centre uses. New and enhanced retail and other town centre activity should be focused here.
Market Warsop Mansfield Woodhouse Oak Tree	Market Warsop Mansfield Woodhouse	district centre	district centres are primarily used for convenience shopping, often containing at least one supermarket or superstore, with some comparison shopping and a range of non-retail services, such as banks, building societies, restaurants and takeaways, as well as local public facilities such as a doctor's surgery, dentist, opticians, post office and library for the settlement and the surrounding communities.
Clipstone Road West Ladybrook Lane Newgate Lane/Ratcliffe Gate	Clipstone Road West Ladybrook Lane (1) Newgate Lane Ratcliffe Gate Nottingham Road Fulmar Close	Local centre	Local centres include a range of small shops of a local nature, serving a small catchment. Typically, local centres might include, amongst other shops, a small supermarket, a newsagent, a sub-post office and a pharmacy. Other facilities could include a hot-food takeaway and launderette.

Recommendations

6.2.103 The preferred approach had a significantly positive effect upon SA11, and negative effects upon the use of natural resources (SA8), waste generation (SA9) and minimising energy use (SA10). It is considered that other policies within the plan would mitigate these effects.

S12 Neighbourhood Parades

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.104 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although neighbourhood parades did feature as part of the retail hierarchy issue which was considered (SC6). The inclusion of a policy on Neighbourhood Parades has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Preferred Local Plan).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.105 None. This policy follows on from the retail hierarchy policy and sets out what the council considers is the only reasonable approach towards the protection, and future development, of neighbourhood parades.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.106 The appraisal of this policy has predicted that there would be significant positive effects in relation to reducing the need to travel by car (SA11). There would also be positive effects upon improving health and wellbeing (SA2), community facilities (SA5) and land and premises required by business (SA14). The appraisal predicted negative effects which were due to the fact that new development would increase energy use (SA10), but it is recognised that other plan policies could be used to help mitigate this.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of reasonable alternatives)

6.2.107 The preferred approach follows that of the 1998 Local Plan in relation to neighbourhood parades. It was considered that this was effective, and also provided a good level of flexibility for expansions if they were required. The only differences between this policy and the 1998 policy are that the floor area allowed for expansions has been reduced to 500 sqm from 750 sqm, and the parades which are designated.

6.2.108 The table below highlights how the designation of parades has changed since the 1998 Local Plan. Reflecting the number and type of shops provided there, the previous neighbourhood parade at Nottingham Road has been re-designated as a local centre. There have also been a number of new parades developed during the last plan period such as Madeline Court at Berry Hill and Birding Street at Mansfield Woodhouse. Similarly, in recognition of a number of other existing small collections of shops, it was decided to designate Bright Square at Bull Farm, Ladybrook Lane at Ladybrook, Southwell Road West and Southwell Road East (1 and 2) as neighbourhood parades.

6.2.109 Carter Lane which was a large elongated parade has been split into two separate parades where it made sense to do so, and part of the Newgate Lane local centre has been re-designated as a neighbourhood parade which better reflects the types of shops located there. Egmanton Road has been removed as the surrounding area is to be redeveloped, and the shops moved elsewhere within the Bellamy Road estate. (location to be confirmed).

Table 6.3 Neighbourhood Parades

Centre (1998 Plan)	Centre (Preferred Option)	Centre Type	Role and Function
Carter Lane Chesterfield Road North Chesterfield Road South Cox's Lane/Brown Avenue Egmanton Road Garibaldi Road Harrop White Road Ling Forest Road Nottingham Road Ossington Close Peck's Hill Ravensdale Road	Birding Street Bright Square Carter Lane / Mill Street Carter Lane / Rock Street Chesterfield Road North Chesterfield Road South Cox's Lane / Brown Avenue Garibaldi Road Harrop White Road Ladybrook Lane / Tuckers Lane Ling Forest Road Madeline Court Newgate Lane Ossington Close Peck's Hill Ravensdale Road Southwell Road West Southwell Road East 1 Southwell Road East 2	Neighbourhood Parade	Small parades of shops of purely neighbourhood significance, typically under 1,000 sqm net.

Recommendations

6.2.110 Significant positive effects upon improving health (SA2) and reducing the need to travel by car (SA11) need to be monitored to ensure they are realised.

6.2.111 Indicators in relation to sustainable transport (SA11) will be monitored as part of the retail hierarchy policy, however, it will also be useful to record how the number of households within 15 minutes' walk (600m) of a neighbourhood parade changes over the plan period.

S13 Local Shops and Community Facilities

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.112 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.113 None. The inclusion of this policy within the Local Plan was considered important; therefore the alternative of not having a policy to protect local shops and community facilities was seen as an unreasonable alternative and not appraised on that basis.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.114 The policy is predicted to have a significant positive effect by ensuring that social capital (SA5) is a priority within the Local Plan and helping to promote and enhance social capital and the provision of community facilities within the district. Additionally, the policy is predicted to have positive affects upon health and wellbeing (SA2), green spaces & culture (SA3) and sustainable transport (SA11). There is a negative effect upon housing (SA1) as the requirement to retain community facilities could add to build costs for redevelopment, affect viability and restrict a flexible approach to conversion from retail /community use to residential.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.2.115 It is important for the plan to set a presumption against the loss of the district's small convenience stores as, along with neighbourhood parades, they are important to the district's communities. This presumption against loss is also extended to other important community facilities such as village halls, community centres, local shops, churches, church halls, libraries, youth centres, leisure centres and public houses.

6.2.116 Criteria within the preferred policy aim to ensure that the loss of a community facility is only approved where it can be demonstrated that the impact upon communities is low (for example there might be a similar facility within close proximity or, where applicable, it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer viable).

6.2.117 It is also necessary to control the development of new or extended local shops. Whilst it is acknowledged that existing local shops within the district are a community resource, it is important that they do not undermine the retail hierarchy of the district, by becoming so large that they attract custom away from established neighbourhood and local centres. Accordingly, the preferred policy sets a maximum size threshold for local shops. Existing local shops serving a local community are by their very nature convenience shops and the policy will contain a presumption against comparison retail which should be concentrated within the town centre, district and local centres.

Recommendations

6.2.118 The significant positive effect upon social capital (SA5) will need to be monitored. Existing SA Baseline Indicators within the SA Scoping Report are quite limited and just include the number of community centres, leisure centres and libraries. More recent monitoring of community facilities has been broadened to include village halls, churches, church halls, youth centres and public houses. It is suggested that this is also used, as well as the total number of local shops (corner shops / small convenience stores which are outside of designated centres). This is currently a data gap as the district needs surveying, however this will be done before the plan is adopted.

S14 Hot Food Takeaways

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.119 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.2.120 No alternatives identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.2.121 The policy ought to have a positive effect on health and wellbeing (SA2) by minimising hot food takeaways near to schools. This should help to discourage children from eating unhealthily, though a range of other factors clearly play a role. It should also help to ensure community safety (SA4). There are no significant effects for any other SA Objectives.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.2.122 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.2.123 It is considered that a 10 minute walk is typically more than 400m (based upon an average walking speed of 3 meters per second). Reference to a 10min walk should be removed from the policy to avoid confusion.

6.3 Mansfield

M1 Urban Regeneration

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.3.1 There were no specific options concerning regeneration in the Mansfield Urban Area. However issue SC3 looked at ‘supporting regeneration projects’, which could include the Mansfield Urban Area. Three options were included in the Issues and Options consultation document.

- SC3 A - Identify specific areas for regeneration schemes incorporating housing renewal, community facilities.
- SC3 B - Have a policy encouraging regeneration projects where community benefit can be created, using criteria which ensure that issues related to residential amenity, highways and environmental concerns for example are addressed.
- SC3 C - Do not have a specific policy in relation to this.

6.3.2 Whilst these options are useful for engaging with the public, it is not considered that these constitute reasonable alternatives in the context of SA. These options are ‘procedural’, and without detail about which areas might be designated as regeneration priorities, no option provides the detail required to undertake a meaningful appraisal.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.3 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.3.4 The policy approach is expected to have a significant positive effect on the baseline in relation to addressing housing and economic growth and regeneration, as captured by SA objectives relating to housing (SA1) health and wellbeing (SA2), creating high quality employment opportunities (SA12), providing the conditions for a modern economy (SA 14), and positive indirect effects on health and wellbeing (SA2), management of natural resources (SA8) and an efficient transport infrastructure (SA11), through a focus on regenerating the urban core.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.3.5 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.3.6 None identified.

M2 Infrastructure and environmental resources

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.7 These policy areas were not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although they have since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.3.8 This policy broadly reflects guidance outlined in the NPPF and NPPG and sets a framework for Mansfield linked to other Plan policies. Although details are provided elsewhere in the plan, the policy still ought to have positive implications with regards to the encouragement of infrastructure improvements and environmental protection. Consequently, a positive effect is predicted against SA objectives relating to health (SA2), biodiversity (SA6), natural and cultural assets (SA7), management of natural resources (SA8), minimising energy consumption (SA10), reducing the need to travel and making efficient use of existing transport infrastructure (SA11) and providing appropriate infrastructure for a modern economy (SA14).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.3.9 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.3.10 None identified.

M3 Allocations for new homes in Mansfield urban area

Alternatives considered

6.3.11 A number of development site options were identified as reasonable alternatives for housing within the Mansfield urban area. The alternative site options were established in two stages. Stage 1 focused on the urban area, as this was identified as the preferred spatial strategy prior to housing evidence being updated (and identifying a need for additional housing land). Stage 2 explored site options on the urban fringe to supplement those sites that had already been identified as suitable in the urban area.

Stage 1

6.3.12 The preferred spatial strategy at this stage was one of ‘urban containment’. Therefore sites identified as reasonable alternatives at this stage were restricted to all available brownfield and underused greenfield land within the Mansfield urban area (i.e. no sites beyond the urban boundary).

6.3.13 Each site option was appraised against a site appraisal framework. The site appraisal methodology is provided at **Appendix E**. **Appendix F** contains a summary of the appraisal for each site option, whilst **Technical Appendix A** contains a detailed proforma for each individual site option considered in the appraisal.

6.3.14 The sites that were considered are listed in table 6.4 below, with outline reasons provided as to why they have been allocated or discarded.

Table 6.4: Site options for housing in Mansfield urban area (Stage 1)

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
Former Mansfield Brewery (part), Great Central Road, Mansfield	Yes M3(a)	Long standing vacant PDL site with close links to the town centre. Regeneration would be beneficial.
Former Mansfield General Hospital, West Hill Drive, Mansfield	Yes M3(b)	Long standing vacant PDL site with close links to the town centre.
Spencer Street, Mansfield	Yes M3(c)	A vacant PDL site. Development would aid regeneration.
Victoria Street, Mansfield	Yes M3(d)	Cleared PDL site within close proximity of the town centre
Abbey Primary School, Abbey Road, Mansfield	Yes M3(e)	School will be considered surplus to educational requirements upon relocation to a new site.
Broomhill Lane, Mansfield	Yes M3(f)	Only remaining part without permission would be allocated in the Local Plan. The site is considered suitable as it was a former very poor housing area that was demolished to make way for a major regeneration scheme. The total site consisted of PDL and greenfield. The greenfield part was redundant private allotments that were bought up by MDC to undertake the regeneration scheme, the majority of which has planning permission and is under construction.

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
Former Ravensdale Middle School, Ravensdale Road, Mansfield	Yes M3(g)	Derelict school site surplus to educational requirements. Will be subject to Sport England comments on Playing Pitch Strategy.
Former Sherwood Hall School, Stuart Avenue, Mansfield	Yes M3(h)	Derelict school site. Will be subject to outcomes of the Playing Pitch Strategy.
Helmsley Road, Rainworth	Yes M3(i)	Mixed PDL and greenfield site currently outside defined urban area but considered clearly to be part of the urban fabric. A mix of uses including industrial, haulage, residential and vacant unmanaged greenfield land.
Former Victoria Court Flats, Moor Lane, Mansfield	Yes M3(j)	Part PDL part greenfield. This site is likely to be subject to a planning application and unlikely to progress to allocation. The site involves the redevelopment of empty/underused buildings.
Bellamy Road Recreation Ground, Mansfield	Yes M3(k)	Part of the regeneration project for the Bellamy Estate. The open space would be re-formatted to provide better quality facilities.
Broomhill Lane Allotments (part), Mansfield	Yes M3(l)	A section of a wider private allotment site. Development of part of the site would meet the newly adopted allotment strategy. Could well be dealt with as an application prior to allocation.
Clipstone Road East / Crown Farm Way, Mansfield	Yes M3(m)	Lapsed housing site with continued development potential.
Cox's Lane, Mansfield Woodhouse	Yes M3(n)	Lapsed housing site with continued development potential.
Abbott Road / Brick Kiln Lane, Mansfield	Yes M3(o)	Uncertainty remains as to whether the allocation will be the current playing fields or the former cycling proficiency site itself. If it is the playing fields, this will be subject to Sport England comments and potentially be part of a land swap. If it is the former cycling proficiency site then this is best described as un-used greenfield land within the urban area that currently has no use or purpose.
Ladybrook Lane / Jenford Street, Mansfield	Yes M3(p)	An area of land made up from a rather featureless privately owned recreation ground and redundant greenfield land. The area does contain a number of private allotments which would benefit from rationalisation as part of any redevelopment of this site. The use of this land would be able to satisfy the allotment strategy. The site provides a great opportunity to create a purpose built urban park to replace the existing recreation ground. The site may well not reach allocation stage due to the possibility of a planning application being submitted by the trustees.
Meadow Avenue, Mansfield	Yes M3(q)	Unused former school playing fields. Surplus to NCC requirements. Will be subject to playing pitch strategy.
Bilborough Road, Mansfield	Yes M3(r)	Unused greenfield land with no obvious purpose owned by NCC and considered surplus. No facilities/known use.

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
Pump Hollow Road / Newlands Road, Mansfield	Yes M3(s)	Appears to meet allotment strategy but would require some relocation to neighbouring allotment site.
Hall Barn Lane, Mansfield	Yes M3(t)	This site forms part of former school playing fields. Part of the site has already been fenced off from the existing school and is no longer used for education purposes. A planning application has been submitted (to be dealt with by NCC) to redevelop the site which proposes a new school and associated playing fields.
Sandy Lane / Alcock Avenue, Mansfield	Yes M3(u)	Vacant greenfield land that has no use and is not maintained.
Sandy Lane / Garratt Avenue, Mansfield	Yes M3(v)	A proportion (approx 50%) considered appropriate to redevelop for housing due to provision of open space within the area and the current underuse of much of the land.
Sandy Lane / Shaw Street, Mansfield	Yes M3(w)	Vacant greenfield land that has no use and is not maintained.
Sherwood Close, Mansfield	Yes M3(x)	Vacant greenfield land that has no use and is not maintained.
Ladybrook Lane / Tuckers Lane, Mansfield	Yes M3(y)	Fenced off inaccessible greenspace in the urban area. Appears to have no formal use or access and surplus to County councils requirements. Consider developing part of the site on the basis that it could provide new public open space.
Windmill Lane (former nursery), Mansfield	Yes M3(z)	Former nursery (greenfield due to former horticultural use). Declared surplus by the council.
Sherwood Avenue, Mansfield	Yes M3(aa)	The majority of the site previously had residential planning permission, which has since lapsed. Smaller adjoining areas to the north and east are more closely related with this site and have therefore been included as part of the proposed allocation.
Somersall Street Allotments	No	No longer available. Mayor as trustee (who are the owners of the site) indicated that as Somersall Street allotments are well used the small area should remain in allotment use. Unlikely to meet the council's adopted allotment strategy, even if promoted.
Small Part of Forest Road Recreation Ground	No	Not available.
Flint Avenue Open Space	No	Has planning permission, not necessary to allocate.
Former centre for the Disabled	No	No longer available. Site in use.

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
Woburn Road	No	Site is not available and has been safeguarded for a major highway scheme.
Pleasley Regeneration Area	No	Already has planning permission. Was justified for consideration as part of a major PDL regeneration scheme.
Civic centre, Car Park and Part of Recreation Ground	No	No longer available. Required for operational purposes.
Leeming Lane South Open Space	No	Consideration was given to using part of the open space for development purposes as it appeared to be underused and there was already considerable open space in the locality. The land is no longer available.
Vale Road Open Space	No	Not available.
Pheasant Hill (Mansfield Tennis Club)	No	There are access and availability issues.
Rosemary Street Allotments	No	Potentially too small to allocate and needs allotment status to be reviewed.
Wainwright Avenue Open Space	No	Required as open space at current time.
Botany Avenue (Intake Industrial centre)	No	Required for employment purposes at current time.
Union Street / St. John Street	No	Existing buildings in use. Availability issues
Mansfield Town FC Former Training Ground, Quarry Lane	No	Part of a key development site / regeneration area
Gregory's Quarry, Quarry Lane / Stanley Road	No	Major access issues and unacceptable impact on a Local Nature Reserve. The disused quarry was worthy of consideration for development due to its location and disuse. Officers considered unsuitable for residential use due to levels and the inability of the site to be able to create a suitable residential environment unless levels were transformed which would also have viability issues.
Workshops at Hermitage Lane	No	Required for employment purposes and would not provide a suitable residential environment
Land at Kingsmill Lane	No	Major access restrictions. Potential effects on Listed Building.

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
Land at Church Lane / Weighbridge Road	No	Identified as a key development site / regeneration area. PDL close to town centre. Not appropriate for purely residential and uncertain as to realistic prospect of it delivering residential.
Severn Trent Water Depot, Great Central Road	No	Identified as a key development site / regeneration area. PDL close to town centre
Pelham Street	No	Multiple ownership and issues over availability/viability/deliverability. Although residential development would be considered acceptable use in this part of Mansfield it has not been promoted and would be unlikely to come forward as a comprehensive residential allocation.
Blake Crescent Allotments	No	Not available. Used as allotments.
Little Barn Gardens Allotments	No	Well used allotments. Considered as owners wanted it to be considered some time ago. However would not meet allotment strategy standards.
Rear of Clipstone Drive	No	Too small to allocate.
125-147 Southwell Road East	No	Not available. Multiple ownership Garden Land. Given consideration due to one resident's interest in developing the land through the SHLAA process.
Vale Road Housing Repairs Depot	No	No longer available. Required for operational purposes.
Former Marshalls	No	Access is a problem for major residential but site was considered suitable for consideration due to its disused brownfield status.
Clipstone Welfare	No	Availability issues. Loss of playing pitch.
Hermitage Mill	No	Not suitable for residential development.
The Bridleway	No	Not available. Was considered suitable for consideration due to appearance as disused open space.

Stage 2

- 6.3.15 Following the preparation of the updated SHMA (Nottingham Outer Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2015)), it was necessary to identify further sites to meet the council's housing requirements over the plan period with enough 'headroom' to allow some of the identified sites to be discounted as a result of further more detailed analysis.
- 6.3.16 Rejected sites from 'stage 1' (in the urban area) were not reconsidered at stage 2 as these were considered to be unsuitable. As all options had been exhausted there was a need to look to urban fringe areas.
- 6.3.17 The council prepared a Technical Report on Assessment of Locations for Additional Housing Land in Mansfield District. The Technical Report identified, assessed and prioritised urban fringe zones that could be suitable for further development.
- 6.3.18 An estimate of the dwelling capacity of the priority zones in the Technical Report indicated that no more than the upper quartile of zones would be needed to meet the housing requirement.
- 6.3.19 A large scale plan of each of these zones was prepared in order to subdivide them into sites for further consideration. These plans included relevant constraints, such as flood risk areas, local green space, playing fields, wildlife designations, archaeological sites, listed buildings, ground stability and areas of water. Information was also obtained on sites submitted in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), although it was agreed that this should not necessarily imply suitability and that the sites to be considered should not be confined to SHLAA sites.
- 6.3.20 This subdivision resulted in a total of 68 sites of various shapes and sizes across the district, ranging from 0.3 to 18.35 hectares. A desktop exercise was then undertaken by the council to identify which sites were suitable for development (and thus further assessment). The remaining sites after this process were the reasonable alternatives that were appraised through the SA. For Mansfield twenty two site options were identified as follows.

Table 6.5: Site options for housing in the Mansfield Urban Area (Stage 2)

Site Ref	Site name	Gross Area	Net Area	SHLAA Ref	Yield Dwellings
35/1	North of Debdale Lane, east of Burlington Drive	11.93	11.93	33	239
35/3	West of Thistle Hall, off Debdale Lane	2.26	2.26	N/A	23
13/1	Old Mill Lane / Stinting Lane	5.78	3.569	101	107
13/3	New Mill Lane / Sandlands	4.58	4.58	N/A	115
34/1	Radmanthwaite Road / Oxclose Lane	12.51	12.51	135	250
34/3	East and south east of Radmanthwaite Farm, north east of Millenium Business Park	13.37	6.5	135	130
36/1	South of Debdale Lane, north east of Emerald Close	1.08	1.08	N/A	27
36/3	South west of Sherwood Rise, north of Queen Elizabeth Academy	5.82	2.205	N/A	66
36/4	North west of Highfield Close, north east of Queen Elizabeth Academy playing fields	2.67	2.67	N/A	67
33/1	Ruskin Road adjacent the MARR	5.84	5.84	55	146
33/2	Adjacent MARR South West of Wilson Street	5	5	55	125
33/3	Adjacent MARR opposite entrance to Hillmoor Street	10.87	10.87	55	272
33/4	North west of Wharmby Avenue & Wilson Street	3.81	3.81	60	95
17/1	Land rear of Edmonton Road South of B6030	8	8	98	160
17/3	Fields south east of Crown Farm island	4.04	4.04	N/A	81

Site Ref	Site name	Gross Area	Net Area	SHLAA Ref	Yield Dwellings
17/4	Land east of Crown Farm Way bounded by Newlands Drive	2.86	2.86	N/A	57
17/6	Small paddock to east of Newlands Road	0.78	0.78	N/A	12
23/1	Land to the north of Leeway Road and Leeway Close, Rainworth	5.88	5.88	N/A	118
23/2	Land to north east of Helmsley Road, Rainworth	5.01	5.01	N/A	100
23/4	Land to the north east of Helmsley Road & south of and adjoining Rainworth bypass, Rainworth	2.62	2.62	N/A	52
23/6	Land off Helmsley Road, between Heathlands Primary School and Dawn House School	1.11	1.11	138	22
23/7	Land north west of Heathlands Primary School	9.53	9.53	138	191

6.3.21 Each site option was appraised using the SA against a site appraisal framework. The methodology can be found in **Appendix E**. A summary of the appraisal findings is presented in **Appendix G**. **Technical Appendix A** contains a detailed proforma for each individual site option.

6.3.22 The preferred urban fringe site allocations are identified in the table below, including reasons as to why the proposed sites have been selected and the alternative sites have been rejected.

Table 6.6: Site options for housing in the Mansfield Urban Area (Stage 2)

SA Site ID	Site Ref	Site name	Allocated	Rationale
1	35/1	North of Debdale Lane, east of Burlington Drive	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential effects on high quality landscape. Not required to meet housing needs
3	35/3	West of Thistle Hall, off Debdale Lane	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential effects on listed buildings and landscape character. Access to site may be problematic. Not required to meet housing needs.
6	13/1	Old Mill Lane / Stinting Lane	Yes M3 (ad)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can make a contribution to open space. Close to public open space and good access to local facilities and jobs.
9	13/3	New Mill Lane / Sandlands	Yes M3 (ae)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution to open space. Close to public open space and good access to local facilities / jobs (walking distance). Would provide an opportunity to improve road safety on New Mill Lane
12	36/1	Debdale Lane / Emerald Close	Yes M3 (ab)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open space provision possible. Good access to local facilities (within reasonable walking distance). May be more viable than larger sites.

SA Site ID	Site Ref	Site name	Allocated	Rationale
14	36/3	Sherwood Rise (adjacent Queen Elizabeth Academy)	Yes M3 (ac)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to open space. • Close to public open space. • Good access to local facilities (within reasonable walking distance). • May be more viable than larger sites.
15	36/4	North west of Highfield Close, north east of Queen Elizabeth Academy playing fields	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performs generally well, but would cause an unacceptable loss of open space.
22	34/1	Radmanthwaite Road / Oxclose Lane	Yes M3 (af)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to open space. • Close to public open space. • Good access to local community facilities (within reasonable walking distance)
24	34/3	East and south east of Radmanthwaite Farm, north east of Millenium Business Park	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unacceptable impact on landscape due to topography.
35	33/1	Ruskin Road adjacent the MARR	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone could have negative effects. • Not required to meet housing needs.
37	33/2	Adjacent MARR South West of Wilson Street	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone could have negative effects. • Not required to meet housing needs.
42	33/3	Adjacent MARR opposite entrance to Hillmoor Street	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone could have negative effects. • Not required to meet housing needs.
39	33/4	North west of Wharmby Avenue & Wilson Street	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small part of the site is identified by the Coal Authority as a high risk area. • Not required to meet housing needs.
44	17/1	Land rear of Edmonton Road South of B6030	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to the boundary of potential SPA boundaries, HRA suggests to avoid allocation here.

SA Site ID	Site Ref	Site name	Allocated	Rationale
46	17/3	Fields south east of Crown Farm island	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small part of the site is identified by the Coal Authority as a high risk area. • Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone could lead to effects. • Within 400m of a potential SPA • Not required to meet housing needs.
48	17/4	Land east of Crown Farm Way bounded by Newlands Drive	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small part of the site is identified by the Coal Authority as a high risk area. • Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone could lead to effects. • Within 400m of a potential SPA • Not required to meet housing needs.
45	17/6	Small paddock to east of Newlands Road	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not large enough to provide affordable housing (based on threshold of 15). • Within a SSSI risk impact zone and within 400m of a potential SPA • Not required to meet housing needs.
56	23/1	Land to the north of Leeway Road and Leeway Close, Rainworth	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone • Within 400m of a potential SPA • Adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site. • Not required to meet housing needs.
54	23/2	Land to north east of Helmsley Road, Rainworth	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone • Within 400m of a potential SPA • Not required to meet housing needs.
55	23/4	Land to the north east of Helmsley Road and south of and adjoining Rainworth bypass, Rainworth	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within walking distance of any community facilities. • Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone • Within 400m of a potential SPA • Not required to meet housing needs.
59	23/6	Land off Helmsley Road, between Heathlands Primary School and Dawn House School	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within walking distance of any community facilities, • Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone • Within 400m of a potential SPA • Not required to meet housing needs.
60	23/7	Land north west of Heathlands Primary School	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within walking distance of any community facilities, • Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone • Within 400m of a potential SPA • Adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site • Not required to meet housing needs.

- 6.3.23 The table above outlines the reasons why individual site options have been rejected or allocated. Certain sites have similar reasons for rejection or allocation due to the fact that they are within close proximity to each other. For example, the rejected sites broadly fall into one of the following three locations. As well as the reasons identified above for each site option, further reasons for discarding development in these three locations are provided below.
- 6.3.24 Site cluster 1: Edge of Clipstone Village (Sites 44, 45, 46, 48) - Two sites were proposed for allocation in this area. The HRA identifies that these should not have significant effects on the potential SPA. However, further allocations could lead to cumulative effects.
- 6.3.25 Site cluster 2: Edge of Rainworth (Sites 54, 55, 56, 59, 60) - Two sites were proposed for allocation in this area. The HRA identifies that these should not have significant effects on the potential SPA. However, further allocations could lead to cumulative effects.
- 6.3.26 Site cluster 3: West of Chesterfield Road North (Sites 35, 37, 39, 42) – These sites fall within an SSSI impact zone and cumulative effects of further development could occur. Additional sites in this area have not been allocated as housing requirements have been satisfied through proposed allocations, and these sites performed less favourably in the SA.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.3.27 Policy M3 aims to direct new housing across Mansfield with a number of sites across the district. These allocations will have a significant positive effect in helping Mansfield District Council reach their housing targets over the plan period. The sites are reasonably sustainably located, either within the urban area or on the rural urban fringe, therefore are placed close to existing amenities.
- 6.3.28 Development provides an opportunity to help improve community cohesion (SA5) as the influx of people and facilities provided can help bring communities together. Depending on the type of housing, there may be potential for local people to get on the property ladder through ‘starter homes’ or to provide new homes for people who need have particular ‘supported’ housing requirements..
- 6.3.29 Although the policy is likely to bring positive effects, there are some negative effects associated with the allocations. It is important to note that biodiversity sensitivities (SA6) will need to be investigated on certain sites, particularly in the south east. There also is likely to be a loss of public open space/green space as a result of the allocations (SA7). These losses would need to be avoided where possible, and replaced and enhanced as part of development contributions.

Reason for preferred approach

- 6.3.30 The councils reasons for allocating sites (or not) is presented in **Table 6.4** and **Table 6.6**.

M4 Allocations for employment land in Mansfield urban area

Alternatives considered

- 6.3.31 A number development site options were identified as reasonable alternatives for employment land within Mansfield.
- 6.3.32 Each site option was appraised against a site appraisal framework detailed in **Appendix E**. A site appraisal summary for each site can be found in **Appendix F**. **Technical Appendix A** contains a detailed proforma for each individual site option.
- 6.3.33 The sites that were considered are listed in table 6.7 below, with outline reasons provided as to why they have been allocated or rejected.

Table 6.7: Site options for employment land in the Mansfield Urban Area

Site name	Allocated?	Rationale
Land off Commercial Gate	No	Too small to allocate. There are access issues and the site has received little interest in development since its allocation in 1998.
Land at Eakring Road	No	Would involve greenfield land release outside of the urban area. Not needed to meet the employment land requirement.
Ratcher Hill Quarry (south east), Southwell Road West, Mansfield	Yes M4(b)	Vacant land adjacent existing quarry related uses. Needed to meet employment land requirements.
Sherwood Oaks Business Park, Southwell Road West, Mansfield	Yes M4(e)	Remaining undeveloped land within an existing business park. Needed to meet employment land requirements.
Land Adj 54 Nottingham Road	No	Too small to allocate. There are access issues and the site has received little interest in development since its allocation in 1998.
Ransom Wood Business Park, Southwell Road West, Mansfield	Yes M4(c)	Remaining undeveloped land within an existing business park. Needed to meet employment land requirements.
Land Fronting Southwell Road West	No	Not needed to meet employment land requirements.
Ratcher Hill Quarry (south west), Southwell Road West, Mansfield	Yes M4(d)	Vacant land adjacent existing quarry related uses. Needed to meet employment land requirements.
Anglia Way, Mansfield	Yes M4(a)	Vacant land within an existing industrial area with suitable access off Anglia Way. Needed to meet employment land requirements.

**During the plan preparation process a number of sites have been removed from the SA process as they have been granted planning permission.*

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.3.34 Policy M4 aims to direct new employment uses to appropriate sites in Mansfield. This should have a significant positive effect in terms of job creation (SA12) and also improve the wellbeing of the community (SA2) through increased access to employment. The scale of the employment sites also increases the likelihood of bigger companies who require high skilled workers relocating to Mansfield. The location of the sites creates the potential for similar industries to co-locate.

6.3.35 This could bring increased innovation (SA13) and lead to more jobs being created. There is potential for the development to become more sustainable with the introduction of a district heating network (SA10) although the likelihood of this is currently uncertain.

Reason for preferred approach

6.3.36 The Council's outline reasons for proposing to allocate sites or not are provided **Table 6.7**.

MCA1 Mansfield Central Area

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives Identified

6.3.37 Whilst the SA predicted that the options to maximise development at the Mansfield urban area showed strong support for a number of the social and economic SA objectives, it highlighted conflicts against some of the environmental ones.

6.3.38 The options resulting in greater urban concentration at Mansfield scored particularly well in terms of ensuring housing needs are met (SA 1), creating high quality employment opportunities (SA 12), developing enterprise and innovation (SA 13), facilitating a modern economic structure (SA 14), and minimising the need for travel (SA 11).

6.3.39 On the other hand, they rated poorly against the objectives of increasing biodiversity (SA 6), reducing waste (SA 9), and minimising energy use (SA 10). The results of the appraisal of Issues EP1, EP5 and SC6 are set out in more detail in relation to the Settlement hierarchy (S3) and Retail areas (S11) policies.

6.3.40 In terms of supporting neighbourhood regeneration the appraisal showed both policy options had positive implications for most of the objectives including the environmental ones such as increasing biodiversity (SA 6), re-using resources (SA 8), and minimising the need for travel (SA 11). Nevertheless, they rated poorly against the Objectives of reducing waste (SA 9), and minimising energy use.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.41 A number of development site options were identified as reasonable alternatives for retail/commercial development within Mansfield central area.

6.3.42 Each site option was appraised against a site appraisal framework as detailed in **Appendix E**. An appraisal summary for each site is presented in **Appendix F**. **Technical Appendix A** contains a detailed proforma for each individual site option.

6.3.43 The sites that were considered are listed in table 6.8 below, with outline reasons provided as to why they were rejected or proposed for allocation.

Table 6.8: Site options for retail/commercial uses in the Mansfield Urban Area

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
Stockwell Gate North	Yes MCA1(a)	Council owned site, former bus station in need of regeneration. Site will meet the majority of the floorspace requirements.
White Hart Street	Yes (MCA1(b))	An area in need of regeneration. Developer interest, application currently being considered.
Clumber Street	Yes MCA1 (c)	Available site which helps to meet floorspace requirements.
Toothill Lane	Yes MCA1 (d)	Available site which helps to meet floorspace requirements.
Handley Arcade	Yes MCA1 (e)	To meet floorspace requirements (lapsed retail permission).
Portland Gateway (a)	No	Long term regeneration project, cannot demonstrate deliverability sufficiently for inclusion as an allocation. To be included as a regeneration area where any new development will need to work towards the regeneration objectives. (Policy reference MCA1 (f)).
Portland Gateway (b)	No	
Portland Gateway (c)	No	
Portland Gateway (d)	No	
Portland Gateway (e)	No	
Former Mansfield Brewery (part), Great Central Road	No	Site in need of regeneration, but not suitable for retail; likely to include employment and residential. To be included as a regeneration area where any new development will need to work towards the regeneration objectives. (Policy reference MCA1 (h)).
Riverside (a)	No	Long term regeneration project, cannot demonstrate deliverability sufficiently for inclusion as an allocation. To be included as a regeneration area where any new development will need to work towards the regeneration objectives. (Policy reference MCA1 (g)).
Riverside (b)	No	
Riverside (c)	No	
Rear of Town Hall	No	Study found that the Council will be less likely to find a beneficial use for the town hall if it doesn't have a car park associated with it
Bellamy Road New neighbourhood parade	No	Location now unclear. May redevelop existing shops instead.
Land off Nottingham Road	No	Edge of centre site which is not required to meet floorspace requirements.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.3.44 Policy MCA1 is likely to have positive effects upon the economy (SA12-14) through the allocation of land for commercial development at accessible locations. Several sites would also help to regenerate brownfield land, which could also enhance the character of these areas (SA7). There are some site specific issues that would need to be dealt with such as surface water run-off and flood risk at 'White Hart', and potential effects on the Conservation Area for the 'Extension to Morrison's' site.

Reason for preferred approach

6.3.45 The Council's outline reasons for proposing to allocate sites or not are provided in **Table 6.8** above.

Recommendations

6.3.46 It was recommended that policy wording for sites was amended to ensure that development 'reduced the risk of flooding', rather than 'not making it any worse'. This change was made and ought to encourage reduction of flood risk, rather than an approach that only seeks to prevent increased flood risk.

MCA2 Town centre improvements

Issues and Options Stage

6.3.47 The Issues and Options Report did not include options regarding improvements to Mansfield town centre.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.48 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.3.49 The policy identifies a range of specific improvements that will be supported by the Council in terms of bringing forward proposals for development within the town centre (SA14). The delivery of these improvements will help to improve the physical environment of the town centre including the historic environment, public realm/civic spaces, the Four Seasons Shopping centre and Beales Department Store. The delivery of these measures throughout the town centre should help encourage new businesses to locate in the area, which in turn will provide job opportunities (SA12).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.3.50 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.3.51 None identified.

MCA3 Accessing the town centre

Issues and Options Stage

6.3.52 The Issues and Options Report did not include options regarding access to Mansfield town centre.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.53 None identified

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.3.54 The policy incorporates measures for encouraging sustainable travel to and from the town centre, including pedestrian and cycle access (via the creation and enhancements of pedestrian and cycle routes) and bus provisions (implementation of bus lanes). This policy should contribute towards promoting the use of sustainable travel when accessing the town centre (SA11), which in turn would minimise energy usage (SA10). The policy should also have an indirect positive effect on the health of those people travelling into the town centre using the new and enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes (SA2).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.3.55 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.3.56 None identified

MCA4 Town centre mix of uses

Issues and Options Stage

- 6.3.57 The mix of town centre uses was considered within the Issues and Options report. The options (which are also relevant for Policy MCA5) were:
- 6.3.58 TC1 A - Maintain a primary shopping area, restricting new ground floor uses to A1 retail, with a balance of uses elsewhere in the town centre
- 6.3.59 TC1 B - Divide the town centre into distinct areas or zones to create a strong identity. Areas/zones to include the primary shopping zone (restricted to A1), secondary shopping zones (which would be the main areas for financial and professional services as well as some retail), a leisure and evening economy zone (concentrating food and drink outlets and other leisure uses such as the museum together), and a retail-led mixed use zone (which could be based around the mixed use scheme proposed at White Hart).
- 6.3.60 TC1 C - Apply a minimum requirement of 75% A1 uses within primary shopping frontages, 50% within secondary frontages, and a balance of uses elsewhere in the town centre.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

- 6.3.61 No further options were identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.3.62 The policy identifies that Mansfield town centre shall be the focus for all town centre uses with retailing being a particular focus within the primary shopping area. Delivery of retailing uses should have a direct positive effect in terms of ensuring residents are satisfied with the level of retail services provided in the town centre. When delivered alongside Policy MCA3 (Accessing the town centre), the policy should ensure that retail uses are provided in accessible locations (SA11). Additional job opportunities should also be delivered in the retail sector through the implementation of this policy (SA12).

Reason for preferred approach

- 6.3.63 The policy focuses main town centre uses upon Mansfield town centre and supports its diversification to help improve its attractiveness as a place to visit, socialise, live and work. It is closely linked to Policy MCA5 which sets out which uses will be permitted in the primary shopping area.

Recommendations

- 6.3.64 None identified

MCA5 Primary shopping area

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.3.65 Please see above.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.66 None identified

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.3.67 The policy identifies that class A uses (shops (A1), financial and professional services (A2), restaurants and cafes (A3), drinking establishments (A4) and hot food takeaways (A5)) should be located in the primary shopping area in Mansfield town centre. The delivery of this policy should help to ensure that residents are satisfied with the level and mix of services provided in the primary shopping area. Furthermore, the delivery of this policy should have a positive effect in terms of reducing the need to travel (SA11) by ensuring that class A uses are focussed within the primary shopping area.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.3.68 There was a need for this policy to be more flexible than the existing policy in the 1998 local plan due to the way that the 'high street' is changing and becoming less focused on pure retail. The policy, which follows Option TC1 C, aims to achieve more flexibility without losing the main retail function of the primary shopping area. The zoned approach of TC1 B, was considered to be too inflexible when it was discussed with town centre stakeholders.

Recommendations

6.3.69 None identified

MCA6 Mansfield cultural hub

Issues and Options Stage

6.3.70 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.71 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.3.72 This policy should have significant positive effects upon the baseline for those objectives which relate to providing opportunities to increase participation in cultural activities (SA3, SA7), and increasing satisfaction levels (SA5). There is also a significant positive effect in relation to SA7 as the policy's aim is to protect and enhance existing cultural assets. There is also a positive effect in relation to providing the physical conditions for a modern economy (SA14) for both options, and no negative effects were found by the appraisal.

Reason for preferred approach

6.3.73 There are a number of improvements which could be made to Mansfield Palace Theatre in order to increase its attractiveness and popularity as an entertainment venue. Having a policy within the Local Plan which safeguards the future use of the Palace Theatre, Mansfield Museum and the Old Library complex and supports their improvement is considered necessary in order to portray a long-term vision for these important facilities. It is also necessary to ensure that other development is not permitted which would prejudice this vision, or restrict access to the buildings. In addition a local plan policy would be able to be used to help justify any bids that are made for external funding if it were to become available.

Recommendations

6.3.74 It is considered that a criterion that encourages improvements to the energy efficiency of the buildings should be included within the policy, as the effect against energy (SA10) has been appraised as uncertain.

6.3.75 Significant positive effects upon SA3, SA5 and SA7 need to be monitored.

MWDC1 Mansfield Woodhouse district centre mix of uses

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.76 The Issues and Options Report did not include options regarding the mix of uses at Mansfield Woodhouse district centre, as it concentrated on the strategic issue of the retail hierarchy.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.77 The reason for the inclusion of this policy at the Consultation Draft stage is to ensure clarity over the role and function of the district centre and what uses are allowed there. One reasonable alternative has been identified as follows.

- Alternative 1 - Allow a range of main town centre uses (at ground floor level) regardless of the percentage of A1 units.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.3.78 The appraisal has found that the effects of both policy options are very similar, and are generally positive. The only difference between the options is that the preferred policy approach includes a minimum level of A1 units in order to ensure that the district centres retain their historic retailing function. This meant that the preferred policy approach was determined to have a significant positive effect upon protecting and enhancing the various assets of the district (SA7) whereas Alternative 1 had an uncertain long-term effect. The only negative effect was recorded against providing the physical conditions for business (SA14). The appraisal found that the existing conditions of the district centres (i.e. small, presence of listed buildings) may over time restrict the ability of businesses to grow. This effect may be lesser for Alternative 1, which is more relaxed about town centre uses.

Reason for preferred approach

6.3.79 It was considered that the preferred policy, (which allows a range of main town centre uses (at ground floor level) provided that the percentage of A1 units does not drop to under 40% of all units) is the most appropriate approach.

- 6.3.80 The district centre already provides shops and related businesses / services in an accessible location, and the policy (with its 40% minimum target for A1 (retail) units) will ensure the centre can maintain its historic role as a retailing centre that serves the daily needs of the surrounding communities, without becoming too diluted by other main town centre uses.
- 6.3.81 The 40% minimum target was determined on the basis that the data held within the Council's Retail Update reports (produced annually) show that the percentage of A1 uses within both Mansfield Woodhouse and Market Warsop district centres are consistently between 45% and 65% over the last six years. 40% was considered to be the most realistic figure to enable a degree of flexibility within these centres. No other target was considered to be reasonable, and therefore no others were appraised.

Recommendations

- 6.3.82 The significant positive effect upon cultural and built assets (SA7) will need to be monitored. A suggested existing SA Baseline Indicator is 'Number of Conservation Areas' on the basis that if the historic retail function of these district centres was to be lost, it could be that they are considered for de-designation in the future.
- 6.3.83 The policy would also be monitored within the Retail Monitoring Report, produced annually.

MWDC2 Mansfield Woodhouse district centre improvements

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

- 6.3.84 The Issues and Options Report did not include options regarding improvements to Mansfield Woodhouse district centre.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

- 6.3.85 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.3.86 Policy MWDC2 identifies a range of measures that proposals for new development will be required to adhere to that should improve the appearance of the Mansfield Woodhouse district centre. These measures should have a positive effect in terms of the well-being (SA2) and safety (SA4) of people when shopping/working/accessing community facilities located within the district centre. The policy also emphasises the need to protect and enhance the historic environment as part of bringing forward proposals for new development (SA3, SA7)

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

- 6.3.87 Not relevant.

Recommendations

- 6.3.88 None identified.

MWDC3 Allocations for retail at Mansfield Woodhouse district centre

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.89 The Issues and Options Report did not include options regarding allocations for retail at Mansfield Woodhouse district centre.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.90 Eight site options have been identified as reasonable alternatives for retail/commercial development within Mansfield Woodhouse district centre.

6.3.91 Each site option was appraised against a site appraisal framework as detailed in **Appendix E**. An appraisal summary for each site is presented in **Appendix F**. **Technical Appendix A** contains a detailed proforma for each individual site option.

6.3.92 The sites that were considered are listed in table 6.9 below, with outline reasons provided as to why they were rejected or proposed for allocation.

Table 6.9: Site options for retail/commercial uses in the Mansfield Urban Area

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
Extension to Morrisons	Yes	No objections from Morrisons.
Land off Station Street	Yes	Council owned site, which would meet the floorspace requirements.
Land off Park Road	No	Now used by a fencing business.
Land Adj Turners Hall	No	Greenfield, difficult to access.
Land off Portland Street	No	Divorced from retail centre, currently being refurbished.
Police Station	No	Unlikely to come forward, pressure on the police to keep the station open.
Land off Vale Road	No	No longer available. Recently developed by a fencing business.
Land Adj The Greyhound PH	No	Now has planning permission for housing, construction has started.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.3.93 Linked to Policy S4, which sets out a requirement for new retail floor space to be provided within the Mansfield Woodhouse district centre, Policy MWDC3 allocates new commercial sites in the centre. This should have a minor positive effect in terms of job creation (SA12) and also improve the wellbeing of the community with the increased local service offer (SA2). It is unlikely to have an effect on the majority of other SA objectives. Mansfield Woodhouse district centre is in a Conservation Area and development within it should be sensitively developed (SA3, SA7).

Reason for preferred approach

6.3.94 The Council's outline reasons for proposing to allocate sites or not are provided in **Table 6.9** above.

Recommendations

6.3.95 None identified.

6.4 Warsop Parish

W1 Warsop Parish

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.3.1 There were no specific options concerning an overarching policy for Warsop Parish within the Issues and Options Report, although the options regarding the distribution of development did consider varying levels of growth there. Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.4.1 The findings of the SA suggested that to strengthen the role of Market Warsop should help ensure that any developer contributions could be maximised towards improvements in the vicinity, and should help to promote the development and growth of social capital across all parts of the district. However increased development levels could put pressure on the natural environment. The SA in relation to the amount of development that is considered appropriate for Warsop Parish has been covered within Policy S4 (Distribution of new development). By looking to strengthen the role of Market Warsop, development within this market town can be seen as being more favourable in terms of reducing the need to travel, compared to development within the surrounding villages. However it is also recognised that residents of Market Warsop are more likely to need to travel further for employment, retail and leisure activities than residents within Mansfield urban area.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.4.2 None identified at this stage.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.4.3 The policy aims to direct new housing, retail and employment growth towards Market Warsop. This should ensure that new housing, shopping facilities and job opportunities are located in a sustainable location that is accessible to people living within Warsop and in the surrounding villages. This should help reduce the need to travel (SA11). The policy also highlights that greenfield land that is currently well used or provides the best opportunities for re-use for leisure/recreational purposes will be protected (SA8). This should have a direct positive effect in terms of protecting open space (SA7) that could be used for recreational purposes, which should also encourage more active lifestyles for people in the area (SA2).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.4.4 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.4.5 None identified.

W2 Allocations for new homes in Warsop

Alternatives considered

- 6.4.6 A number of development site options were identified as reasonable alternatives for housing within Warsop Parish.
- 6.4.7 The alternative site options were established in two stages. Stage 1 focused on the urban area, as this was identified as the preferred spatial strategy prior to housing evidence being updated (and identifying a need for additional housing land). Stage 2 explored site options on the urban fringe to supplement those sites that had already been identified as suitable in the urban area.

Stage 1

- 6.4.8 The preferred spatial strategy at this stage was one of ‘urban containment’. Therefore sites identified as reasonable alternatives at this stage were restricted to all available brownfield and underused greenfield land within the Market Warsop urban area. (i.e. no sites beyond the urban boundary).
- 6.4.9 Each site option was appraised against a site appraisal framework detailed in **Appendix E**. A site appraisal summary is presented in **Appendix F**. **Technical Appendix A** contains a detailed proforma for each individual site option.
- 6.4.10 The sites that were considered are listed in table 6.10 below, with outline reasons provided as to why they have been allocated or discarded.

Table 6.10: Site options for housing in Warsop Parish (Stage 1)

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
Wood Lane (Miners Welfare), Church Warsop	Yes W2(a)	Mixed site of underused buildings that form part of Church Warsop but are currently outside the village envelope. The site is in a poor state of repair and requires redevelopment for regeneration purposes.
Sherwood Street / Oakfield Lane, Market Warsop	Yes W2(b)	Unused greenfield land that is surplus to NCC requirements, has no known use and lies within Market Warsop Urban Area.
Ridgeway Terrace & Other Allotments	No	No longer available but was suitable for consideration as part of the rationalisation of allotments and underused land, within the urban boundary of Market Warsop.
Mount Pleasant Allotments	No	Owners have indicated the site is no longer available. Considered suitable site by officers to maximise urban land and rationalise allotment use.
Moorfields Farm	No	Being dealt with via planning applications.
Robin Hood Avenue	No	Small part of a woodland promoted through SHLAA. Comments from MDC Arboricultural Officer indicated it should be protected as Important Woodland.
Land at Welbeck Farm, Netherfield Lane	No	Considered suitable for allocation as unused land well located for limited development within Meden Vale, but has documented flooding issues and been the subject of long negotiations.
Land at Netherfield Lane	No	Put forward through SHLAA but would create coalescence issues between Meden Vale and Church Warsop.

Stage 2

- 6.4.11 Following the preparation of the updated SHMA (Nottingham Outer Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2015)), it was necessary to identify further sites to meet the Council’s housing requirements over the plan period with enough ‘headroom’ to allow some of the identified sites to be discounted as a result of further more detailed analysis.
- 6.4.12 The Council prepared a Technical Report on Assessment of Locations for Additional Housing Land in Mansfield district. The Technical Report identified, assessed and prioritised urban fringe zones that could be suitable for further development.
- 6.4.13 An estimate of the dwelling capacity of the priority zones in the Technical Report indicated that no more than the upper quartile of zones would be needed to meet the housing requirement.
- 6.4.14 A large scale plan of each of these zones was prepared in order to subdivide them into sites for further consideration. These plans included relevant constraints, such as flood risk areas, local green space, playing fields, wildlife designations, archaeological sites, listed buildings, ground stability and areas of water. Information was also obtained on sites submitted in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), although it was agreed that this should not necessarily imply suitability and that the sites to be considered should not be confined to SHLAA sites.
- 6.4.15 This subdivision resulted in a total of 68 sites of various shapes and sizes across the district, ranging from 0.3 to 18.35 hectares. A desktop exercise was then undertaken by the Council to identify which sites were suitable for development (and thus further assessment). The remaining sites after this process were the reasonable alternatives that were appraised through the SA. For Market Warsop four site options were identified as follows.

Table 6.11: Site options for housing in Warsop Parish (Stage 2)

Site Ref	Site name	Gross Area	Net Area	SHLAA Ref	Yield Dwellings
9/1	Sookholme Lane / Sookholme Drive, Market Warsop	9.01	6.507	10	130
9/2	Stonebridge Lane / Sookholme Lane, Market Warsop	7.27	6.597	9	132
8/1	West of Mansfield Road, south of railway line	12.84	11.786	15	236
8/2	West of Mansfield Road, south of 8/1, Market Warsop	3.38	3.092	N/A	62

- 6.4.16 Each site option was appraised against a site appraisal framework detailed in **Appendix E**. A site appraisal summary is presented in **Appendix G**. **Technical Appendix A** contains a detailed proforma for each individual site option.
- 6.4.17 The preferred site allocations are identified in the table below, including reasons as to why the proposed sites have been selected and the alternative sites have been rejected.

Table 6.12: Site options for housing in Warsop Parish (Stage 2) – Rationale

SA Site ID	Site Ref	Site name	Allocated	Rationale
40	9/1	Sookholme Lane / Sookholme Drive, Market Warsop	Yes W2(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets the specific housing needs of Warsop Parish and provide some headroom capacity. Good access to local facilities (walking distance).
41	9/2	Stonebridge Lane / Sookholme Lane, Market Warsop	Yes W2(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets the specific housing needs of Warsop Parish, and provides some headroom capacity. Good access to local facilities (walking distance).
68	8/1	West of Mansfield Road, south of railway line	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not within reasonable walking distance of any community facilities. The railway line forms a strong defensible boundary that would be lost. The scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone and within 5km of a SAC and a future pSPA. Effects on landscape character. Further housing not needed above allocated sites.
66	8/2	West of Mansfield Road, south of 8/1, Market Warsop	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale of housing proposed within the SSSI impact risk zone and within 5km of a SAC and a future pSPA. The railway line forms a strong defensible boundary that would be lost. Impact on landscape character. Further housing not needed above allocated sites.

Summary of sustainability appraisal

- 6.4.18 The policy allocates new housing at four sites in Market Warsop. This will have a positive effect in helping the Council reach their housing targets over the plan period (SA1). The sites are sustainably located within the urban area and well placed to existing amenities, although one site would lose open space as a result of development. Depending on the type of housing, there may also be potential for local people to get on the property ladder (affordable housing) or to provide specialist homes.
- 6.4.19 Development of these sites will support new or enhanced health and education facilities through Section 106 contributions. This will help to ensure that new and existing residents are well served by essential services (SA2).
- 6.4.20 Given the proximity of these sites to the Hills and Holes and Sookholme Brook SSSI, there is potential for negative effects on biodiversity (SA6) due to the loss of green/open space between the River Maun and the urban area. It will be necessary to secure a large habitat buffer between the development and the SSSI to the West, and where possible seek to enhance green infrastructure (SA7) as the sites both fall within a Calcareous Natural Grassland Opportunity Area, and are adjacent to Wetland Opportunity Areas.
- 6.4.21 The potential for effects on landscape will also need to be addressed as well as managing areas of low water permeability (SA8).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.4.22 The Council's outline reasons for allocating sites or not at stage 1 and stage 2 is provided in the preceding tables.

Recommendations

6.4.23 It will be necessary to secure a large habitat buffer between the development of sites adjacent to the Hills and Holes and Sookholme Brook SSSI.

6.4.24 Seek to enhance green infrastructure on allocated sites which fall within a Calcareous Natural Grassland Opportunity Area, and / or adjacent to Wetland Opportunity Areas.

W3 Proposed allocations for employment land in Warsop ParishAlternatives considered

6.4.25 Three development site options were identified as reasonable alternatives for employment land within Warsop Parish. The two allocated sites are both previously developed and were known to be vacant.

6.4.26 Each site option was appraised against a site appraisal framework detailed in **Appendix E**. A site appraisal summary is presented in **Appendix F**. **Technical Appendix A** contains a detailed proforma for each individual site option.

6.4.27 The sites that were considered in the SA are listed below, with outline reasons provided as to why they have been allocated or discarded.

Table 6.12: Site options for employment in Warsop Parish

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
Mansfield Road (former railway station), Market Warsop	Yes W3(a)	Vacant land adjacent former Market Warsop Station. Needed to meet employment land requirements.
Oakfield Lane (land adjacent recycling depot), Market Warsop	Yes W3(b)	Land lastly used in part for tyre storage, adjacent to an existing household recycling depot. Needed to meet employment land requirements.
Land off Netherfield Lane	No	Site is partly covered by flood zones 2 & 3, and is in an area at risk from flooding. In line with the NPPF the application of the sequential test is required. In this regard, it is considered there are other reasonably available sites appropriate for allocation for B class uses in Warsop Parish with a lower probability of flooding.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.4.28 The policy aims to direct new employment to sites to Market Warsop. This should have a significant positive effect in terms of job creation (SA12) and also improve the wellbeing of the community (SA2) with the increased access to jobs. Development of the sites should secure remediation of potential contamination (SA7-8) as well as ensuring that infrastructure exists to support future economic activity (SA14). Effects on biodiversity (SA7) are unclear - whilst there are designated sites nearby, effects would be indirect, and there may also be potential for ecological enhancement as part of development agreements. It is anticipated that potential negative effects on landscape character (SA7-8) could be mitigated through the application of Policy NE1.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.4.29 See rationale presented in **Table 6.12** above.

Recommendations

6.4.30 Include biodiversity enhancement within policy requirements / design briefs for allocated sites.

WDC1 Market Warsop district centre mix of uses**Issues and Options Stage**Alternatives considered

6.4.31 The Issues and Options Report did not include options regarding the mix of uses at Market Warsop district centre, as it concentrated on the strategic issue of the retail hierarchy.

Consultation Draft StageAlternatives considered

6.4.32 The reason for the inclusion of this policy at the Consultation Draft stage is to ensure clarity over the role and function of the district centre and what uses are allowed there. One reasonable alternative has been identified as follows.

- Alternative 1 - Allow a range of main town centre uses (at ground floor level) regardless of the percentage of A1 units.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.4.33 The policy identifies the need to deliver town centre uses in Market Warsop district centre (retail, non-retail services (banks, building societies, restaurants and takeaways) and local public facilities (doctor's surgery, dentist, opticians, post office and library), whilst ensuring that the percentage of retail units remains above 40%. The delivery of this policy should contribute towards ensuring that sufficient community and retail facilities and services are delivered throughout Market Warsop for the local population and surrounding villages. In turn, this policy should reduce the need to travel (SA11) in order to access key community and retail facilities and services; and new employment opportunities will be delivered (SA12).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.4.34 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.4.35 None identified.

WDC2 Market Warsop district centre improvements**Issues and Options Stage**Alternatives identified

6.4.36 The Issues and Options Report did not include options regarding district centre improvements.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.4.37 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.4.38 Policy WDC2 identifies a range of measures that proposals for new development will be required to adhere to that should improve the appearance of the Market Warsop district centre.

6.4.39 These measures ought to have a positive effect in terms of the well-being (SA2) and safety of people (SA4) when shopping/working/accessing community facilities located within the district centre. The policy also emphasises the need to protect and enhance the historic environment (SA7) as part of bringing forward proposals for new development.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.4.40 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.4.41 None identified.

WDC3 Allocations for retail sites at Market Warsop district centre

Alternatives considered

6.4.42 Six development site options were identified as reasonable alternatives for retail/commercial development within Market Warsop.

6.4.43 Each site option was appraised against a site appraisal framework detailed in **Appendix E**. A site appraisal summary is presented in **Appendix F. Technical Appendix A** contains a detailed proforma for each individual site option.

6.4.44 The sites that were considered are listed below, with outline reasons provided as to why they have been rejected or proposed for allocation.

Table 6.13: Site options for retail/commercial use in Market Warsop District Centre

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
High Street (land adjacent Crates and Grapes PH), Market Warsop	Yes WDC3(a)	No objections from the land owner and accessible directly from the high street.
Church Street (car park), Market Warsop	Yes WDC3(b)	Appears to be a suitable site which would meet the floorspace requirements. This is highly visible from the A60 main road, with access also from the High Street. Would be a good location for retail.
Burns Lane / Church Street, Market Warsop	Yes WDC3(c)	Interest from a food retailer, previously had planning permission for a small Tesco store. Suitable and available.
Library and Adj Car Park	No	Not available.

Site name	Allocated	Rationale
The Market PH and Adj Car Park	No	Not available.
Land at G.A. Townroe & Son Funeral Directors	No	Not suitable.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.4.45 Policy WDC3 is likely to have positive effects upon the economy (SA12-14) through the allocation of land for retail development at accessible locations. Several sites would also help to regenerate brownfield land (SA8), which could also enhance the character of these areas (SA7). These sites are within close proximity to a SSSI but significant effects are unlikely given that these sites are previously developed within the urban area.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.4.46 The Council's outline reasons for proposing sites for allocation (or not) are provided in **Table 6.13** above.

Recommendations

6.4.47 None identified.

6.5 Sustainable Transport

ST1 Protecting and improving our sustainable transport network

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

- 6.5.1 Issue ES6 within the Issues and Options Report put forward options for promoting sustainable travel through planning policy. There was also one alternative suggested during public consultation.
- Option A - have a specific policy dealing with sustainable transport to promote public transport and other alternatives to the private car including walking and cycling; *and*
 - Option B - do not have a specific policy on this issue but cover sustainable transport and accessibility issues through criteria within other plan policies;
 - Alternative 1 - Set out transport assessment criteria, and safeguard land required for transport improvements.
- 6.5.2 Whilst these options are useful for engaging with the public on the content and approach to the Local Plan, it is not considered that these options constitute reasonable alternatives in the context of SA. These options are 'procedural', and would not be likely to lead to discernible differences in effects.
- 6.5.3 The Local Plan should be read 'as a whole' and so it should make no difference whether policy principles for sustainable transport are presented in one policy or across several policies.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

- 6.5.4 The policy sets out infrastructure improvement measures that will be supported and encouraged to achieve greater use of sustainable modes of travel. As the district is relatively compact, the main transport routes provide good access to Mansfield, but the routes are at capacity at key junctions. Encouraging sustainability measures to help relieve this pressure is positive. There are no reasonable alternatives to this approach.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.5.5 The policy is predicted to help reduce transport emissions by encouraging and facilitating public transport, walking, cycling and the infrastructure for ultra-low emissions vehicles (i.e. charging points). This ought to have a significant positive effect in the long term on the baseline associated with –transport (SA11) and –energy (SA10). There would also be beneficial effects for health and wellbeing (SA2) by supporting access to green space. There is some uncertainty about the effects on biodiversity (SA6) and built and natural heritage (SA7). On the one hand, development of trails and routes could improve access to nature as well as providing opportunities for enhancement. Conversely, this increased access could put recreational pressure on wildlife. It is likely that other Plan policies would mitigate potential negative effects though.

Reason for preferred approach

- 6.5.6 The preferred policy has been influenced by the appraisal at the Issues and Options stage and most closely resembles Option A set out in the Issues and Options Consultation document.
- 6.5.7 Making the best use of the existing sustainable transport network is an important priority; however the future growth of the district may require improvements / introduction of new sustainable routes and facilities.

6.5.8 The preferred approach would mean that the existing sustainable transport network will be protected, and opportunities to improve the existing or provide new facilities and services will be supported especially along the public transport corridors and in association with the development proposals put forward through the Plan.

Recommendations

6.5.9 The significant positive effects of the preferred policy approach upon natural resources (SA8), energy consumption (SA10) and transport (SA11) need to be monitored. Suggested existing SA Baseline Indicators include:

- Air quality - exceedences of the National Air Quality Standards and Objectives for NO₂ (SA8); Area covered by AQMA (ha) (SA8);
- Carbon dioxide emissions per capita (tonnes per annum) (SA8);
- Amount of energy used by road users from petroleum products (GWh) (SA10); Amount of energy used by rail users from petroleum products (GWh) (SA10); Railway station usage (total entries and exits) (SA11);
- % of people aged 16 - 74 who usually travel to work by car or van (SA11);
- % of people aged 16 - 74 who usually travel to work by train (SA11);
- % of people aged 16 - 74 who usually travel to work by bus, mini bus or coach (SA11);
- % of people aged 16 - 74 who usually travel to work by bicycle (SA11);
- % of people aged 16 - 74 who usually travel to work on foot (SA11);
- % of households with one or more cars.

6.5.10 In addition, another indicator that could be used to demonstrate that the policy is having a significant positive effect upon SA11 would be footfall levels at Mansfield bus station.

ST2 Encouraging sustainable transport

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.5.11 Issue ES6 within the Issues and Options Report put forward options for promoting sustainable travel through planning policy. These options are not considered to be reasonable alternatives in the context of the SA for the reasons set out under Policy ST1.

Consultation Draft Stage

6.5.12 The preferred policy has been influenced by the appraisal at the Issues and Options stage and has evolved from the further consideration of Options A and Alt 1 (see policy ST1) which were appraised at that time.

Alternatives considered

6.5.13 None. The previous appraisal was refined to ensure it reflected the preferred policy, however there were no other alternatives considered at this stage.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.5.14 This appraisal has found that the policy approach would have likely significant positive effects upon reducing the need to travel by the private car (SA11), minimising energy consumption (SA10), and managing natural resources prudently (SA8). In addition, it was also found that encouraging sustainable travel performed well in terms of improving people's health and well-being (SA2), improving opportunities to value the district's green spaces (in particular green infrastructure) (SA3, SA7), helping to reduce crime and the fear of crime (SA4), and improving access to and use of community facilities (SA5). It was also found that the preferred policy would be likely to help to ensure that the physical conditions for a modern economic climate are provided (SA14).

6.5.15 There were no negative effects found although uncertain effects were recorded against some of the environmental objectives where increasing pressure from commuters and recreational users (on areas of green infrastructure) arising from more sustainable travel could cause minor adverse effects upon the natural environment (SA7-8) and biodiversity levels (SA6).

Reason for preferred approach

6.5.16 To encourage and enable the modal shift set out in the policy 'Encouraging sustainable transport' it is important to ensure that a sustainable transport network is in place.

6.5.17 Making the best use of the existing sustainable transport network is an important priority, however the future growth of the district may require improvements / introduction of new sustainable routes and facilities. The preferred approach would mean that the existing sustainable transport network will be protected, and opportunities to improve the existing or provide new facilities and services will be supported especially along the public transport corridors and in association with the development proposals put forward through the Plan.

Recommendations

6.5.18 The significant positive effects of the preferred policy approach upon natural resources (SA8), energy (SA10) and reducing the need to travel by car (SA11) need to be monitored.

ST3 Impact of development upon the highway network

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.5.19 Issue ES6 within the Issues and Options Report put forward options for promoting sustainable travel through planning policy. These options are not considered to be reasonable alternatives in the context of the SA for the reasons set out under Policy ST1.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.5.20 Ensuring that development has safe access to the highways network and does not create unsafe conditions is a standard planning requirement which does not present any reasonable alternatives.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.5.21 The policy is unlikely to have any significant negative or positive effects, as many of the issues would be covered in absence of the plan. However, the policy is predicted to have broadly positive implications for health and wellbeing (SA2), infrastructure (SA14) and community safety (SA4).

Reason for preferred approach

6.5.22 Developments that could make the highways network unsafe would be unlikely to gain permission due to national policy and guidelines and likely opposition from transport bodies. Therefore, the influence of this policy is predicted to be mostly neutral. However, the policy re-iterates the requirement to secure safe developments and the mechanism for achieving necessary upgrades to infrastructure. In this respect, positive implications can be expected in terms of wellbeing, community safety and accessibility.

Recommendations

6.5.23 None identified.

ST4 Parking provision

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.5.24 Issue ES6 within the Issues and Options Report put forward options for promoting sustainable travel through planning policy. These options are not considered to be reasonable alternatives in the context of the SA for the reasons set out under Policy ST1.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.5.25 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.5.26 Without reviewing the Parking Standards SPD it is difficult to predict the significance of effects on the baseline with respect to making efficient use of existing infrastructure (SA11) - which is the objective of most relevance to this policy, although a positive effect is assumed. No significant effects are predicted in relation to the baseline with respect to any of the other SA objectives, although a positive effect is likely in relation to community safety and the prevention of crime (SA4), given that this is one of the stated requirements in the consideration of new parking developments.

Reason for preferred approach

6.5.27 Without reviewing the Parking Standards SPD it is difficult to predict the significance of effects on the accessibility, but a positive effect is assumed.

Recommendations

6.5.28 None identified.

6.6 Climate change

CC1 Climate change and new development

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.6.1 Issue ES5 in the Issues and Options Consultation Document considered ‘using more renewable and low carbon energy’. Four options were presented:

- ES5 A - Develop a district wide CO2 emissions reduction policy target for new buildings.
- ES5 B - Identify local opportunities for decentralised energy to supply new development and develop policies which would maximise any identified potential within specific development areas or strategic sites.
- ES5 C - Use the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards to set higher environmental performance standards for new developments within specific development areas or strategic sites.
- ES5 D - A combination of all policies.

One further option was identified through consultation:

- ES5 Alternative 1 - Encourage the development of renewable energy on farms and former colliery sites

6.6.2 These options are not mutually exclusive, and therefore are not considered to be ‘alternative approaches’ to policy development. Nevertheless, an appraisal of the merits of each approach was undertaken to help inform policy development.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.6.3 The appraisal found that all of the options had positive implications for the environmental SA objectives with which they had a direct relationship with, namely the objectives to minimise energy usage and to develop the district’s renewable energy resource (SA10), and to manage prudently the natural resources of the district including water (and associated flooding and quality issues), air quality, soils and minerals (SA8).

6.6.4 In addition, it found that all of the options work positively towards the objectives to improve health (SA2) and protect and enhance the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environmental and archaeological assets of the district (SA7), based mainly upon the consequential positive effects such policies would have upon local air quality.

6.6.5 On the other hand, the appraisal found that the options pushing higher building performance standards rated poorly against the SA objective related to housing (SA1). This is because of the likely negative effects of higher standards on overall development costs and the knock-on effects for the delivery of housing.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.6.6 The NPPF requires that Local Plans should be prepared to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change. A business as usual approach is therefore not considered to be reasonable.

6.6.7 The Government has made it clear that the energy performance of new developments will be delivered through national standards (i.e. building regulations) and not through Local Plan policies. This makes options ES5(A) and ES5(C) (proposed at issues and options stage) unreasonable approaches.

6.6.8 Policy CC2 has been developed in the context of the Government Housing Standards review, whilst seeking to deliver the principles of planning for a low carbon economy set out in the NPPF. The policy therefore focuses on the role that planning can play in delivering low carbon development (for example support for decentralised energy schemes).

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.6.9 The policy approach is likely to have a positive effect on energy (SA10), waste (SA9) and natural resources (SA8) by minimising the requirement for resource use. There could also be positive effects on the built and natural environment (SA7-8) by helping to enhance green infrastructure and create more resilient developments.

Reason for preferred approach

6.6.10 Mitigating and adapting to climate change is an international and national priority, however as stated above, much of the control over energy, water and other sustainability aspects are matters for building regulations – outside the remit of planning. The preferred approach is for the local plan to influence the design of new development and to encourage applicants to adopt good practice in meeting the challenge of climate change.

Recommendations

6.6.11 It is unclear how viability will be taken into account when delivering this policy. At present the policy 'requires' developers to achieve a range of sustainability measures. The extent to which this is balanced against the need for viable developments and other plan requirements (such as affordable housing) is not alluded to. It would be useful to add some clarification on this matter to increase certainty that negative effects on housing delivery would not occur. For example, the following addition (underlined) could be made to policy wording.

In order to mitigate against and adapt to climate change new development will be required (subject to viability) to:

CC2 Standalone and community-wide energy generation

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.6.12 Options for 'using more renewable and low carbon energy' were presented in the Issues and Options Consultation Document (as described above under CC1). However, the focus of these options was on reducing carbon emissions from new development (rather than standalone energy generation schemes).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.6.13 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.6.14 The policy provides support for the delivery of renewable energy development in suitable locations throughout Mansfield district, with a particular emphasis on community led-schemes. This should have a positive effect on health and wellbeing (SA2) for certain communities by helping to provide heat and power locally at a favourable rate. It should also encourage community groups to work together to bring forward proposals, which is a positive effect in relation to community development (SA5). In terms of

renewable energy generation (SA10), the policy ought to have a positive effect in the longer term as installed capacity increases. This should have positive effects for the economy (SA14) by helping to move towards a more resilient energy network to support modern business. Although the NPPF requires that energy schemes provide protection for a range of environmental factors, this policy is more locally specific by referring to the need to respect 'the local landscape character'; this should help to ensure that landscapes of local value are protected, which should have a positive effect on the natural and built environment (SA7).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.6.15 The policy approach has been developed in-line with the principles set out within the NPPF (Para 97) and locally specific evidence such as the East Midlands Low Carbon Energy Opportunities Report (2011).

Recommendations

6.6.16 Recommendations were made as follows, with actions taken as appropriate:

- The policy could be improved through a requirement for proposals to incorporate measures to enhance biodiversity (where appropriate). - This suggestion was worked into the policy to ensure a more proactive approach to managing biodiversity and landscape.
- Decommissioning arrangements should also consider the previous use of land and whether it can be returned to its former use if appropriate. The supporting text to the policy now clarifies this issue.

CC3 Flood risk

Issues and Options Stage

6.6.17 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.6.18 The broad principles of flood risk management and sequential testing are set out in the NPPF. There are no reasonable alternatives to this approach.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.6.19 The policy broadly reflects national guidance (NPPF and NPPG) on managing flood risk in considering proposals for development (SA8). The policy sets out the need for site-specific flood risk assessments to be prepared for all applicable developments in areas likely to flood.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.6.20 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.6.21 None identified

CC4 Impact of development on water**Issues and Options Stage**

6.6.22 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft StageAlternatives considered

6.6.23 None identified

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.6.24 The policy incorporates a range of measures that are aimed at managing and conserving water and improving water quality in bringing forward development. The implementation of this policy is likely to have a direct positive effect in terms of ensuring no deterioration in and improvements in water quality across Mansfield District (SA8).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.6.25 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.6.26 None identified

6.7 Natural environment

NE1 Landscape character

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.7.1 Issue ES2 in the Issues and Options Consultation Document considered landscape character. Five options were presented:

- ES2 A - Assess the protection and enhancement of all areas within the district through the district's Landscape Character Assessment approach and relevant development.
- ES2 B - Assign additional protection and / or enhancement to specific landscape areas of the district with respect to preventing coalescence between settlements.
- ES2 C - Assign additional protection and / or enhancement requirements specific to landscape areas and / or features associated with the Sherwood Forest Regional landscape character area e.g. heathland, forest pasture and / or other landscapes and landscape features of historical importance.
- ES2 D - Assign additional protection and / or enhancement requirements specific to development within the urban fringe and identified green corridors.
- ES2 E - A combination of all options.

6.7.2 A further two options were identified through consultation as follows:

- ES2 Alternative 1 - A combination of ES2 A and ES2 B
- ES2 Alternative 2 - A combination of ES2 A, ES2 B and ES2 C

Summary of sustainability appraisal

6.7.3 The appraisal of this issue illustrated that all the options broadly perform the same – which could be expected given their similar nature. Overall, each option is predicted to score well, having a number of significant positive effects against environmental objectives. The options perform poorer against objectives in relation to meeting housing needs (SA1) and providing land for modern businesses (SA14). This is due to the fact that they would restrict the amount of land available for development. However, the spatial strategy already places 'restrictions' on development that could affect landscape by seeking to maximise development in the urban areas.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.7.4 Building upon the options and appraisals undertaken at Issues and Options stage, two alternatives were identified at Consultation Draft Stage.

- Alternative 1 – Take a sequential approach to landscape character protection.
- Alternative 2 - Do not take a sequential approach to landscape character protection.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.7.5 The proposed policy approach is likely to have positive effects upon biodiversity (SA6), the built and natural environment and green spaces (SA7) by protecting the natural environment. The alternative approach would have a more significant positive effect as it would protect the most sensitive areas and seeking enhancement where possible. The alternative approach would therefore have a more positive effect on health and wellbeing (SA2).
- 6.7.6 The effects on housing (SA1) and employment (SA12) are not considered to be significant given that the strategy is one of urban containment. However, the preferred approach is likely to be less restrictive with regards to housing and employment development. There is uncertainty about these effects though.

Reason for preferred approach

- 6.7.7 The preferred approach takes account of the fact that the Landscape Character Assessment does not specifically rule out development within the most sensitive policy zones, which makes it difficult to justify a sequential approach to development. The policy therefore seeks that development is appropriately designed and that defined landscape actions for the relevant area are met.

Recommendations

- 6.7.8 None identified.

NE2 Green Infrastructure

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

- 6.7.9 Issue ES1 of the Issues and Options Report set out two options in relation to strategic green infrastructure..

These options were:

- Option ES1A - Identify strategic areas, corridors and linkages as part of a combined strategic green infrastructure network within which development will not be permitted where it causes loss or damage to acknowledged GI interests;
- Option ES1B - In addition to Option A, seek to protect and enhance all GI assets, wherever they are.

Summary of sustainability appraisal

- 6.7.10 Protecting and enhancing green infrastructure (GI) is an important component of achieving sustainable development. The appraisal recognises that both policy options would have positive implications with regards to health and well-being (SA2), protecting and enhancing the district's heritage and biodiversity (SA3, SA6), addressing climate change (SA8, SA10), managing natural resources (SA8) and improving sustainable transport options (SA11).
- 6.7.11 By solely relying on a strategic approach to GI (for protection and enhancement), this could limit the ability to efficiently protect natural and cultural resources and reduce health inequalities, as environmental assets at a more local level (neighbourhood scale) may be left unprotected. Conversely, it is recognised that protection of green infrastructure, in any form, may limit where development could be built, thus potentially affecting housing and employment development in the district. These effects depend on capacity within the urban area and outside the strategic GI network, to meet development needs (e.g. housing numbers).

- 6.7.12 The Local Plan plays an important role in helping to guide new development to the most sustainable locations within the district and encouraging the effective use of land through the use of previously developed sites and land of lesser environmental value. A strategic green infrastructure network helps inform this.
- 6.7.13 The appraisal also recognises that development contributions are important sources for funding enhancements to the GI network; development provides the opportunity to facilitate investment of new and enhanced green infrastructure. Conversely, seeking contributions may affect the financial viability of a development, as green infrastructure is one of a number of contributions sought from development; the overall impact of requesting a varied number of financial contributions was uncertain at this stage. However this conflict could be addressed through a 'Contributions Policy'.
- 6.7.14 Overall, a balance must be struck between protecting the most important areas of GI and improving the quality and function of GI assets and linkages within neighbourhoods. At the same time, a policy needs to recognise a balanced approach to development.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

- 6.7.15 At this stage no further alternatives were identified. The approach evolved from the consideration of the alternatives described above at the issues and options stage.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.7.16 This appraisal has found that the preferred approach would have a significant positive effect upon both biodiversity (SA6) and built and natural assets (SA7) as it should help to protect the GI network, and seek its enhancement through development. There are also a number of positive effects predicted upon health (SA2), society (SA5), natural resources (SA8) and transport (SA11).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

- 6.7.17 In order that the Local Plan addresses the issues raised by the sustainability appraisal, the decision was made to combine various options to inform the 'preferred' option. The new approach most closely resembles Option B at the issues and options stage, but it was considered important to include elements of Option A as well as responding to new evidence and policy developments.

Recommendations

- 6.7.18 None identified.

NE3 Protection of community open space**NE4 Protection of allotments****NE5 Protection of local green space****Issues and Options Stage**Alternatives identified

6.7.19 At issues and options stage, the protection of community open space was covered by issue SC4 'Providing for open space, sport and recreation'. Two options were presented in the consultation document as follows.

- Option SC4 A - Protect as much of our existing open space, sport and recreational facilities as possible.
- Option SC4 B - Utilise funding from the sale of certain poorer quality sites, or parts of sites, to improve the remaining area or nearby areas, concentrating on quality not quantity of provision.

6.7.20 Two further options were identified through consultation:

- SC4 Alt 1 - Identify any over-provision of sites against provision standards, with any funding raised used to improved areas in greatest need, or where there is potential to link sites (in-line with GI principles).
- SC4 Alt 2 - Improve the provision of open space, sport and recreation at all possible opportunities.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.7.21 Options SC4 A and SC4 Alt 2 involved both protecting as much open space as possible, and improving as much open space as possible. Both options were found to have significant negative effects upon meeting the housing needs of the district (SA1), efficient use of the transport network (SA11), high quality job opportunities (SA12), enterprise and innovation (SA13) and physical conditions for a modern economic structure (SA14) due to the fact that they restrict the amount of land within the urban area which could be used for development purposes (even if it is currently underutilised). Conversely, these options were also predicted to have a number of significant positive effects. These included the fact that protecting / improving as much open space as possible should help to ensure there are opportunities for physical recreation to help increase the health and wellbeing of the District's residents (SA2). SC4 Alt 2 was also predicted to have a significant positive effect as improvements made to open spaces (SA3) are likely to encourage more use and more opportunities for people to enjoy them. (This was also the case with Option SC4 C and SC4 Alt 1). Option SC4 A was predicted to have significant positive effects upon biodiversity (SA6), natural and cultural assets (SA7) and natural resources (SA8) which all aim to protect various elements of the natural environment. (The business as usual approach also had the same effect on SA7 and SA8). Finally, a significant positive effect was recorded against making efficient use of the transport network (SA11). This is because the release of surplus open spaces could result in sustainably located development, with improvements made to green infrastructure linkages.

Consultation Draft StageAlternatives considered

6.7.22 The preferred approaches were influenced by the appraisal of broad options at issues and options stage as described above. There are no further alternatives to the principle of protecting and enhancing open space, sport, leisure and recreation facilities.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.7.23 *Policy NE3* - By protecting places where residents can enjoy open space, the policy ought to have beneficial effects for health and wellbeing (SA2), access to open space (SA3) and social capital (SA5). There could also be positive implications in terms of providing habitat for biodiversity (SA6), environmental protection (SA8) and maintaining the openness of built environments (SA7). These effects are more uncertain though. Given that the focus of the policy is on preventing the loss of existing open space, the policy is not likely to have a significant effect in terms of enhancement.
- 6.7.24 *Policy NE4* - The Protection of Allotments policy is unlikely to have an effect on the baseline for the majority of the SA objectives. However, it ought to have a positive effect on providing the opportunity to enjoy green space (SA3), health and wellbeing (SA2) promoting social capital (SA5) and landscape (SA7). The policy also allows for development of allotments, not just protection, which should ensure the positive effects continue in the medium to long term as well.
- 6.7.25 Requiring allotment plots to be provided on site or within a 15 minute walk is beneficial as it ensures that communities that stand to lose the facilities are not adversely affected. Allowing for provision to be met offsite away from the affected communities may be more flexible, but it would be less beneficial in terms of community development.
- 6.7.26 *Policy NE5* - Due to its' focused nature, the Protection of Local Green Space policy is unlikely to have an effect on the baseline for the majority of the SA objectives. However, it ought to have a positive effect on providing the opportunity to enjoy green space (SA3), promoting social capital (SA5), biodiversity (SA6), landscape (SA7) and travel (SA11).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

- 6.7.27 The preferred policies were influenced by the SA undertaken at issues and options stage as described above.

Recommendations

- 6.7.28 None identified.

NE6 Protection of trees

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.7.29 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.7.30 Alternative 1 - Do not have a specific tree policy. Rely upon NPPF and other national guidance relating to protected trees.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.7.31 The policy would have significant positive effects upon green spaces and culture (SA3) and built and natural assets (SA7). The policy is also considered to have a positive effect on biodiversity (SA6) and natural resources (SA8). Negative effects are predicted in relation to employment (SA12) and business land and infrastructure (SA14) as there is the possibility that the protection of trees could act as a constraint on land for business development, Alternative 1 is unlikely to have significant effects on the baseline, as it essentially represents the baseline position (i.e. what would be likely to happen anyway in the absence of a Plan Policy on protecting trees).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.7.32 The preferred policy would ensure that inappropriate arboricultural procedures which would harm the visual appearance and long term life expectancy of protected trees can be resisted, as well as the removal of protected trees without sufficient arboricultural justification. This will help to maintain the special character and appearance of conservation areas and other parts of the district where streetscape is characterised by visually attractive mature trees. In addition, the preferred approach will ensure that, where appropriate, replacement trees are planted in lieu of trees that are felled as part of a development.

Recommendations

6.7.33 None identified.

NE7 Biodiversity**NE8 Protection of designated biodiversity and geodiversity sites****Issues and Options Stage**Alternatives identified

6.7.34 At issues and options stage, the approach to biodiversity was covered by issue ES4. Four options were presented in the consultation document as follows.

- ES4 A - Provide policies for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity within an overarching green infrastructure policy which focuses primarily on designated sites and identified habitat areas and corridors.
- ES4 B - In addition to ES4 A, provide criteria based policies for protecting and enhancing biodiversity within the urban and urban-fringe areas.
- ES4 C - In addition to ES4 A, provide criteria based policies to ensure new developments produce a demonstrable gain of biodiversity by ensuring that local biodiversity action plan targets / objectives for priority species and habitats are taken into account
- ES4 D - A combination of all options.

6.7.35 Whilst these options are useful for engaging with the public, it is not considered that these constitute reasonable alternatives in the context of SA as they are 'procedural' and not mutually exclusive. Nevertheless, each option was appraised to identify the pros and cons of each approach. This helped to provide input into the approach to biodiversity as the Plan was developed.

Summary of Sustainability appraisal

6.7.36 The appraisal identified that there would be few differences between each option, which is unsurprising given that each has a similar focus on biodiversity protection and enhancement. It was predicted that each option ought to have a positive effect across the majority of SA objectives, with the exception of housing (SA1), as the need to protect biodiversity could make housing at some sites unfeasible. The principle of achieving a net gain in biodiversity is proactive, and ought to have further positive effects compared to the baseline position.

Recommendations

6.7.37 The principle of achieving a net gain in biodiversity is proactive, and ought to form part of the preferred policy approach for biodiversity.

Consultation Draft StageAlternatives considered

6.7.38 The preferred policy approach for biodiversity has been influenced by the findings from the sustainability appraisal at issues and options stage (as described above). No further alternatives have been identified at this stage.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.7.39 *Policy NE7* - The 'Gains in Biodiversity' policy is unlikely to have an effect on the majority of SA objectives. However, it ought to have a significant positive effect on biodiversity (SA6), and beneficial effects on opportunities to enjoy greenspace (SA3) and landscape (SA7). The policy outlines specific requirements for development and offers 'considerable weight' to developments that deliver significant biodiversity gains. The policy also includes long-term measures such as requiring development to be accompanied by appropriate management plans and ensuring resilience to climate change.

6.7.40 *Policy NE8* - The 'Protection of Sites' policy is unlikely to have an effect on the majority of SA objectives due to its specific ecological focus. The policy does not present additional requirements above the NPPF, and therefore enhancement (i.e. a significant positive effect) is unlikely. However, it ought to have a positive effect on biodiversity (SA6) and landscape (SA7) by ensuring that the most sensitive ecological sites in Mansfield are protected (in line with national policy).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.7.41 Policies NE7 and NE8 were developed in light of the appraisal findings at issues and options stage as well as the appraisal of draft policies prepared at consultation draft stage.

Recommendations

6.7.42 Recommendations at issues and options stage were taken into consideration when Policy NE7 and NE8 were prepared.

6.7.43 No further recommendations have been identified.

NE9 Maintaining a clean and healthy environment

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.7.44 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.7.45 The NPPF requires that Local Plans should take into account cumulative effects of air quality and prevent development from contributing to or being put at an unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of air pollution. The proposed policy builds upon these principles.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.7.46 The policy is unlikely to have an effect on most SA objectives due to its specific focus on air quality. However, by ensuring that air quality does not deteriorate, the policy ought to have a positive effect on health and wellbeing (SA2), biodiversity (SA6) and transport (SA11). As air quality is not a major issue for Mansfield it is unlikely that the positive effects would be significant.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.7.47 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.7.48 None identified.

NE10 Land contamination

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives identified

6.7.49 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.7.50 No reasonable alternatives identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.7.51 The policy will ensure that development on contaminated land adequately addresses risks to human health and the environment. Whilst this is positive with regards to health and wellbeing (SA2), biodiversity (SA6), the built and natural environment (SA7) and resource use (SA8) - the effects are unlikely to be significant given that the onus is on developers to bring forward and remediate land for development and remediation of land would be a requirement of national planning and pollution policies. The policy could be enhanced through a more proactive approach that encourages developers to bring forward contaminated sites.

6.7.52 This could be achieved by 'supporting and encouraging' developments that remediate contaminate land, particularly those that incorporate soft end uses and less sensitive uses of land.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.7.53 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.7.54 The policy could be enhanced through a more proactive approach that supports and encourages developments that remediate contaminated land, particularly those that incorporate soft end uses and less sensitive uses of land.

NE11 Statutory nuisance**Issues and Options Stage**Alternatives considered

6.7.55 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft StageAlternatives considered

6.7.56 No reasonable alternatives identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.7.57 The policy is likely to contribute to positive effects on health (SA2) (although this is not considered significant against the baseline). Suitable assessments will be required to outline appropriate mitigation if there are any 'nuisances' or identify if development is not suitable.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.7.58 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.7.59 None identified.

6.8 Built environment

BE1 Protection of the historic environment

BE2 Development within Conservation Areas

BE3 Development affecting listed buildings

BE4 Scheduled monuments and archaeology

BE5 Registered parks and gardens

BE6 Non designated local heritage assets

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.8.1 At issues and options stage, the need to conserve, enhance and manage heritage assets was covered by *issue EP7*. Four options were presented in the consultation document as follows.

- EP7 A - Have one policy which sets out key issues relating to the protection and enhancement of historic assets which must be addressed in all proposals for development which affects Listed Buildings and / or Conservation Areas.
- EP7 B - Have a policy which seeks to ensure that all historic assets within the district (including statutory and locally listed buildings) are effectively protected and managed with a proactive approach to recording, understanding and maximising their potential contribution to the historic environment.
- EP7 C - Do not have a specific policy relating to the conservation and management of the historic environment.
- EP7 D - A combination of options EP7 A and EP7 B.

6.8.2 Whilst these options are useful for engaging with the public on the content and approach to the Local Plan, it is not considered that these options constitute reasonable alternatives in the context of SA. These options are 'procedural', and would not be likely to lead to discernible differences in effects.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.8.3 The overarching policy BE1 is high level and reiterates the NPPF principles of protecting the character and setting of heritage assets.

6.8.4 Each individual policy BE2-BE6 deals with specific types of heritage assets, but the principles are the same throughout (i.e. presumption that assets should be protected and enhanced).

6.8.5 To not protect these assets would be contrary to the NPPF and good planning principles. There are no reasonable alternative ways of achieving these objectives. Appraisal of these policies will ensure that the positives are enhanced and any negatives mitigated.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.8.6 BE1 in combination with BE2-BE6 is likely to have a positive effect on the built environment and enjoyment of culture (SA3, SA7) without affecting the achievement of socio-economic objectives.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.8.7 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.8.8 Policy BE1 was enhanced in light of recommendations made in the draft SA, which suggested there is a need to ensure that opportunities to "better reveal the significance of heritage assets" are encouraged.

BE7 Design of new buildings and neighbourhoods

Issues and Options Stage

6.8.9 At issues and options stage, the design of new buildings and neighbourhoods was covered by issue EP6 '*Achieving design excellence in new development across the district*'. Five options were presented in the consultation document as follows.

- EP6 A - Have a policy which draws together design themes, providing principles which must be addressed in all proposals for new development across the district to ensure it is of the highest quality design which achieves a sustainable form of development.
- EP6 B - Have a number of policies which require high quality design for specific types of new development e.g. housing, industrial, employment.
- EP6 C - Have a policy which requires high quality design in new development which would affect historic assets including Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.
- EP6 D - Incorporate design quality requirements within a wider policy on sustainable development.
- EP6 E - Focus design quality policies on specific parts of the district such as town centre, urban extensions.

6.8.10 One further alternative was proposed through consultation:

- EP6 Alt 1 - Combine options EP6 A with EP6 B, and with EP6 C where a district-wide policy is developed to include specific requirements related to different types of development and historic environment considerations.

6.8.11 Whilst these options are useful for engaging with the public, it is not considered that these constitute 'reasonable alternatives' in the context of SA. These options are 'procedural', and not necessarily mutually exclusive. The specific content of the policy under each approach is not set out either, and therefore appraisal and comparison through the SA would not be particularly enlightening.

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.8.12 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.8.13 The policy is likely to have beneficial effects on the quality of buildings and neighbourhoods, which ought to be positive for the built and natural environment (SA7), health (SA2), community safety (SA4) and accessibility (SA11). Although higher quality development could affect the viability of some developments (SA13), these effects are not anticipated to be significant, and good design ought to attract businesses and residents into the area (though there is uncertainty about these effects).

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.8.14 Not applicable.

Recommendations

6.8.15 The draft policy was amended in light of draft SA recommendations to ensure that developments design for effective waste management that does not have a detrimental effect on the street scene

BE8 Comprehensive development

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.8.16 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.8.17 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.8.18 The Comprehensive development policy is likely to lead to a significant positive effect on housing (SA1) by ensuring that the levels and mix of housing remain appropriate in the event that new or revised proposals come forward. There should also be positive effects on health (SA2) green spaces (SA3, SA7), community safety (SA4) community development (SA5) biodiversity (SA6) heritage (SA7) and accessibility (SA11) by ensuring that committed and allocated development remains well-planned and provides adequate provision for social, physical and environmental infrastructure in the event a new or revised applications.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.8.19 Not applicable.

Recommendations

6.8.20 None identified.

BE9 Home extensions and alterations

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.8.21 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.8.22 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.8.23 Due to its specific and focused nature, the Home extensions and alterations policy is unlikely to have an effect on the majority of SA objectives. However, it ought to have a positive effect on the built environment (SA7) by ensuring that the design and layout of buildings respects the character of the street scene and surrounding areas. The policy will have positive implications in terms of protecting neighbourhood amenity, but the effects are negligible given the limited scope of influence that the policy will have.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.8.24 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.8.25 None identified.

BE10 Advertisements and signposting

Issues and Options Stage

Alternatives considered

6.8.26 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.8.27 The policy is focused on a specific element of planning consent and thus there are no reasonable alternative approaches.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.8.28 The policy ought to have a positive effect on pedestrian safety (SA4), as well as protecting the character of the built and natural environment (SA7). The effects are unlikely to be significant though given the very specific nature of the policy. Although higher quality signage could cost more for businesses, it is unlikely to be a major cost, and hence no significant effects are predicted.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.8.29 Not relevant.

Recommendations

6.8.30 None identified.

6.9 Infrastructure delivery and planning obligations

ID1 Infrastructure delivery

Issues and Options Stage

6.9.1 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.9.2 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.9.3 The proposed policy is likely to generate positive effects in relation to improving the baseline conditions which relate to health and wellbeing (SA2), transport (SA11) and economic infrastructure (SA14). However, in the main, the predicted effects of the policy are unclear as positive improvements would be subject to relevant developments coming forward and the viability, and thus ability of new development to contribute to infrastructure improvements. As the policy lacks detail on the 'appropriate thresholds' that will be applied, and thus the volume of developments which are likely to be subject to the policy, it is difficult to determine the significance of any positive effects. In addition, the policy is high level and non-specific, making it difficult to judge significance.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.9.4 Not applicable.

Recommendations

6.9.5 The policy would be strengthened by providing further detail of what 'appropriate thresholds' are likely to be applied in the supporting text, and what infrastructure requirements are likely to be prioritised over the life time of the plan, drawing on the Infrastructure Study and Delivery Plan. The policy was amended to state that 'appropriate thresholds' are to be set out in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

ID2 Planning obligations

Issues and Options Stage

6.9.6 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft Stage

Alternatives considered

6.9.7 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.9.8 The explanatory text to the policy indicates that the focus of such contributions is very much on addressing immediate site specific issues, which is appropriate for a planning obligations policy. However the scope of the policy could be broadened by giving more thought to addressing the wider determinants

of health and well-being, such as promoting built environments that encourage more active lifestyles or addressing the quality of the public realm to increase the attractiveness of new housing. This would assist to address key issues in the district such as the high levels of obesity and high percentage of early deaths from heart attacks, strokes and cancer (SA2) and the low demand issues in relation to the housing market (SA1). Any positive impacts of applying the policy on the baseline will very much depend on the viability of individual developments to support such contributions over the lifetime of the plan, which is considered uncertain given the current housing market issues.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.9.9 Not applicable.

Recommendations

6.9.10 None identified.

ID3 Local employment and skills initiatives

Issues and Options stage

6.9.11 This policy area was not specifically included as part of the Issues and Options report although it has since been appraised against the SA Framework (during the production of the Local Plan Consultation Draft).

Consultation Draft stage

Alternatives considered

6.9.12 None identified.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal

6.9.13 The policy should improve access to construction jobs for residents (SA12) in Mansfield District, which should have positive effects on health and wellbeing (SA2) and community safety (SA4). The distance needed to travel to access employment should also be reduced, as well as encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport (SA11). Upskilling of the workforce should help to support the enterprise and innovation.

Reason for preferred approach (in light of alternatives)

6.9.14 Not applicable.

Recommendations

6.9.15 The effects of the policy could be enhanced by broadening the scope to include operational stages.

7. Cumulative and Synergistic Effects

7.1 Cumulative Effects

7.1.1 This section sets out the cumulative and synergistic effect of the draft Plan. This is an appraisal of the ‘whole plan’ rather than its individual policies as set out in the previous section (see **Table 7.1** for a summary of the effects predicted for every policy in the draft Plan). This is important in order to identify where the effects of policies could combine to generate significant effects, and where plan policies could mitigate any potential negative effects generated through other aspects of the Plan. It is important to present this holistic view, in order to give a more accurate picture of the significant effects of the Plan.

7.1.2 The effects have been summarised under broad sustainability topics, which align with the SA objectives. To avoid duplication, SA objectives with similar aims have been grouped together under one sustainability topic.

Housing

7.1.3 This section summarises the effects of the whole plan (i.e. *cumulative and synergistic effects*) in relation to ‘housing’; which covers one SA objective as outlined below.

- SA1 Housing

7.1.4 **Significant positive effects** are predicted from the policies focused on delivering new housing, including those allocating sites to meet the quantum of need identified in the SHMA, (Policy M3 – Allocations for new homes in Mansfield and Policy W2 – Allocations for new homes in Warsop Parish), (together these contribute significantly towards meeting the full OAN for the district and thus a significant positive in-combination effect is also predicted); as well as the policies which set the strategic framework for the distribution and promotion of housing delivery. This includes Policy S4 – Distribution of new development, and Policy M1 – Urban Regeneration, which provides support for residential development, both regeneration of the urban core and new-build on the urban fringe. Although not recorded as having significant positive effects on their own, the predicted in-combination effects of Policy S2 - Scale of new development, Policy S3 - Settlement hierarchy, and Policy S8 – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and travelling showpeople alongside the policies identified above, is considered to be a **significant positive effect**.

7.1.5 **Significant positive effects** are also likely to be generated both individually, and cumulatively, by Policy S5 - Affordable housing and Policy S6 - Specialist housing – which seek to improve access to housing, deliver housing to meet specific needs, and improve affordability; addressing the housing needs identified in the SHMA.

7.1.6 In the main, the thematic policies on the natural environment, built environment, climate change and flood risk, and transport; as well as spatial policies for the Mansfield town centre are predicted not to have any significant effects on the baseline for housing, and in the majority of these policies, no effects on housing are predicted.

7.1.7 No significant negative effects on the housing baseline are predicted from any of the proposed plan policies.

- 7.1.8 Minor negative effects have been identified in relation to Policy S13 - Local shops and community facilities and Policy NE1 – Landscape character, due to the slight restrictions the application of these policies may have on housing delivery.
- 7.1.9 However the application of these policies is not considered likely to generate a significant negative effect, either individually or in-combination with other policies.
- 7.1.10 Uncertain effects are predicted from Policy CC1 - Climate change and new development, Policy NE2 - Green infrastructure, Policy BE7 - Design of new buildings and neighbourhoods, Policy ID1 - Infrastructure delivery and Policy ID2 - Planning obligations. These uncertain effects relate to the potential adverse impacts on the viability of housing delivery from applying design and sustainability standards, open space enhancements and other infrastructure requirements. However the impact of applying the plan policies in-combination on the viability of likely developments coming forward in the district has been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Assessment found that the spatial strategy is likely to support delivery of housing targets. However, it may be necessary to reduce policy requirements (particularly affordable housing) where viability is an issue, such as on previously developed land.
- 7.1.11 Overall, the draft Plan is predicted to have a **significant positive effect** on the baseline for housing.

Health and wellbeing

- 7.1.12 This section summarises the effects of the whole plan (i.e. *cumulative and synergistic effects*) in relation to 'health and wellbeing'; which covers the four SA objectives listed below.
- SA2 Health
 - SA3 Access to green space and culture
 - SA4 Community safety
 - SA 5 Social capital
- 7.1.13 **Significant positive effects** on the baseline for health (SA2) have been predicted for Policy S2 – Scale of new development, due to the fact that the Plan seeks to meet the housing, employment and town centre uses needs that have been identified through evidence gathered to support preparation of the Plan. Although no other significant positive effects on health have been predicted, the effects of Policy S1 - Sustainable development, acting in-combination with the strategic housing policies relating to affordable housing (Policy S5), specialist housing (Policy S6), Gypsies, Travellers and traveling showpeople (Policy S8) and rural workers housing needs (Policy S9 - Development in the countryside) are likely to be positive and significant as there is a strong association between housing and health and wellbeing.
- 7.1.14 A minor negative effect is recorded in relation to Policy W2 Allocations for new homes in Warsop Parish, as none of the four proposed housing sites lie within walking distance of a GP, and it is unlikely that the proposed development would mitigate this (i.e. through contributions to a new facility).
- 7.1.15 **Significant positive effects** on the baseline for culture and access to open space (SA3) have been predicted in relation to implementation of policy MCA6 (Mansfield's Cultural Hub) and the in-combination effects of the Built Environment Policies BE1-BE6. Negative effects are predicted in relation to Policy M3 (Allocations for new homes in Mansfield), as a number of the sites are located on former open space, allotments, playing fields, and former school sites. This is also true of one of the proposed housing sites in Warsop Parish (W2(a) (Policy W2) (which leads to the loss of a former community facility). However most of the proposed housing sites have good access to existing green and open space and new development provides an opportunity to enhance existing space, or create more appropriate new open space to serve the new development. The effects are therefore not predicted to be significant.

- 7.1.16 The in-combination effects of mitigation and enhancement on individual sites, coupled with the application of policies such as Policy NE2 (Green infrastructure), Policy NE3 (Protection of community open space), Policy NE4 (Protection of allotments), Policy NE5 (Protection of local green space) and Policy NE6 (Protection of trees) should have synergistic positive effects.
- 7.1.17 The HRA has commented on the strong policy approach to green infrastructure in terms of protection of the ppSPA and SAC from recreational pressure, and thus the in-combination effects of the biodiversity and open space policies should also be positive (provided the mitigation measures identified by the HRA are implemented).
- 7.1.18 No significant effects (either positive or negative) have been predicted in relation to the baseline for SA4 (Community Safety and Crime). However, positive effects are likely through the in-combination implementation of the Sustainable transport and Built environment policies which identify the importance of safety in the design and construction of new development. At the strategic level it is difficult to identify significant effects on this baseline, either from individual policies or in-combination.
- 7.1.19 **Significant positive effects** on the baseline for social capital (SA5) are predicted from Policy MCA6 (Mansfield's Cultural Hub) and Policy S13 (Local shops and community facilities), as these policies facilitate opportunities for local people to meet and interact; and to develop a sense of pride and ownership of local facilities.
- 7.1.20 Positive effects are also recorded in relation to thematic and spatial policies which relate to town centre and other community meeting places, such as the Natural environment policies; which seek to protect community open spaces. In-combination, it is predicted that there would be a **significant positive effect**. There are no negative effects predicted in relation to the baseline for social capital (SA5).
- 7.1.21 At this stage, it is not possible to determine the in-combination effects of Policy ID1 (Infrastructure delivery) and Policy ID2 (Planning Obligations) policies acting in conjunction with those policies which seek to protect or enhance existing cultural, open space or health facilities. This is because the balance between competing requirements for physical, social and/or green infrastructure and the appropriate thresholds are yet to be articulated (these will be set out in a Supplementary Planning Document). The Whole Plan Viability Assessment found that viability is finely balanced, and therefore it may not always be possible to secure enhancements to cultural, open space or health facilities (if these are not essential elements). Having said this, the inclusion of greenfield sites in the draft Plan ought to ensure that viability is less of an issue than a focus on previously developed land only.
- 7.1.22 A wide range of SA objectives are considered under this topic, but overall the effects are predicted to be predominantly positive and significant at this stage.

Biodiversity

- 7.1.23 This section summarises the effects of the whole plan (i.e. *cumulative and synergistic effects*) in relation to 'biodiversity'; which covers one SA objective as outlined below.
- SA6 Biodiversity
- 7.1.24 **Significant positive effects** on the baseline for biodiversity are predicted from the following thematic policies on the Natural Environment: Policy NE1 - Landscape character, Policy NE2 - Green infrastructure and Policy NE7 - Biodiversity. The in-combination effects of applying these policies is also predicted to be significant and positive.
- 7.1.25 Many of the thematic policies are predicted to have no effect on the baseline, including those relating to the Mansfield Central Area, retail policies, policies for the built environment, the strategic housing and employment policies and those natural environment policies which address specific issues such as air quality, land contamination and amenity.

- 7.1.26 However it should be noted that the HRA recommends that further guidance should be provided to prospective applicants in the supporting text for Policy NE9 (Air Quality) explaining that detailed consideration of air quality impacts may be required for projects that would significantly increase traffic flows within 200m of the Sherwood ppSPA.
- 7.1.27 Whilst much of the plan has limited effects on the baseline for biodiversity, the nature of the development strategy and identification of specific sites to meet development needs generate a number of potential **significant negative effects**.
- 7.1.28 The overall development strategy of the plan (Policy S4 - Distribution of new development) is to focus the majority of new development at Mansfield (as the highest order settlement), and to the urban area, reducing development pressure on sites in and adjacent to Warsop Parish which are particularly sensitive.
- 7.1.29 The HRA has concluded that an adequate policy framework is in place (coupled with the planned relocation of the Sherwood Forest Country Park visitor centre) to ensure that a likely significant effect would not arise on the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC. It also found that due regard has been given to the importance of the Sherwood ppSPA and to habitat suitable for nightjar and woodlark outside the ppSPA to ensure that the Council's obligations regarding the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations are met. However, the HRA recommends that eight specific site allocations which lie within 400m of the ppSPA should be subject to application-specific assessment and (where necessary) mitigation, to meet Natural England's recommended risk-based approach. This includes five sites for employment and three sites for housing.
- 7.1.30 Policy M3 allocates sites for housing in Mansfield. Allocated housing sites in the urban area are mostly unlikely to have a direct effect on biodiversity as they are not within close proximity of wildlife sites. However some urban sites abut Local Nature Reserves and there are a number of sites on the urban fringe adjacent to Local Wildlife Sites and / or within close proximity to the Sherwood ppSPA.
- 7.1.31 A number of the proposed allocation sites for housing will also result in the loss of open space, which could potentially have an adverse in-combination effect on the baseline for biodiversity. However the HRA did not consider this to be an issue in relation to the particular sensitivities of the ppSPA or the SAC, and found that the policy approach in the Plan which focuses on the delivery of a strong network of natural green infrastructure in the district, would alleviate recreational pressure on the SAC and ppSPA.
- 7.1.32 Overall, the effects of Policy M3 (Housing sites for Mansfield) are predicted to be negative at this stage, but not sufficiently adverse to cause an issue in relation to the HRA, provided that site-specific assessments are undertaken at the point of application.
- 7.1.33 If appropriate, it will be possible to secure biodiversity protection and enhancement measures through individual development briefs. Recommended mitigation could include improvements to biodiversity enhancement opportunity areas.
- 7.1.34 With respect to the employment land allocations, Policy M4 –Allocations for employment land in Mansfield is predicted to have **significant negative effects** as it seeks to allocate two sites at Ratcher Hill Quarry for B1, B2 or B8 uses (M4(b) and M4(d)). These sites lie adjacent to the ppSPA and could therefore lead to disturbance to birds/wildlife. A mitigating factor is that these sites are already occupied, and expansion is in part onto previously developed land or land being used as car parking. Nevertheless, in order to adopt a precautionary approach, (and in line with Natural England's advice to adopt a risk-based approach to development in the vicinity of the ppSPA) significant negative effects are predicted at this stage by the SA (although not as far as the remit of the HRA is concerned). As identified in the HRA, it will be necessary to undertake application-specific assessments when these sites are brought forward for development, in order to determine the effects more accurately and identify appropriate mitigation.

- 7.1.35 Policy W1 - Warsop Parish focuses the delivery of development land requirements for the Parish within the settlement of Market Warsop, which should help to reduce pressure on sensitive areas of countryside such as around villages to the north east and the north. In the main, the most sensitive locations have been avoided by focusing on urban containment/regeneration. However, sites allocated on the south eastern edge of Market Warsop could have **significant negative effects** upon Hills & Holes & Sookholme Brook SSSI. Policy W2 - Allocations for new homes in Warsop Parish is predicted to generate **significant negative effects** on the baseline for biodiversity due to the location of two of the four allocated sites for housing adjacent to the SSSI. To mitigate this, significant buffers between the developed part of the sites and the SSSI will be required; and opportunities to enhance the SSSI and the buffer should also be pursued, as the proposed housing sites fall within Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. Whilst significant negative effects are predicted at this stage, the identified mitigation could reduce these.
- 7.1.36 Site W2(c) has potential for **significant negative effects** due to the potential effects on designated local landscapes together with the biodiversity sensitivities identified above.
- 7.1.37 Effects on biodiversity from Policy W3 Allocations for employment land in Warsop Parish are currently unclear – the employment sites allocated are fairly small scale, but designated biodiversity sites are located in close proximity. Effects would be likely to be indirect, and there may also be potential for enhancement of adjacent biodiversity opportunity areas through development agreements.
- 7.1.38 The HRA does not identify any sites in Warsop Parish which cause particular concern (i.e. in terms of potential significant effects on the ppSPA or SAC).
- 7.1.39 Taken together, it is not considered that there is a significant in-combination negative effect from the housing and employment land allocation policies for Market Warsop. The picture is less clear in relation to Mansfield, as identified above. The overall in-combination effects of the proposed allocation sites for housing and employment in the Mansfield urban area are predicted to be potentially negative at this stage; though there are some uncertainties (as discussed above) and mitigation measures ought to reduce the potential for significant effects.

Built and natural heritage

- 7.1.40 This section summarises the effects of the whole plan (i.e. *cumulative and synergistic effects*) in relation to 'built and natural heritage', which covers the SA objective outlined below.
- SA7 Built and natural heritage
- 7.1.41 Overall, the effects of allocated housing, employment and retail sites upon landscape character are predicted to be insignificant given that there is a focus on directing new development to urban areas. There are exceptions at sites on the urban fringe such as W2(c), where there could be negative effects in these locations. However, the cumulative effects of such allocations on landscape character across the district are not predicted to be significant given the general focus on urban containment and the likelihood that mitigation will be secured through other plan policies such as Policy NE1 (Landscape Character), Policy NE2 (Green Infrastructure) and Policy BE7 (Design of new buildings and neighbourhoods).
- 7.1.42 Several policies would have a positive effect on built and natural heritage by protecting landscapes from inappropriate development (Policy S9, Policy NE1), enhancing green infrastructure (Policy NE2) local green and open space (Policy NE5, Policy NE3). Together, these policies would combine to have a positive effect on landscapes and townscapes by ensuring that further development is protective of built and natural heritage and secures enhancements were possible.
- 7.1.43 Overall, the effect of the draft Plan on landscape character is **mixed**. Development of greenfield sites could potentially have negative effects upon the character of the urban fringe, but this could be mitigated. In some instances it may also be possible to enhance landscape character.

- 7.1.44 With regards to built heritage, the spatial strategy (including allocated housing and employment sites) has the potential to affect the setting of heritage assets. However, significant effects are not predicted as policies in the local Plan such as Policies BE1-BE7 ought to ensure that any negative effects are mitigated. Development of allocated sites for employment and housing should also help to achieve regeneration on brownfield sites.
- 7.1.45 The Plan contains a number of proactive town centre policies that are likely to secure improvements to the character of the built environment in Mansfield and Market Warsop. This ought to have **significant positive effects** on built and natural heritage in the long term. Improvements to specific buildings highlighted under Policy MCA6 should also lead to **significant positive effects**.
- 7.1.46 Overall, the effects of the draft Plan upon heritage are predicted to be significantly positive, with synergistic effects likely in the central areas of Mansfield and Market Warsop.
- 7.1.47 Although there could be some localised adverse effects upon specific heritage assets, it is likely that other Plan policies would help to ensure that effects are minimised.

Natural resources

- 7.1.48 This section summarises the effects of the whole plan (i.e. *cumulative and synergistic effects*) in relation to 'natural resources', which covers the SA objective outlined below.
- SA8 Natural Resources
- 7.1.49 The draft Plan will support development at greenfield sites, some of which will contain agricultural land / soil resources. The loss of such assets is considered to be negative in terms of land-use. However, the Plan strategy should lead to the remediation of brownfield land, and broadly supports the re-use of land by directing development away from the countryside. Policy NE4 could help to mitigate any loss of soil resources by seeking to protect and enhance allotment provision. The overall effects on soil resources are therefore predicted to be insignificant.
- 7.1.50 With regards to air quality, draft Plan policies ST1 (Protecting and improving our sustainable transport network) and ST2 (Encouraging sustainable transport) are predicted to have **significant positive effects** by seeking to reduce the need to travel and to promote increased use of sustainable and active modes of travel. However, there are some **uncertainties** regarding the likely effect of employment allocations on air quality due to increased HGV movements along strategic transport routes.
- 7.1.51 A number of environmental-based policies in the draft Plan are predicted to have broadly positive effects upon natural resources through the protection and enhancement of open space (NE3, NE5), green infrastructure (NE2) and trees (NE6); as well as requiring SUDs as an integral part of development (CC4). Together these policies ought to have **significant positive effects** on water quality.
- 7.1.52 The cumulative effects of the draft Plan on flood risk are not predicted to be significant.

Resource use

- 7.1.53 This section summarises the effects of the whole plan (i.e. *cumulative and synergistic effects*) in relation to 'resource use', which covers the two SA objectives listed below.
- SA9 Waste
 - SA10 Energy
- 7.1.54 In the main, the draft Plan is predicted to have insignificant effects with regards to waste and energy. Although the Plan supports the growth of housing, employment and commercial development, this is not predicted to have a significant effect on waste generation, or energy consumption.

- 7.1.55 This is because growth could be expected to occur in the absence of the Plan (albeit in a less structured way). In fact, the draft Plan seeks to focus development in urban areas, which ought to be more conducive to efficient waste management (rather than dispersed collection regimes), and could help to support decentralised energy schemes in areas of heat opportunity.
- 7.1.56 There is a focus on sustainable transport throughout the Plan, notably through Policies ST1-ST2, which together could have positive effects in the longer-term with regards to reducing energy use from travel.
- 7.1.57 Although Policy CC1 (Climate change and new development) and Policy CC2 (Standalone and community-wide energy generation) are positive in terms of promoting energy efficiency and low carbon energy schemes, the effects individually and in combination are not considered to be significant, as the influence of these policies is considered to be relatively limited.
- 7.1.58 Earlier stages of the SA recommended minor changes to draft policies that were more restrictive with regards to the development of standalone low carbon energy schemes in the countryside. These changes have mitigated potential negative effects upon energy in this respect.
- 7.1.59 Overall, the Plan promotes a pattern of growth that should help to promote effective waste collection and the use of existing energy infrastructure. Plan policies are not overly restrictive so as to prevent standalone energy schemes being secured in the countryside, but neither are they proactive enough to achieve a significant positive effect on the baseline. On balance a **neutral effect** is therefore predicted.

Transport and accessibility

- 7.1.60 This section summarises the effects of the whole plan (*i.e. cumulative and synergistic effects*) in relation to ‘transport and accessibility’; which covers one SA objective listed below.
- SA11 Transport and accessibility
- 7.1.61 The draft Plan is predicted to have a **significant positive effect** on the baseline position for SA Objective 11. The strategy and supporting allocations direct growth mainly to the urban areas of Mansfield and Market Warsop, which have better accessibility than smaller centres and villages. This ought to ensure that new development is located in areas that reduce the need to travel to access services, goods and employment. The increase in development anticipated is not predicted to have a significant effect on congestion.
- 7.1.62 The Plan also seeks to achieve increased use of sustainable modes of travel by supporting improvements to town and district centres (Policy MCA3, Policy MWDC2, Policy WDC2) protecting and enhancing sustainable transport networks (Policies ST1-ST2), supporting pedestrianisation of town centres, and enhancing active travel opportunities through green infrastructure improvements (Policy NE2). A number of these plan policies would have **significant positive effects** both individually and when applied in combination.
- 7.1.63 Overall, the Plan should help to achieve a positive trend upon the baseline with regards to improving accessibility, minimising the need to travel, and increasing the use of sustainable modes of transport.

Economy

- 7.1.64 This section summarises the effects of the whole plan (*i.e. cumulative and synergistic effects*) in relation to ‘economy’; which covers the three SA objectives listed below.
- SA12 Employment
 - SA13 Enterprise and Innovation
 - SA 14 Modern economy

- 7.1.65 **Significant positive effects** are predicted on the baseline for employment (access to jobs, provision of high quality jobs) (SA12) from the strategic Policy S10 (Safeguarding Employment Areas) and Policy M1 (Urban Regeneration), as well as from those specific policies which seek to allocate land for employment uses, namely Policy M4 (Allocations for employment land in Mansfield) and Policy W3 Allocations for employment land in Warsop Parish). Together, these allocation policies are predicted to have a significant positive in-combination effect on the baseline, as they seek to meet the identified needs for employment land/floorspace in the district.
- 7.1.66 Individually, **significant positive effects** are predicted from Policy S10 (Employment areas), on the baseline for SA13 including the potential to attract knowledge based industries and on providing the appropriate infrastructure to support new technologies and industries (SA14). Policy M1 (Urban Regeneration) is also predicted to have a **significant positive effect** on SA14.
- 7.1.67 Cumulatively, the predicted in-combination effects on the economy from these policies are expected to be significant and positive.
- 7.1.68 No significant negative effects on the baseline for the economic SA objectives have been identified from the policy appraisals. However some very minor short term negative effects have been predicted arising from the application of Policy NE6 (Protection of trees), Policy NE1 (Landscape character) and development management Policy BE10 (Advertisements and signposts), mainly as these relate to imposed costs on development. These effects are not considered significant in-combination either.
- 7.1.69 In combination, Policy S2 (The scale of new development), Policy S3 (Settlement hierarchy) and Policy S4 (Distribution of new development) are predicted to have a **significant positive effect** on the baseline for the economic SA objectives.
- 7.1.70 The thematic policies for the Natural environment, Built environment, Community facilities and Housing will (in the main), have negligible effects on the economic objectives, or where effects are predicted, these are generally positive. The in-combination effects of these policies are not likely to be significant either. However the Mansfield town centre policies are (in-combination) predicted to have a **significant positive effect** and in relation to SA 12 Employment and SA14 Infrastructure.
- 7.1.71 Overall, the predicted effect of the draft Plan on the economic SA objectives is positive.

8. Equality Impact Assessment

8.1 Equality Impact Assessment

- 8.1.1 Public bodies are required to consider and document how they have taken into consideration equality issues in their decision-making. Consequently, an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been undertaken alongside the SA to establish the likely effects on groups with protected characteristics as defined in the Equality Act 2010. These are race, age, sex, disability, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion or belief and pregnancy or maternity.
- 8.1.2 Although there are similarities and cross overs between EqIA and SA, the EqIA allows for a more in depth assessment of the likely effects of the draft Plan on these groups; with a view to minimising negative effects and maximising positives. Consequently, the findings of the EqIA have helped to guide the sustainability appraisal findings in relation to SA objectives relating to health and wellbeing and social capital.
- 8.1.3 A summary of the EqIA conclusions is presented below; including recommendations made in the EqIA and how the Council responded to these when preparing the draft Plan. The full EqIA can be viewed on the Council's website.

Summary of findings

- 8.1.4 The Plan as a whole performs well and promotes equality of opportunity for persons sharing protected characteristics, and supports improved relations between groups and increased community cohesiveness. This assessment identified the following policy areas where there may be an opportunity to further develop the policy to strengthen its positive equality impact. The Council's response to these recommendations is also outlined.
- 8.1.5 **Policy S5 – Affordable Housing.** The policy could be more explicit about the potential implications of off-site provision for communities, including low-income households. It could also include criteria to guide how the split between affordable rented and intermediate housing will be determined on a site-by-site basis.

Council Response - This detail will be provided in the Developer Contributions SPD.

- 8.1.6 **Policy MCA3 – Accessing the town centre.** The policy should be more explicit about how the council intends to ensure easy access for pedestrians and mobility scheme users between the town centre and new edge-of-centre car parks.

Council Response – The policy has been amended (in response to the EqIA) to include *'in accordance with part a.i'*

- 8.1.7 **Policy ST2 – Encouraging sustainable transport.** The policy should be more explicit about what steps will be taken to improve public transport in order to encourage greater use.

Council Response - This detail will be provided in the Developer Contributions SPD.

- 8.1.8 **Policy ST4 – Parking provision.** The policy could be strengthened by including an explicit requirement for new developments to include designated Blue Badge parking spaces. However, it is understood that such details would be provided in the Parking Provision SPD.

Council Response - This detail will be provided in the Parking Provision SPD.

Policy ID1 – Planning obligations. Guidance should be provided regarding when it would be appropriate or preferable for contributions to off-site facilities to take into account both the profile/identified needs of residents of the new development and priority needs for social infrastructure within the district. However, it is understood that such details would be provided in the Parking Provision SPD.

Council Response - This detail will be provided in the Developer Contributions SPD.

- 8.1.9 **Policy ID3 – Local employment and skills initiatives.** The policy could extend the scope of the policy to include operational jobs as well as construction.

Council response – Consideration will be given to this during the preparation of the Local Plan Publication Draft.

9. Next Steps

9.1 Next Steps

Plan finalisation and adoption

- 9.1.1 The Council has prepared a draft Plan in-line with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. Consultation on the consultation draft version of the Plan commenced through 11th January to 22nd February.
- 9.1.2 Though not a legal requirement, this Interim SA report has been prepared to support the preparation of the Local Plan. Comments on the Interim SA Report are welcomed and will be taken into consideration as the Council works towards the ‘Publication’ of the draft Plan (in line with Regulation 19 of the Planning Regulations).
- 9.1.3 The final Plan will then be ‘Submitted’ for Examination in Public (EiP). The Council will also submit a summary of issues raised (if any) through representations at the Publication stage so that these can be considered by the Government appointed Planning Inspector who will oversee the EiP. At the end of the EiP, the Inspector will judge whether or not the Plan is ‘sound’.
- 9.1.4 Further SA work may be required to support the Plan-making process as it moves through Examination (*for examples the preparation of SA Addendums*).
- 9.1.5 Upon Adoption of the Plan, an SA Statement must be prepared that sets out:
- *How SA findings and the views of consultees are reflected in the adopted Plan,*
 - *Measures decided concerning **monitoring**.*

Monitoring

- 9.1.6 At the current stage (i.e. within the Interim SA Report), there is no requirement to identify monitoring measures. However, wherever possible, potential monitoring measures have been identified throughout Section 6 to deal with the effects of specific policies. When the significant effects of the draft Plan (at Regulation 19) have been established, further monitoring measures will be suggested in the SA Report. These measures will then be ‘decided’ at the time of Plan Adoption; being presented in an SA Statement.

Appendices

AECOM
Bridgewater House
Whitworth Street,
Manchester,
M1 6LT

ian.mccluskey@aecom.com