



Allerdale Borough Council

Core Strategy Policy Options Appraisal

Sustainability Appraisal Report

Address: Empress House, 12 Empress Road, Lyndhurst, Hampshire, SO43 7AE

Tel: 023 8028 3226

Email: erin.banks@wyg.com





Document Control

Project: Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal
Client: Allerdale Borough Council
Job Number: A060921-2
File Origin: Z:\Projects\A060001-A061000\A060921-2\reports\Core Strategy Assessment\Final version

Document Checking:

Prepared by:	Erin Banks	Signed:	
--------------	------------	---------	---

Checked by:	Steve Mustow	Signed:	
-------------	--------------	---------	---

Verified by:	Steve Mustow	Signed:	
--------------	--------------	---------	---

Issue	Date	Status
1	30.03.12	1 st Draft issue to ABC
2	24.05.12	Final issue
3		
4		



Contents Page

1.0	Background to the Sustainability Appraisal	1
2.0	Sustainability Appraisal methodology	4
3.0	Development of the Core Strategy.....	7
4.0	Results of the SA of preferred and alternative policy options.....	11
5.0	Conclusions and recommendations	22
6.0	References	24

Table Contents

Table 1.1	Stage B of the SA process advised by DCLG	2
Table 2.1	Allerdale Borough Council Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.....	4
Table 2.2	Key for the Sustainability Appraisal matrices.....	6
Table 3.1	The Core Strategy Objectives	7
Table 4.1	Strategic Policy Options Summary Results.....	12
Table 4.2	Housing Policy Options Summary Results	15
Table 4.3	Economy Policy Options Summary Results.....	16
Table 4.4	Transport Policy Options Summary Results.....	18
Table 4.5	Built Environment Policy Options Summary Results	19
Table 4.6	Natural Environment Policy Options Summary Results.....	20
Table 5.1	Next Steps in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Allerdale Core Strategy	22





Appendix Contents

Appendix A – Compatibility Assessment for Core Strategy Objectives

Appendix B – Core Strategy Policy Assessment Table



1.0 Background to the Sustainability Appraisal

1.1 Purpose of the sustainability appraisal report

This sustainability appraisal (SA) report has been prepared for Allerdale Borough Council (ABC) as an integral part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) process to replace the existing Adopted Local Plan. As a key component of the LDF portfolio of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), the completed Core Strategy for Allerdale will set out a spatial vision and strategic objectives for Allerdale borough, and the strategic policies required in delivering that vision. The purpose of the SA process is to appraise the social, environmental and economic effects of a plan in an integrated way from the outset to help ensure that Allerdale's DPDs effectively guide decision-making to result in development that is sustainable.

It is a mandatory requirement of the LDF process that SA is undertaken on the Core Strategy's draft objectives and draft policies. The first stage of the SA of the Core Strategy DPD was 'scoping', or Stage A. The results of the scoping exercise were presented in a Scoping Report produced by Allerdale in 2006 and revised in January 2007 following consultation. Stage B of the Core Strategy SA began with a SA of the Core Strategy initial Issues and Options Paper (ABC, 2006) using the SA framework developed in Stage A. The Issues and Options Paper set out a number of key options and questions relating to future development in Allerdale. The outcome of the Issues and Options Paper SA was set out in an initial appraisal report produced by WYG on behalf of ABC in 2007.

ABC next produced two discussion papers containing the Strategic Objectives for the Core Strategy and details of the initial Spatial Options: 'From Strategic Objectives to Spatial Options: Discussion Paper 2' (ABC, 2009) and 'Spatial Options: Cockermouth and Post-Deluvian Issues: Discussion Paper 3' (ABC, 2009). WYG undertook the SA of these options and presented the results in May 2010.

Since 2010, the Council has undertaken extensive work in considering the potential policy options that will form part of the Core Strategy. The policy options that have been considered as part of the Council's work have been appraised against the Sustainability Appraisal Framework and the results of this appraisal are set out in this report. The findings of the sustainability appraisal, in conjunction with the Habitats Regulations Assessment and a wide range of other evidence and policy guidance has been used to inform the decision-making in terms of the preferred policy options that are set out in the Council's Core Strategy document.



Table 1.1 Stage B of the SA process advised by DCLG

Stage		SA Steps	Links to Core Strategy Process
Stage B Developing and refining options and assessing effects	B3 & B4	Predict and assess the effects of the draft Core Strategy.	Undertaken after draft Core Strategy has been developed. The Core Strategy will then need to be revised in line with any findings.
	B5	Develop mitigation to minimise adverse effects and maximise beneficial effects.	Undertaken after draft Core Strategy developed. The Core Strategy will then need to be revised in line with any findings.

This report completes stage B4 of the option process as advised by DCLG.

1.2 Compliance with the SEA Directive

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)¹ requires Local Planning Authorities to carry out an SA of all of their DPDs. Local Planning Authorities are also required to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of certain LDF documents under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004). Although the statutory requirements for carrying out SA and SEA are distinct it is possible to satisfy both through a single but integrated SA process. Such a joint approach is advocated in Government guidance.

The combined SEA/SA process for the Core Strategy DPD identifies key social, economic and environmental issues associated with Allerdale and how adoption of the Core Strategy DPD will influence them. It will help to ensure that the significant adverse effects arising from the Core Strategy DPD are either avoided or mitigated. The process will also identify requirements (or indicators) for monitoring the implementation of the Core Strategy DPD following its adoption. Monitoring will identify any unforeseen impacts and inform the next revision or replacement of the Core Strategy and related DPDs.

Revisions to the LDF process as a result of the Planning Act 2008 removed the requirement for a formally staged approach to consultation on the development of DPDs. As such, ABC's decision to consult on the

¹ as amended by the Planning Act (2008)



spatial options can be considered good practice. New Government SA guidance² confirms that DPDs need now only be accompanied by a single SA Report at pre-submission consultation (Regulation 27) and that this report should detail the full SA process undertaken. However, the SEA Directive and SA guidance still require consideration of the significant effects of alternatives(s). For this reason the Allerdale Core Strategy SA addressed not only the preferred but also the alternative policies developed by ABC for consultation in Stage C of the LDF process. We consider this robust approach to be good practice in keeping with the government's approach to encouraging localism.

² Communities and Local Government (2009) Plan Making Manual: Sustainability Appraisal Guidance (<http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pageId=152450>)



2.0 Sustainability Appraisal Methodology

2.1 Sustainability Appraisal Framework and Objectives

The 16 SA objectives used for the SA process, listed in Table 2.1 below, were taken from the Sustainable Development Framework for Cumbria, developed by Cumbria County Council's Sustainability Team. These same objectives have been used by ABC in earlier SA work, and this ensures consistency in the approach undertaken by the Council.

Table 2.1 Allerdale Borough Council Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history.
Effective protection of the environment
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment.
Sustainable use and management of natural resources
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil.



NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste.
Building a sustainable economy in which all can prosper
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities.
EC2: To improve access to jobs.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy.

2.2 Sustainability Appraisal scoring process

In undertaking this SA for the Allerdale Core Strategy DPD, WYG followed the five step process (Stages A to E) set out in current government SEA guidance³ (ODPM, 2005). The outcomes of Stage A were presented in the Scoping Report (ABC, 2006). Stage B involves *'developing and refining alternatives (options) and assessing effects'* and is made up of stages B1 (*'testing the plan objectives against the SA objectives'*) and B2 (*'developing strategic alternatives'*). This report combines both Stage B1 and B2 by presenting the results of the SA of both ABC's preferred and strategic alternative policy options using the SA objectives listed above.

Each option was appraised to determine whether it will result in development that moves towards or away from the achievement of each sustainability objective. In some cases the options appear to have no influence on an SA objective, or their influence on whether or not an objective will be met will depend on how the option will be implemented. This is illustrated through the use of symbols in the Options Appraisal Tables; these symbols are explained below in Table 2.2.

³ ODPM (2005) A Practical Guide to the SEA Directive



Table 2.2 Key for the Sustainability Appraisal matrices

Key			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇦	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse, effects may depend on how the option will be implemented		
↔	No significant effect: neutral relationship with Sustainability Appraisal objective/or very little change to the status quo		

For the purposes of the SA, baseline conditions are assumed to be the 'status quo' for Allerdale. Implementation of the options will result in either an improvement to, or deterioration of, this baseline. If the Core Strategy DPD is not implemented (do nothing situation) then it must be assumed that there will be no change to the current baseline. In reality, however, this would not occur as natural and social processes would continue to operate.

In each table, a short commentary explains the likely positive and/or negative effects that may result from each preferred and alternative option. In addition, where necessary, changes to the options or mitigation measures have been recommended with the aim of reducing any potential adverse effects, or to maximise beneficial effects.



3.0 Development of the Core Strategy

3.1 Allerdale's Core Strategy Objectives

The Core Strategy, as the first DPD of the new LDF, will set out the policies that all other Allerdale DPDs and SPDs will have to conform to. This is because the Core Strategy sets out the overarching vision for future development within the borough and offers guiding policies for how new development could best be implemented. The Core Strategy cannot, however, dictate site specific allocations; these are covered by the Site Specific Allocations DPD and by the Proposals Map.

Following an initial SA and consultation in 2007, refinements following evidence based research and further sustainability appraisal assessment, the Council has developed a series of objectives for the Core Strategy, these are set out in Table 3.1 below. Appendix A provides the compatibility matrix which checks and illustrates the relationship between the Core Strategy objectives and the SA objectives, i.e. to ensure that they compliment each other and do not conflict.

Table 3.1 The Core Strategy Objectives

SO1) Climate Change and Objectives
SO1a) Focus major development in Workington and encourage complementary and additional development in Key Service Centres of Maryport, Cockermouth, Wigton, Silloth and Aspatria. Small scale development will be supported in Local Service Centres with appropriate facilities.
SO1b) Ensure that towns and villages remain sustainable, with a stable and balanced population, accessible and meet a range of community needs.
SO1c) Support and encourage construction methods that seek to reduce energy consumption, use renewable energy sources, minimise waste and encourage recycling.
SO1d) Promote renewable and low carbon energy production in the Borough.
SO1e) Facilitate the best use of land and protect the most versatile agricultural land from development.
SO2) Housing
SO2a) Enable a balanced housing market which delivers a mix of housing type and tenure to meet the needs of all communities.
SO2b) Support housing renewal in Workington and Maryport.
SO2c) Ensure a deliverable supply of housing land which meets the needs of the community and local



economy.
SO2d) Increase access to affordable housing as part of housing developments and rural exception sites.
SO2e) Support independent living for older people and people with disabilities by ensuring housing is adaptable for changing and varied needs.
SO3) Economy
SO3a) Diversify the urban and rural economic base of the Borough to enable a prosperous mixed, low carbon economy, including creative knowledge based industries, specialist engineering, energy and tourism sectors.
SO3b) Encourage the development of business clusters, building on expertise in the energy sector, to produce high value jobs and ensure the timely delivery of essential infrastructure to support economic growth, in particular Nuclear New Build.
SO3c) Promote Lillyhall as a strategic employment site, encouraging the growth of nuclear technology and research clusters while building on its existing education and skills role through the Nuclear Skills Academy and the West Lakes College campus.
SO3d) Provide a wide range of modern, high quality employment sites and premises to meet existing business needs and emerging sectors.
SO3e) Support opportunities for home working, creation of rural enterprise hubs for start up businesses and proposals that contribute to farm diversification.
SO3f) Lobby for improved ICT connections, especially in rural areas.
SO3g) Support the development of further and higher education in the Borough and improve educational attainment and skills to meet the needs of existing and future employment opportunities.
SO3h) Promote the principles of sustainable tourism, the provision of high quality accommodation and attractions, and support key projects such as Derwent Forest, and Roman Maryport.
SO3i) Promote the vitality and viability of town centres, including the night time economy and support the retention of existing rural services.
SO3j) Enable the long term sustainability of the ports of Workington and Silloth by supporting appropriate port related activities and lobbying for improved road and rail links.
SO4) Transport
SO4a) Locate the majority of the development in locations that are accessible by a variety of modes of transport, particularly public transport, walking and cycling and reduce the need to travel.
SO4b) Support essential road and rail infrastructure improvements required to deliver economic growth and nuclear new build.



SO4c) Work with partners to improve sustainable transport, especially between Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres.
SO4d) Improve access to jobs, services, education and the wider countryside on foot, by cycle, public transport and ICT access.
SO4e) Develop and maintain safe, efficient, high quality, modern and integrated transport networks with good internal links and connections to key routes including A66, M6 and West Coast mainline.
SO4f) Enable the delivery of Workington and Maryport Interchanges.
SO4g) Promote the role of Workington and Silloth ports as an alternative means of accessing the area for both business and visitors.
SO5) Built Environment
SO5a) Ensure that all new development meets high standards of quality of design, energy efficiency, safety, security and accessibility, and relates well to existing development, enhances the public realm and develops locally distinctive quality places.
SO5b) Protect and enhance places and buildings of historical, cultural and archaeological importance and their settings.
SO5c) Protect and enhance existing social and community infrastructure, such as education, health, cultural and leisure facilities.
SO5d) Enhance green infrastructure by providing a comprehensive network of high quality open space such as parks, gardens, natural green spaces and allotments.
SO5e) Minimise the risk from flooding, support the incorporation of mitigation measures as part of the overall design solution.
SO5f) Mitigate against the effects of air, water and soil pollution / contamination, and noise and odour nuisance.
SO6) Natural Environment
SO6a) Protect the natural and historic landscape, including Ancient woodland and geological assets, from unnecessary and harmful development, particularly within the Solway Coast AONB.
SO6b) Protect priority habitats and species, notably the Natura 2000 sites from harm and take opportunities to enhance and create ecologically diverse habitats in all locations.
SO6c) Promote opportunities to improve access to the countryside and coast.
SO6d) Ensure high levels of water, soil and air quality are retained and where necessary improved.
SO6e) Promote a comprehensive network of green infrastructure, incorporating multi-functional green and



blue spaces both within developments and linking across settlements and the Borough.



4.0 Results of the Sustainability Appraisal

Using the SA methodology described in section 3.0 of this report, the SA process identified potential social, economic and environmental effects associated with each of the draft preferred and alternative policy options for the topic headings listed in section 3.1. These are detailed within the appraisal tables in Appendix B. A brief summary of the Policy topic areas and how they have performed in terms of the SA are detailed below.

4.1 Strategic Policies

The strategic policies set out the broad overarching framework for the rest of the Core Strategy to draw upon, including sustainable development, settlement strategy and the area based strategies for the main towns within the Borough. The policies under this topic area are:

- S1: Sustainable Development Principles
- S2: Adapting and mitigating the effects of Climate Change
- S3: Delivering a sustainable and diverse local economy
- S4: Developer contributions
- S5: Level of Growth
- S6: Settlement Hierarchy
- S7: Role of Settlements
- S8: Development Limits
- S9: Distribution of Growth
- S10: Area Based Strategy – Workington
- S11: Area Based Strategy – Cockermouth
- S12: Area Based Strategy – Maryport
- S13: Area Based Strategy – Wigton
- S14: Area Based Strategy – Silloth
- S15: Area Based Strategy - Aspatria



The summary of the assessment of these options is provided in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Strategic Policy Options Summary Results

Policy	Options Assessment Summary
S1	The policy will provide an overarching framework for the promotion of sustainable development in all policy decision making for the Allerdale Core Strategy. As a result it performs strongly in terms of the sustainability objectives and as such the preferred option is determined to be the most sustainable.
S2	The policy ensures that the impact of climate change on the natural and built environment is taken into account in all decision-making and therefore performs strongly in terms of many of the sustainability objectives, in particular SP2, EN3, NR1, NR3 and EC2 are all directly supportive of the preferred option. The alternative option relies on national policy and fails to ensure that principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation are fully taken into account in decision-making.
S3	The policy option seeks to provide an overarching economic development policy, to emphasise the importance of economic development towards achievement of the core strategy objectives. In general the policy performed strongly against the sustainability objectives, particularly in comparison to the alternative option. A few small areas of uncertainty were identified relating to the potential impact on landscape and biodiversity as a direct result of new economic development, these will need to be considered in more detail with the findings of the HRA and any direct impacts will be dependent on location.
S4	The preferred policy aims to provide greater certainty for developers relating to planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy, the policy option performed strongly against all sustainability objectives, as there was no reasonable alternative (due to the requirement of the policy being driven by circular 05/2005), the preferred option was the most sustainable option.
S5	In general, the policy options and the alternatives considered raised a number of areas of uncertainty in terms of impact, these include the impact on landscape, biodiversity, capacities of existing facilities, services and utilities, use of land, quality of the built environment and generation of greenhouse gas emissions, however all of these impacts relate more to the final location of development and can be addressed at later stages of the plan making process. The preferred options did identify a number of potential strengths against the sustainability objectives and the alternative options considered and as a result the preferred options were determined to be the most sustainable.
S6	The preferred option for this policy aims to ensure that the majority of development is located within existing urban centres that already provide a good range of services, facilities, employment opportunities and access to public transport. The policy option performed strongly against the sustainability objectives in these respects in comparison to the alternative options. However, again potential concerns were raised over the potential impact of the development on landscape and biodiversity assets, although this was a common concern against all policy options considered, and the preferred option was concluded to be the most sustainable.
S7	The preferred option performed strongly against the majority of sustainability objectives, and it was therefore determined that defining the role of settlements within the Core Strategy would be



Policy	Options Assessment Summary
	the most sustainable approach to take.
S8	Controlling the level of development within and out with the physical limits of the town, identified sustainability strengths in most areas, these included the benefits of ensuring good access to services and facilities, and benefits for emissions and local air quality. Without this policy approach, there were considered to be risks resulting in potential inappropriate development that is out of scale in terms of the settlement hierarchy, resulting in potentially reduced access to services and facilities and therefore an increased need to travel.
S9	A policy addressing the distribution of growth across the Borough, identified sustainability strengths in most areas. These included the benefits of ensuring good access to services and facilities, and benefits for emissions and local air quality. This is through focussing most development within the main urban centres, but also ensuring continued access to small facilities and vibrancy of more rural communities through enabling of small scale infill development. Without this policy approach, there were considered to be risks resulting in potential inappropriate development that is out of scale in terms of the settlement hierarchy, resulting in potentially reduced access to services and facilities and therefore an increased need to travel.
S10	The area strategy will ensure that new development in Workington will continue to support its role as the main service centre for the Borough and an important service centre for Copeland. The policies contained within the strategy will ensure that the type and mix of housing and economic development will meet the identified needs of the town and support the existing services and facilities contained within it. Policies to support development within the town will also ensure that there is continued good and sustainable access to these facilities, and will promote the most efficient use of land, protecting the open countryside from inappropriate development.
S11	The Cockermouth area based strategy is the most sustainable approach to take in terms of guiding new development within the town and its environs. The policies will ensure that the most appropriate type and mix of housing, particularly addressing the issue of affordability in the town will be promoted, and will also ensure that the most appropriate types of economic development are promoted within the town, for example to address the current deficit in convenience. The high quality environment within and adjacent to the town will still be protected by national policy, but the policies in the area based strategy will support these at a local level, providing extra support, and opportunities for identifying enhancements. The issue relating to drainage capacity in the town will need to be addressed prior to new development irrespective of the presence of the area based strategy policies.
S12	The area based strategy for Maryport will ensure that new development is provided to an appropriate scale for the town supporting existing services and facilities and its current role as a key service centre for the Borough. The high quality environment within and adjacent to the town will still be protected by national policy, but the policies in the area based strategy will support these at a local level, providing extra support, and opportunities for identifying enhancements. The policies contained within the strategy will promote the use of brownfield land within the town and support the opportunities for the economy of the town to diversify and strengthen, rather than leaving economic development to be driven by market forces alone.
S13	The policies contained within the area strategy for Wigton will ensure that all new development within the town and its environs will address the identified needs of the town in terms of type and mix of housing and economic development, services and facilities to support the continued



Policy	Options Assessment Summary
	vibrancy of the town whilst ensuring that new development is in-keeping with the scale and character of the current town. The policies will ensure that development in the more rural areas, is enabled where there is an identified need but that it is undertaken within the existing scale and character of the settlements, and does not adversely affect the natural environment, in particular the Solway Coast AONB.
S14	The Silloth area based strategy is the most sustainable approach to policies relating to new development in the Silloth area. Without specific policies to guide appropriate development to the rural north of the Borough, new development may not promote social and economic regeneration in the area, and result in inappropriate development. Specific policies will promote the role of heritage in the area, and protect the natural environment supporting the local economy through regional tourism opportunities. In addition, local policies that support the sustainability of smaller settlements through small scale infill housing and provision of key services and facilities will benefit the sustainability of this area.
S15	The area based strategy for Aspatria ensures that there are specific policies to guide appropriate development to the more isolated rural parts of the Borough. This is because new development may not promote social and economic regeneration in the area, and result in inappropriate development. Local policies that support the sustainability of smaller settlements through small scale infill housing and provision of key services and facilities, and rural economic development including farm diversification, will benefit the overall sustainability of this rural area.

4.2 Housing Policies

The housing policies set out the approach to future housing development in terms of mix and types of housing and rural housing issues. The policies under this topic area are:

- HO1: A Balanced Housing Market
- HO2: Affordable Housing
- HO3: Housing Mix
- HO4: Housing Renewal
- HO5: Rural Exceptions Sites
- HO6: Dwellings in the Open Countryside
- HO7: Elderly Needs Housing
- HO8: Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites

The summary of the assessment of these options is provided in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2 Housing Policy Options Summary Results**

Policy	Options Assessment Summary
HO1	The preferred housing option relates to achieving a balanced housing market in the Borough to enable sustainable mixed communities that meet the identified needs of the whole community. When compared against the alternative option, this policy performed strongly in sustainability terms, identifying potentially beneficial effects against almost all of the sustainability objectives.
HO2	The preferred policy option performed most strongly in sustainability terms of all the options considered for this objective. Particular strengths were the beneficial effects of considering the different areas and needs across the Borough in terms of targets and thresholds for affordable housing rather than taking the approach of a single target or threshold to be applied across the whole area. This ensures that the very specific and differing needs of the different areas within Allerdale are fully taken into account in decision making.
HO3	The preferred policy options performed strongly in sustainability terms and against the alternative option proposed. Particular strengths were the beneficial effects of using an evidence base to consider the different areas and needs across the Borough in terms of the mix of housing to be developed as part of a proposal, rather than taking the approach of using a threshold to trigger those developments that would require a balanced mix. This ensures that the very specific and differing needs of the different areas within Allerdale are fully taken into account in decision making and that smaller communities who are only likely to receive development that falls under the threshold are still able to benefit from development in their locality.
HO4	The policies relating to housing renewal were strong performers in sustainability terms, they promote the reuse of existing housing areas and land, that is generally well located within settlements which often have existing services and facilities that the new population can benefit from. Supporting housing renewal across the whole Borough, rather than just in priority areas, will ensure that even the smaller settlements that currently have issues relating to empty / less desirable areas of housing will benefit from the policy.
HO5	A policy to enable rural exceptions sites within the Borough performed well against some of the sustainability objectives, and had no identified effect in other areas. These areas of strong performance were particularly linked to the provision of decent and affordable homes and the supporting of the vibrancy of communities. Affordability is a key issue across the Borough including in the rural areas, and this policy permits affordable housing in those areas outside of the more formal core strategy policies. The alternative option was considered less sustainable as this would not necessarily provide the much needed affordable housing in the area.
HO6	The preferred options were considered to all be strongly sustainable, they support the provision of decent and affordable housing in rural areas, reducing the need to travel for those rural workers and potentially support rural business and farm diversification schemes etc, strengthening and diversifying the economy of the Borough. The alternative approach was considered less sustainable in terms of the lack of affordability of housing, the increased need to travel, the economic restrictions that this may place on the rural business sector and also in recognition of the importance that agriculture and rural business has in the Allerdale economy.
HO7	In general all policy options assessed identified potentially beneficial impacts against the relevant sustainability objectives. The area where the alternative option performed less well than the



Policy	Options Assessment Summary
	preferred options, was the policy focus which would enable development outside of the key service centres. There was the concern that this could reduce access to key services and facilities and increase the need to travel, therefore increasing transport related emissions.
HO8	The provision of a criteria based policy to address the requirements for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople sites performed strongly in sustainability terms and was concluded to be more sustainable than the alternative approach to rely on national policy and generic local policies. The policy was strong in terms of provision of a decent home and ensuring good access to services and facilities.

4.3 Economy Policies

The economic policies set out the overarching policy framework for economic development in the Borough covering issues such as location of employment land, the rural economy and tourism. The policies under this topic area are:

- EC1: Location of Employment Land
- EC2: Employment Allocations
- EC3: Rural Economy and Enterprise
- EC4: Education and Skills
- EC5: Town Centres and Retail
- EC6: Tourism and Leisure
- EC7: Derwent Forest
- EC8: Stand Alone Renewable or Low Carbon Technology
- EC9: Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects
- EC10: New Nuclear Power Station at Sellafield

The summary of the assessment of these options is provided in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Economy Policy Options Summary Results

Policy	Options Assessment Summary
EC1	The preferred policy approaches performed most strongly in terms of sustainability when considered along with the alternative options for the location of employment land. Particular



Policy	Options Assessment Summary
	strengths related to the focus of new economic development to be within the existing urban centres, where the improved infrastructure exists and where the majority of the population reside, therefore increasing access to services and facilities and reducing the need to travel. The preferred approach also performs strongly in terms of strengthening and diversifying the Allerdale economy rather than leaving economic development to be driven solely by market forces.
EC2	The preferred options in combination were considered to be the most sustainable for this policy area and would provide the best solution in terms of employment allocations prior to future plan development in terms of the Employment Land Allocation DPD. The preferred options allow for greater flexibility and future targeting.
EC3	The provision of a policy approach that supports the economic prosperity and sustainability of rural communities through enabling appropriate growth and diversification, whilst protecting the countryside, performs strongly against the sustainability objectives considered. The alternative approaches did identify beneficial effects in some areas but also identified a number of potentially adverse effects. These effects were in terms of the limiting of rural developments to only those settlements within the settlement hierarchy, and the lack of focus on the identified needs of the rural communities and the important role that they play within the wider Allerdale economy.
EC4	The preferred policy option identified a range of strong beneficial effects related to improvement of education and skills in the Borough, and the related benefits of increased access to educational facilities and beneficial elements related to the economy. Without a policy approach, decision making in the Core Strategy will fail to consider education and skills fully and fail to address the current skills and education gaps in the Borough that currently restrict the potential for future economic growth and development across the area.
EC5	The preferred options in combination present the most sustainable approach to implementing this policy in the Core Strategy, as they performed the most strongly in terms of the sustainability objectives. The policy option's strengths in particular where the encouragement that they provide towards town centre viability and the support that they provide to the local economy in terms of encouraging investment and diversification, protection and growth of employment opportunities and improving access to employment opportunities.
EC6	The preferred options performed strongly in most areas of the sustainability objectives as they reflect the importance of the Borough as a tourism destination, particularly in terms of the economy. They also reflect the importance of the Borough's environmental assets in supporting this level of tourism interest. Without the preferred policy approaches in the Core Strategy, the assessment identified that there is a potential risk of inappropriate development in the wrong locations.
EC7	The preferred policy approach and alternative option EC7b both identified potentially beneficial effects against the sustainability objectives and in comparison to the other alternative option EC7a. However, the preferred option ensures that the social, economic and environmental issues related to the development of Derwent Forest are fully considered and maximised. The support identified through policy option EC7b was not considered to be as explicit as the preferred option, hence the conclusion that the preferred option is the most sustainable.
EC8	The preferred policy options in combination present the most sustainable approach to consideration of renewable and low carbon generation in the Core Strategy. The alternative policy



Policy	Options Assessment Summary
	options performed less well by virtue of them not necessarily supporting renewable energy development in the Borough and therefore not addressing issues related to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. They also related to the setting of restrictive thresholds and distances that would result in limiting the amount of energy related development coming forward and therefore not contributing to energy targets etc.
EC9	Whilst the policy options do not relate to the actual location or form of development of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) in the Borough, the preferred approach of adopting a proactive and transparent process towards applications for NSIPs performed most sustainably as this ensured the involvement of the local community and enables local stakeholders to work towards ensuring that new NSIPs within the Borough reflect the needs and desires of the community, rather than passing through at a national level with no consideration of local issues.
EC10	Whilst the policy options do not relate to the actual location or form of development of a new Nuclear Power Station at Sellafield, the preferred approach of adopting a proactive and transparent process towards the proposals, which fall outside of the Borough, but are closely tied to the future of the Borough, performed most sustainably. This was because the preferred approach ensures the involvement of the local community and enables local stakeholders to work towards ensuring that Nuclear New Build (NNB) at Sellafield reflects the needs and desires of the community.

4.4 Transport Policies

The transport policies set out the transport framework for the future development of the Borough, including the overarching transport principles and strategic infrastructure. The policies under this topic area are:

- TR1: Transport Principles
- TR2: Supporting and Safeguarding Strategic Infrastructure

The summary of the assessment of these options is provided in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Transport Policy Options Summary Results

Policy	Options Assessment Summary
TR1	The preferred approach to transport principles in the Core Strategy performs the most strongly in terms of sustainability. The only potentially adverse effect identified in terms of the preferred options relates to rural exceptions and the potential impacts that these might have on use of Greenfield land and on landscape character and quality. However, on balance this performs strongly in other areas and therefore is appropriate to remain as a preferred policy option.
TR2	The preferred policy options relating to supporting and safeguarding strategic infrastructure in the Borough in combination are the most sustainable. The preferred policy options generally all potentially give rise to beneficial sustainability effects, although potentially adverse effects were



	<p>identified in terms of provision of new infrastructure in Maryport and Workington and the potential impact that this may have on biodiversity interests in the area. However, on balance these options in combination still present the most sustainable approach to decision making in the Core Strategy and are preferable to the alternative option.</p>
--	--

4.5 Built Environment Policies

The built environment policies set out the approach to be taken in terms of design, the historic environment, pollution and flood resilience. The policies under this topic area are:

- BE1: Design and Development
- BE2: Previously Developed and Contaminated Land
- BE3: Reuse of Rural Buildings
- BE4: Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage
- BE5: Pollution Management
- BE6: Historic Environment

The summary of the assessment of these options is provided in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Built Environment Policy Options Summary Results

Policy	Options Assessment Summary
BE1	<p>The preferred policy option of a criteria based design policy to be included in the Core Strategy, performs very strongly in terms of sustainability across almost all of the objectives. The policy addresses high quality design, layout, environment, access, safety and sustainability. The alternative options identified fewer beneficial effects and a number of potentially adverse effects. These included not properly addressing the issues of design in new development, or focusing on traditional design which fails to address the whole range of sustainability measures.</p>
BE2	<p>The preferred options in combination present the most sustainable approach to decision making in terms of previously developed land and contaminated land, as they ensure that brownfield land is prioritised in new development, reducing loss of Greenfield land. This brings potential benefits in terms of protecting biodiversity and landscape assets and reducing the potential for soil sealing. Without this policy, there will be less strength to argue that development should prioritise brownfield land and therefore potentially other sustainability goals will be adversely affected.</p>
BE3	<p>The preferred policy approach promotes the conversion and reuse of redundant rural buildings where the scheme will contribute to the sustainability and vitality of the local economy and community. The preferred policy options performed well against the sustainability objectives, with a high number of potentially beneficial effects identified. There was some potential uncertainty as</p>



	to whether all potential opportunities for reuse would contribute to the development of affordable homes in the countryside, but on balance the overall approach was determined to be the most sustainable. It was considered that to restrict policy on permitting of rural conversion would have far greater adverse impacts.
BE4	The preferred approach seeks to prevent development in areas of flood risk and to defer to the drainage hierarchy and incorporate SuDS. This performed strongly in terms of the sustainability objectives, the 'no policy' alternative option identified potentially significant adverse effects across almost all sustainability objectives, and it was determined that whilst the alternative option to encourage the use of SuDS may result in some beneficial effects, this would not be enforced. Therefore the preferred approach would result in more definite beneficial effects.
BE5	The preferred approach was considered to be the most sustainable in this assessment as it identified the strongest beneficial effects in terms of the protection of assets such as water quality, land and soil, from pollution generating development.
BE6	Provision of a locally distinctive policy in the Core Strategy relating to the historic environment will ensure that the Borough's assets and their settings are appropriately protected and managed in the development process. Therefore this approach was considered the most sustainable. In particular strengths were noted in terms of the wider benefits of improvements to the built and local environment, people's quality of life and also through the benefits to the local economy through tourism related to the Borough's historic assets.

4.6 Natural Environment Policies

The natural environment policies set out the policy approach for the natural environment of Allerdale, including green infrastructure, landscape and biodiversity. The policies under this topic area are:

- NE1: Green Infrastructure
- NE2: Landscape
- NE3: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- NE4: Air, Soil and Water Quality
- NE5: Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities
- NE6: Countryside and Coastal Access and Recreation
- NE7: Shoreline Management and Coastal Development

The summary of the assessment of these options is provided in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 Natural Environment Policy Options Summary Results



Policy	Options Assessment Summary
NE1	The provision of an overarching green infrastructure policy identified potentially beneficial effects across many of the sustainability objectives, and is therefore considered a sustainable approach to take. Alternative option NE1b did perform more strongly in certain areas of the assessment than the preferred option, however, these potential effects rely on the adoption and ongoing management of the Green Infrastructure Plan. At this stage it is understood that the adoption and management of this plan is not guaranteed and therefore the preferred approach is the most sustainable at this time.
NE2	The preferred approaches to landscape policy are in combination the most sustainable. Generally in terms of designations the preferred options follow national policy, but they also place a focus on the value of all landscapes rather than just those that are designated. Therefore this approach improves and protects all local environments, improves access to countryside and open space, and benefits quality of life and the tourism for the area which is inextricably linked to the quality of its environment.
NE3	The preferred approach to protection of biodiversity and geodiversity in combination is a sustainable policy approach, and identifies many beneficial effects. The alternative approach that restricts development where harm would occur does perform more strongly in certain areas. However, it is considered that this may be a too restrictive and inflexible approach and that where suitable and appropriate mitigation and compensation measures can be identified, the preferred policy approach would be a suitable policy approach for the Core Strategy.
NE4	The preferred approach to protection of air, soil and water quality in combination is a sustainable policy approach, and identifies many beneficial effects. The alternative approach that restricts development where harm would occur does perform more strongly in certain areas. However, it is considered that this may be a too restrictive and inflexible approach and that where suitable and appropriate mitigation and compensation measures can be identified the preferred policy approach would be a suitable policy approach for the Core Strategy.
NE5	The policy approach to safeguarding existing areas of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the Borough has identified a wide range of potentially beneficial effects. The slight areas of concern relate to the criteria-based section of the preferred approach that would determine when the loss of open space or facilities would be allowed. That is because these would, depending on the type and scale of the development, result in the loss of access, landscape and biodiversity impacts and a reduction in quality of life. Overall, the preferred approach in combination is still considered the most sustainable.
NE6	The preferred policy approach facilitates sustainable leisure and recreational opportunities that require a countryside location. In terms of the assessment, it performs well in sustainability terms and also in comparison to the alternative options and therefore it is considered the most sustainable approach. Particular strengths of the policy include improved access to the countryside and the benefits this can have to communities and general sense of health and well-being amongst the population.
NE7	The shoreline management and coastal development policy options do not directly influence large areas of the sustainability appraisal matrix. However, the preferred approach performs strongly in those areas of relevance. Particular strengths relate to the benefits in terms of improving health and well-being, protecting and enhancing biodiversity and landscape and supporting and growing local employment opportunities.



5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

This report forms Stage B of the SA of the Core Strategy DPD. The findings of this appraisal will need to be taken into account when finalising the Core Strategy as detailed in Table 5.1 below.

Table 5.1 Next Steps in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Allerdale Core Strategy

Stage		SA Steps	Links to Core Strategy Process
Stage B Developing and refining options and assessing effects	B5	Develop mitigation to minimise adverse effects and maximise beneficial effects.	The Core Strategy will need to be revised in line with any findings.
	B6	Develop recommendations for monitoring and indicators.	Undertaken after draft Core Strategy revised/refined.
Stage C Preparing the SA Report (including Environmental Report)	C1	Prepare the SA Report for the draft Core Strategy.	Undertaken in conjunction with preparation of the draft Core Strategy.
Stage D Consultation and decision making	D1	Consultation on the SA Report.	Undertaken at the same time as formal consultation on the draft Core Strategy (Regulation 27).
	D2	Appraise any significant changes to the Core Strategy.	Undertaken in conjunction with finalisation of the Core Strategy.
	D3	Produce a consultation statement to accompany the Submission Core Strategy outlining how the findings of the SA and responses to consultation have been taken into account.	Undertaken in conjunction with finalisation of the Submission Core Strategy.
Stage E Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Core	E1 & E2	Undertake monitoring of significant effects arising from the Core Strategy and respond to adverse effects.	Undertaken after the Core Strategy has been adopted.



Stage		SA Steps	Links to Core Strategy Process
Strategy			

The SA process that has been undertaken on the draft Core Strategy policies, generally illustrates that the preferred options present the most sustainable approach to future development in the Borough. This does not necessarily mean that they all result in positive effects, but in considering the overall approach they in combination present the most sustainable solution. There are many areas, where the scale of the impact identified depends on further assessment, design and implementation. Additional evidence such as the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will need to be fully taken into account when confirming the final policy approach for the Borough and when considering site specific allocations.

Mitigation measures will need to be incorporated, where adverse impacts have been identified, or built into those policies where potential issues relating to design and implementation have identified potential risks.

Amendments made to the policies as a result of the HRA and the consultation on the Core Strategy will need to be reassessed in order to ensure that amendments do not have an adverse sustainability impact that had not previously been identified.



6.0 References

Allerdale Borough Council (2007). Scoping Report.

Allerdale Borough Council (2012). Draft Core Strategy.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2005). Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents.

WYG (2007). Issues and Options Appraisal report.



Appendices





Appendix A – Compatibility Assessment for Core Strategy Objectives





Appendix A – Compatibility Matrix

Key	
✓✓	Highly Compatible
✓	Potentially Compatible
✗✗	Highly Incompatible
✗	Potentially Incompatible
~	Neutral/No Interaction

SA Objective	Core Strategy Strategic Objectives																																																
	1) Climate Change and Sustainability					2) Housing					3) Economy										4) Transport					5) Built Environment					6) Natural Environment																		
	a	b	c	d	e	a	b	c	d	e	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	a	b	c	d	e	f	a	b	c	d	e											
SP1	✓	✓✓	~	~	~	✓	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	✓	~	~	✓✓	✓✓	~	~	~	✓✓	~	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	~	✓	~	✓✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p>Analysis: In general the Strategic Objectives do not hinder or actively support participation in the democratic process. However in some instances they have the potential to support it, such as through increasing access to educational / community facilities. Regeneration in general can provide numerous opportunities for community involvement / empowerment.</p> <p>Recommendations: Where practicable, the implementation of the LDF should encourage the participation of local people, particularly those from hard to reach groups in the decision-making process.</p>
SP2	✓	✓✓	~	~	~	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	~	~	~	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	~	✓✓	✓✓	~	~	✓✓	~	✓✓	~	~	✓✓	~	✓✓	~	~	<p>Analysis: A number of the Core Strategy objectives are considered to be highly compatible with SP2 as they will directly contribute to provision of facilities (such as healthcare, sports, leisure and education) or the provision of employment opportunities. Other objectives are also considered to be highly compatible as they will directly contribute to improving physical access to these facilities / workplaces. Those objectives that promote development within areas which potentially contain the required facilities (for example, focusing development within urban areas or within rural areas which already provide relevant facilities) and objectives which generally relate to improvements in quality of life, are considered to be potentially compatible with SP2.</p> <p>Recommendations: Where practicable, the implementation of the LDF needs to ensure that the capacity of local facilities (such as healthcare, sports, leisure and education) can withstand the proposed levels of growth. Facilities and infrastructure should be designed to maximise accessibility for disabled users.</p>					
SP3	~	~	✓✓	~	✗	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	~	~	~	~	~	✓	~	~	~	~	✓	~	~	✓	~	~	✓✓	~	~	~	~	~	✓✓	~	~	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	~	<p>Analysis: In general a number of the Core Strategy objectives are considered to be highly compatible with SP3 as they directly relate to the provision of housing, in particular provision of affordable housing. A number of the objectives are considered to be potentially compatible with SP3 as they relate to general improvements in quality of life and development which meet the needs of the whole community. This may involve improvements to existing housing stock or the provision of new housing.</p> <p>Recommendations: Where practicable within the LDF, targets for Code for Sustainable Homes should be introduced to deliver more efficient / sustainable housing and targets for Lifetime Homes standards introduced to ensure that homes meet the needs of the whole population and enable residents to live independently for longer.</p>						
SP4	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	✓	~	~	~	~	~	✓✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p>Analysis: A number of the Core Strategy objectives are considered to be highly compatible with SP4 as they directly relate to increases in the provision of education / training. Other objectives are supportive by enabling development that meets the needs of the whole community and by protecting and enhancing community facilities respectively, and have the potential to increase / improve the provision of education / training.</p> <p>Recommendations: Where practicable, the implementation of the LDF needs to ensure that the capacity of local educational facilities can withstand the proposed levels of growth within the plan period.</p>						
SP5	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	✓	~	~	✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	✓	~	✓	✓✓	~	~	✓	~	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	~	~	✓✓	~	~	<p>Analysis: The Core Strategy objectives in some areas are considered to be highly compatible with SP5 as they specifically refer to the provision of health facilities, or promote proposals that are in line with a 'healthy communities agenda', the aim of which is to reduce health inequalities, and have the potential to contribute to the provision of healthcare services by protecting and enhancing community facilities.</p> <p>As well as provision of healthcare facilities, physical wellbeing may be promoted through participation in sports and leisure activities, and on a more global scale, through the prevention of climate change. The potential health impacts of climate change include those associated with extreme cold and heat events, and weather related natural hazards, which as well as resulting in physical health effects may also affect mental health and wellbeing (e.g. by interfering with livelihoods and damage to critical infrastructure).</p> <p>Mental wellbeing may also be promoted through good design, and the protection of environmental, heritage and other cultural assets. Reducing inequalities and improving quality of life may also aid mental wellbeing.</p>					



SA Objective	Core Strategy Strategic Objectives																																					
	1) Climate Change and Sustainability					2) Housing					3) Economy										4) Transport					5) Built Environment					6) Natural Environment							
	a	b	c	d	e	a	b	c	d	e	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	a	b	c	d	e	f	a	b	c	d	e
	<p>The objectives that relate to the location of new development within urban areas, and in sustainable rural areas may potentially improve access to jobs by ensuring they are already located within areas that are well-connected. Further objectives may encourage creation of employment opportunities within areas of need and may encourage people to use sustainable forms of transport to access their places of work, and may result in the provision of employment opportunities, potentially in areas of need.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: Where practicable within the LDF, new housing should be located in areas with good access to employment opportunities, i.e. accessible through public transport, walking and cycling as well as the private car.</p>																																					
EC3	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p>ANALYSIS: The Core Strategy objectives that are considered to be highly compatible with EC3 are those that will contribute to strengthening the local economy through the expansion of certain sectors (including energy, tourism and education), the regeneration of deprived areas, and the enhancement of both town centres and rural areas.</p> <p>Other objectives that are considered to be potentially compatible are those that will contribute to improving access to jobs and skills training, which may help to boost the local economy. Further objectives may encourage creation of employment opportunities within areas of need and focus development within urban areas which are well-connected. This may further boost the local economy.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: Where practicable within the LDF, encourage new employment land to provide a variety of opportunities in different sectors. This will also help to retain graduates and a skilled workforce within the Borough.</p>



Appendix B – Core Strategy Policy Assessment Table

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇄	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇄	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇄	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
⇄	No significant effect		

S10 Area Based Strategy - Workington

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S10: Area Based Strategy - Workington						
	Housing Policy Options				Comments		
	(1): Identify land for new housing reflecting position with the settlement hierarchy, recognising the importance of Workington to future residential development in Allerdale	(2): Seek to encourage new housing across the area to provide a mix of tenures and types, including affordable to meet current and future need, aspirations and regeneration objectives	(3): Target areas of poor quality housing and prioritise for housing renewal and improvement				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⇄	No significant effect	⇄	No significant effect	↑↑	This reflects the desire of residents to see an improvement in the currently poor quality housing stock particularly within the southern wards of the town.	The policy for housing renewal is supportive of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	Prioritising Workington as the main centre for new housing development will increase accessibility to services and facilities as Workington is the principle retail and leisure centre for Allerdale and Copeland Boroughs, and is well served by public transport and cycle routes.	↑↑	Prioritising Workington as the main centre for new housing development will increase accessibility to services and facilities as Workington is the principle retail and leisure centre for Allerdale and Copeland Boroughs, and is well served by public transport and cycle routes.	⇄	The policy addresses renewal of existing housing stock which will already benefit from accessibility to key services and facilities by virtue of its location within Workington.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	Policy option directly supports this objective, Workington is one of the more affordable parts of the Borough but has high levels of deprivation and low quality housing stock, therefore a policy of renewal should help to address these issues.	↑↑	Policy option directly supports this objective, Workington is one of the more affordable parts of the Borough but has high levels of deprivation and low quality housing stock, therefore a policy of renewal should help to address these issues.	↑↑	Policy option directly supports this objective, Workington is one of the more affordable parts of the Borough but has high levels of deprivation and low quality housing stock, therefore a policy of renewal should help to address these issues.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	⇄	No significant effect	⇄	No significant effect	⇄	No significant effect	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Provision of decent affordable housing in the town and its environs will help to address issues of deprivation and well-being	↑↑	Provision of decent affordable housing in the town and its environs will help to address issues of deprivation and well-being as Workington has relatively high levels of deprivation, particularly Moss Bay and related to this, high levels of poor health.	↑↑	Policy of housing renewal will aid health and well-being through provision of decent affordable homes to replace the existing low quality housing stock in the area.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	This option directly supports the achievement of this objective because it will help to build on the existing community within Workington and its suburbs.	↑↑	This option directly supports the achievement of this objective because it will help to encourage mixed communities in Workington.	→→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community through housing renewal should help foster community vibrancy and inclusiveness.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	⇄	The policy relates to the town of Workington and the wider environs, whilst it is unlikely that new housing development within the town itself will have adverse impacts on biodiversity, there is the potential that development in the wider area could take place on greenfield land or result in habitat fragmentation. There is also the need to ensure that new housing development does not adversely impact on designated sites including the River Derwent Corridor SAC.	⇄	The policy relates to the town of Workington and the wider environs, whilst it is unlikely that new housing development within the town itself will have adverse impacts on biodiversity, there is the potential that development in the wider area could take place on greenfield land or result in habitat fragmentation. There is also the need to ensure that new housing development does not adversely impact on designated sites including the River Derwent Corridor SAC.	↑	This policy relates to the reuse of existing land and buildings rather than relating to new development on potentially greenfield or biodiverse sites.	Further impact assessment will need to be undertaken as part of the HRA to assess the potential impact of the development upon biodiversity and in particular the River Derwent Corridor SAC. The policy of housing renewal supports this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	⇄	The policy relates to the town of Workington and the wider environs, whilst it is unlikely that new housing development within the town itself will have adverse impacts on landscape there is the potential that development in the wider area could take place on greenfield land or result in landscape fragmentation. However, there is also the potential that new development could contribute to the GI network in conjunction with NE policies.	⇄	The policy relates to the town of Workington and the wider environs, whilst it is unlikely that new housing development within the town itself will have adverse impacts on landscape there is the potential that development in the wider area could take place on greenfield land or result in landscape fragmentation. However, there is also the potential that new development could contribute to the GI network in conjunction with NE policies.	→	This option works well with NE policies to improve GI provision and landscape character in Workington through appropriate housing development, i.e. the Workington housing renewal programme and natural environment improvements can be compatible.	The policy options are generally supportive of this objective, further consideration will need to be given to LCA and implementation. The options will also need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	The town is the main centre for the Borough and for Copeland Borough and is well served by public transport and cycle routes, and facilities, services and employment opportunities, therefore locating new housing here should result in a sustainable approach reducing the need to travel and therefore emissions, addressing the current slight local air quality issues.	↑↑	The town is the main centre for the Borough and for Copeland Borough and is well served by public transport and cycle routes, and facilities, services and employment opportunities, therefore locating new housing here should result in a sustainable approach reducing the need to travel and therefore emissions, addressing the current slight local air quality issues.	↑	Through renewal of existing housing stock there is the potential to make the properties more efficient and therefore the potential to reduce the volume of emissions currently arising through the use of the properties.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective, policies in the wider plan should seek to ensure the highest possible standards of efficient design when undertaking the policy of housing renewal in Workington.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↓	There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development on the River Derwent SAC which could then affect the integrity of the designated site. The Derwent is also identified as an area at risk of flooding in the SFRA, therefore consideration will need to be taken in terms of location.	↓	There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development on the River Derwent SAC which could then affect the integrity of the designated site. The Derwent is also identified as an area at risk of flooding in the SFRA, therefore consideration will need to be taken in terms of location.	⇄	Depending on the location of the housing identified for renewal within the town the issues relating to (1) and (2) may also be relevant, however, it is assumed that if identified as suitable for renewal that these issues have been addressed.	The policy options will potentially result in adverse impacts, but these will be dependent on location. The findings of the SFRA and HRA will need to be considered in combination in order to determine those areas of the town that are unsuitable for further development.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	This option should help towards avoiding excessive soil-sealing and impacts on drainage by helping to guide the location of new development to the town of Workington and its environs, including the restoration of brownfield sites.	↑	This option should help towards avoiding excessive soil-sealing and impacts on drainage by helping to guide the location of new development to the town of Workington and its environs, including the restoration of brownfield sites.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it relates to the reuse of land and existing buildings.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⇄	No significant effect	⇄	No significant effect	⇄	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	⇄	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities.	⇄	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing renewal will help to support existing job security and create new opportunities.	The policy options are indirectly supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	Through locating housing in the main centre for leisure and retail in West Cumbria and in close proximity to the main employment sites of Sellafield, the Port, Derwent Howe and Lillyhall, this ensures that good sustainable access for the population is maintained.	↑↑	Through locating housing in the main centre for leisure and retail in West Cumbria and in close proximity to the main employment sites of Sellafield, the Port, Derwent Howe and Lillyhall, this ensures that good sustainable access for the population is maintained.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing renewal should help to improve access to employment by supporting existing job security and create new opportunities.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	⇄	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.	⇄	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing renewal will help to encourage inward investment, economic diversification and a stronger local economy.	There is indirect support for this objective from the policy options.

Key: Significance of Effects		S10 Area Based Strategy - Workington	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects	Direct Effects	Indirect Effects
↑↑↑ Major beneficial	→→→ Major beneficial	↑↑↑ Major beneficial	→→→ Major beneficial
↑↑ Minor beneficial	→→ Minor beneficial	↑↑ Minor beneficial	→→ Minor beneficial
↑ Potentially beneficial	→ Potentially beneficial	↑ Potentially beneficial	→ Potentially beneficial
↓ Potentially adverse	← Potentially adverse	↓ Potentially adverse	← Potentially adverse
↓↓ Minor adverse	←← Minor adverse	↓↓ Minor adverse	←← Minor adverse
↓↓↓ Major adverse	←←← Major adverse	↓↓↓ Major adverse	←←← Major adverse
⚡ Potentially beneficial or adverse		⚡ Potentially beneficial or adverse	
⊕ No significant effect		⊕ No significant effect	

Sustainability Objectives	S10: Area Based Strategy - Workington							Comments
	Economy Policy Options							
	(1): Seek to maximise the strategic role of Lillipoll in the future growth of the Allerdale economy by promoting the growth of the energy sector, research and development clusters, education and skills and the development of high quality, large format industrial and commercial use	(2): Work closely with partners to enable development of land around the Port of Workington to capitalise on and complement the Ports role in the movement of freight and the potential role in servicing the energy sector and NNB	(3): Encourage the growth and enhancement of employment opportunities on existing employment sites such as Derwent How in order to realise the potential	(4): Seek to maximise the opportunity to redevelop brownfield land to create new mixed and employment opportunities such as the redevelopment of the former Corus site	(5): Support the role of Eneergus and Lakes College (West Cumbria) as part of the Energy Coast Campus	(6): Actively seek to improve the vitality and viability of Workington town centre by directing retail and leisure developments to town centre and edge of centre sites, by supporting a wide and diverse range of shops and leisure uses within the centre and by encouraging a thriving evening economy	(7): Support redevelopment of the Derwent Valley area for a mix of uses which may include leisure, retail and employment. Particular encouragement will be given for proposals which seek to improve and enhance the town's sports and leisure facilities in this edge-of-centre location	
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↑ Policy option reflects the desire to promote development on brownfield land prior to greenfield land.	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↑ Policy reflects the desire of the local population to achieve a high quality redevelopment of the area with an identified need for regeneration	(4) and (6) are supportive of the objective, the other options show no identifiable effect.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑ The policy option will directly increase access to education and skills training and employment opportunities for the population in the Workington area.	↑ The policy option will directly increase access to employment opportunities for the population in the Workington area.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective through increased access to employment opportunities and potentially additional services and facilities.	↑ Policy option aims to increase access to employment opportunities and facilities and services and is therefore complementary to the objective.	↑ The policy option will directly increase access to education and training opportunities for the population in the Workington / West Cumbria area.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective through increased access.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports this objective, the Derwent Valley proposals all to provide a link between the retail core of Workington and main residential areas, improving access to the whole range of services and facilities and open space for local residents.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↑ Potential to provide decent homes, if developments come forward as mixed use proposals.	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↑ The policy will improve the local environment which in turn contributes to providing decent homes where people will want to live.	(4) and (6) are supportive of the objective, the other options show no identifiable effect.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	↑ The option has the potential to increase opportunities for skills training particularly in conjunction with the support role for NNB	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↑↑ The policy option will directly increase access to education and training opportunities, and the level of knowledge and skills for the population in the Workington / West Cumbria area.	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	(1), (2) and (5) are supportive of the objective, the other options show no identifiable effect.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↑ The policy will improve the local environment and therefore improved quality of life which benefits sense of well-being. The proposals will also provide access to open space and sport and recreational facilities, providing opportunities for people to live healthy lifestyles.	↑ The policy will improve the local environment and therefore improved quality of life which benefits sense of well-being. The proposals will also provide access to open space and sport and recreational facilities, providing opportunities for people to live healthy lifestyles.	(6) and (7) are supportive of the objective, the other options show no identifiable effect.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↑ This option supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town.	↑ The policy option presents the potential to develop mixed use development. There is less likely to be a noticeable effect when the proposals relate entirely to economic development.	⊕ No significant effect	↑ This option supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town.	↑ The proposals will provide a link between the retail core of the town and the main residential areas, and provides publicly accessible open space and facilities, that can benefit the whole community and provide space for cultural events and festivals, fostering social cohesion.	(3), (4), (6) and (7) are supportive of the objective, the other options show no identifiable effect.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	⊕ No significant effect	↓ Depending on the location of new development in proximity to the port, there will be potential impacts related to biodiversity, proposals will need to be considered in conjunction with the findings of the HRA and NE policies.	⊕ The potential effects are dependent on location, however the proposals relate to growth of existing sites such as Derwent How therefore there is less likely to be any additional biodiversity impacts.	↑ Promoting the use of brownfield land for new development before consideration of greenfield land should help to minimise the effects of new development on biodiversity. However, brownfield sites can also be highly biodiverse so will still need to be considered in terms of NE policies and findings of the HRA.	⊕ No significant effect	⚡ The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals both within Workington town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which is more likely to be on greenfield land. Proposals for new development will need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies and the findings of the HRA. Particular issues may be related to the River Derwent and SSSIs.	⚡ The site is bounded on one side by the River Derwent therefore there is potential here. This will need to be considered in conjunction with the HRA and NE policies.	(2), (6) and (7) have identified the potential for adverse impacts on biodiversity in terms of the location of new development in terms of its potential location on greenfield land and in proximity to designated sites. The policy options will need to be considered in more detail in conjunction with the findings of the HRA and NE policies. (4) is identified as potentially beneficial in terms of focusing new development on brownfield land which typically has less biodiversity impacts, however, this does not preclude the potential for biodiversity impacts in these areas.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	⊕ No significant effect	↓ Depending on the location of new development in proximity to the port, there will be potential impacts related to landscape proposals will need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies.	⊕ The potential effects are dependent on location, however the proposals relate to growth of existing sites such as Derwent How therefore there is less likely to be any additional landscape impacts.	↑ Promoting the use of brownfield land for new development before consideration of greenfield land should help to minimise the effects of new development on landscape character quality. However, brownfield sites can also result in impacts landscape terms, particularly on the setting of designated landscapes, so they will still need to be considered in terms of NE policies.	⊕ No significant effect	⚡ The potential effects are dependent on location, as the policy focuses on new proposals both within Workington town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less landscape impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which has the potential to impact on the setting of designated landscapes and result in fragmentation.	↑ The site is currently a range of operational and derelict uses at a gateway point to the town. Appropriate regeneration of the area, with a co-ordinated approach to the landscape proposals will improve the overall landscape character and local environment.	(7) is identified as a potentially positive benefit in terms of regenerating an existing site with open space and landscape proposals providing a new gateway access to the town. (4) is also potentially positive through focussing new development on brownfield land (as in the comments above). (2) and (6) are identified as potentially adverse, dependent on the location of new development, and they will need to be considered in conjunction with NE policies and LGA.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⊕ No significant effect	⚡ Through good strategic planning to enable new development at the port, this option would help to retain existing built environment quality, although the creation of new development and infrastructure may well have some adverse impacts. These could be mitigated to some extent over time through S10e and CL measures.	↑↑ This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Workington's employment sites to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs	↑↑ This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Workington to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs	⊕ No significant effect	↑↑ This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Workington to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs	↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as it promotes regeneration of an area to provide a gateway to the main town.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	⊕ No significant effect	↑ Enabling of development around the port should help to raise the profile and accessibility of the port in terms of infrastructure and businesses, which should in turn increase the use of the port for the movement of materials etc. rather than by road, reducing emissions and benefitting local air quality.	↑ The policy option promotes the growth of services and facilities within the town, this should increase the overall offer of the town and reinforce its role as the PSC for the Borough, therefore this will potentially reduce some of the need to travel to other towns outside the Borough, reducing emissions related to this travel.	↑ The proposal promotes the development of employment opportunities within the proximity of the town, which should help to encourage sustainable access to work opportunities, reducing emissions and helping to address local air quality issues within the town.	⊕ No significant effect	↑ The policy option promotes the growth of services and facilities within the town, this should increase the overall offer of the town and reinforce its role as the PSC for the Borough, therefore this will potentially reduce some of the need to travel to other towns outside the Borough, reducing emissions related to this travel.	↑ The proposals aim to develop the area as an accessible location that is easy to enjoy on foot, bike or by public transport, and to develop the area's relationship with surrounding areas. This has the potential to reduce the number of car journeys and therefore emissions, however, if realised the effect is predicted to be slight.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⊕ No significant effect	↓ Depending on the location of new development in proximity to the port, there will be potential impacts related to water quality impacts will need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies.	⊕ The town is adjacent to the River Derwent and any hydrological links to this will need to be considered as part of any development. Parts of the town are also at risk from flooding. However, as the policy relates to the existing employment sites, it is assumed that these issues have already been addressed.	⚡ The town is adjacent to the River Derwent and any hydrological links to this will need to be considered as part of any development. Parts of the town are also at risk from flooding, development will need to be directed away from these areas.	⊕ No significant effect	⚡ The town is adjacent to the River Derwent and any hydrological links to this will need to be considered as part of any development. Parts of the town are also at risk from flooding, development will need to be directed away from these areas.	⚡ The site is bounded on one side by the River Derwent therefore there is potential that new development in this location could adversely impact on water quality here. This will need to be considered in conjunction with the HRA and NE policies.	The policy options (2, 4, 6 and 7) identify potentially adverse effects as a result of impacts on the river Derwent, therefore the policies will need to be considered in conjunction with the findings of the HRA and NE policies.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⊕ No significant effect	↓ This option will result in the loss of land and soil sealing through land-take to provide new development and associated infrastructure.	⊕ The policy relates to growth on existing employment sites, and therefore there should be no additional impacts.	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective through the promotion of the use of brownfield land for new development.	⊕ No significant effect	⚡ The policy primarily focuses on development within the town, which will prioritise the use of brownfield land, however, it does also enable edge of centre development which is more likely to involve the use of greenfield land.	↑ The proposals aim to regenerate an existing part developed area, and will address any previous contamination issues associated with the gas compound. The proposals will also secure large areas of woodland and open space.	(2) and (6) are potentially adverse effects through soil sealing and the use of greenfield land as a result of new development. (7) is identified as a positive effect as it regenerates a previously developed area, including areas of potential contamination. (4) is strongly supportive of the objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⊕ No significant effect	↑ Whilst the policy option does not minimise the use and transport of primary minerals, it does provide a sustainable approach to transport of materials.	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	Generally there are no significant effects, however (2) does present the opportunity to transport minerals sustainably.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective through the promotion of development to enable new employment opportunities.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The proposals aim to make the derwent valley a focus for investment with real opportunities for new economic development and that contributes to economic regeneration in the area.	The policy options are strongly supportive of the objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective through the promotion of development to enable new employment opportunities, in close proximity to the town providing good access for the local population.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The proposals aim to make the derwent valley a focus for investment with real opportunities for new economic development and that contributes to economic regeneration in the area.	The policy options are strongly supportive of the objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective through the promotion of development to enable new employment opportunities.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The proposals aim to make the derwent valley a focus for investment with real opportunities for new economic development and that contributes to economic regeneration in the area.	The policy options are strongly supportive of the objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		S10 Area Based Strategy - Workington	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇦	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S10: Area Based Strategy - Workington		
	Built Environment Policy Option		Comments
	(1): Seek the continued protection of the attractive historic buildings within the Conservation Areas of Portland Square, Brow Top and St. Michaels		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	This supports the public's views in terms of protection of historic character and features.	The policy option is supportive of the objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↔	No significant effect	None
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect	None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	⇨	This policy has the potential to have an indirect effect on this objective, by enhancing the local historic environment	None
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	By protecting and preserving the local conservation areas in Workington, this option helps to support this objective .	The policy option is strongly supportive of the objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	This policy includes the protection of soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees and hedges within the conservation areas, which could support this objective.	The policy option is supportive of the objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	This policy includes the protection of hard and soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees, hedges, fences and surfacing within the conservation areas and so supports this objective.	The policy option is strongly supportive of the objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	This policy supports the sympathetic development in conservation areas and alteration/extensions to listed buildings and so supports this objective	The policy option is supportive of the objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effect	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effect	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This policy aims to enhance social and economic regeneration in Workington by promoting the role of heritage; historic properties can provide an income, source of employment and supplement the regional tourism industry.	The policy option is strongly supportive of the objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This policy will provide additional jobs in tourism and other associated industries by promoting the role of heritage in Workington	The policy option is strongly supportive of the objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	This policy promotes the role of heritage within the local economy and supplements the facilities available to visitors to Workington.	The policy option is strongly supportive of the objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		S10 Area Based Strategy - Workington	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	⇒⇒	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	⇒	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇒	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇐	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	⇐	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	⇐⇐	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S10: Area Based Strategy - Workington						Comments
	Natural Environment Policy Options						
	(1): Protect and enhance the exceptional natural beauty of Curwen Park and recognise the importance of this area for recreational uses, as a habitat for protected wildlife species, and a significant GI asset	(2): Recognise and protect the special character of the River Derwent and River Derwent Corridor (SAC)	(3): Support proposals which minimise the risk of flooding and effectively contribute to defence management				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⇒	This policy supports the public's views in terms of the value placed on Curwen Park as an asset to the town and recreational resource.	⇒	This policy supports the public's views in terms of the value placed on the River Derwent as an asset to the area.	↑↑	This policy supports the views of the community about future development in areas of flood risk within the town and along the Derwent valley.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↔	No significant effects, this will continue to maintain the existing levels of access to the park.	↔	No significant effects.	⇒	Development in areas of flood risk can result in impeded access to services and facilities should a flood event occur, contributions to defence management could help maintain access to infrastructure and facilities for those areas of the town that are currently at risk from flooding.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	↑	This policy steers development away from the high risk areas adjacent to the Derwent and encourages the use of lower risk areas within the town, this will ensure that people have access to a decent home.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effect.	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Reinforcing and enhancing highly valued the landscape of Curwen Park could help to further support this objective.	↔	No significant effects.	⇒⇒	This policy will prioritise development in lower, rather than higher risk areas of the town reducing the impact of flooding on residents or users of the development and improving their sense of well-being.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	Reinforcing and enhancing highly valued landscape of Curwen Park within the town could help to further support this objective and create a strong sense of local history amongst residents.	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑	There will be considerable synergy and overlap between biodiversity and landscape criteria, with high potential for enhancement of both as the park is a highly valued resource in biodiversity and landscape terms.	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective.	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	There will be considerable synergy and overlap between biodiversity and landscape criteria, with high potential for enhancement of both as the park is a highly valued resource in biodiversity and landscape terms.	⇒⇒	Protection of landscape character and quality and the protection of the SAC are inextricably linked.	⇒	By not building in high flood risk areas associated with the Derwent, this option should help to reduce the risk of damage to the town from flood events.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	Taking direct account of specific local character of Curwen Park in shaping the setting and design of new development and regeneration schemes within Workington town centre will help to enhance and reinforce the quality of the built environment within the town.	↔	No significant effects.	⇒	This policy supports this objective by steering developments to lower flood risk areas away from the banks of the Derwent.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effect.	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⇒	There may be further potential for improvements in the quality and extent of surface water features and river landscapes that also help towards improving water quality and resources in the park and the adjacent Derwent.	⇒⇒	Protection of water quality and the protection of the SAC are inextricably linked.	↑↑	This policy fully supports this objective, reducing increased pressure on the water environment in Workington.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇒⇒	There is strong indirect potential for improvements in landscape features and elements in the park to also help improve land and soil quality: soil type strongly influences key landscape characteristics. In turn, these characteristics can help to conserve soil resources.	⇒⇒	Protection of land and soil and the protection of the SAC are inextricably linked.	⇒⇒	By not developing areas of high flood risk there is less impact on the land from the effects of flooding, i.e. landslides and soil contamination.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effect.	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effect.	None
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effect.	None
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	⇒⇒	By reducing the impact of flood risk in the Workington area, businesses should be encouraged to locate in the town without the concern of potential flood risk issues and prosper.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		S10 Area Based Strategy - Workington	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects	Major beneficial	Major beneficial
↑↑	→→	Major beneficial	Major beneficial
↑	→	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial
↑	→	Potentially beneficial	Potentially beneficial
↓	←	Potentially adverse	Potentially adverse
↓	←	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
↓↓	←←	Major adverse	Major adverse
↕		Potentially beneficial or adverse	
↔		No significant effect	

S10: Area Based Strategy - Workington											
Transport / Infrastructure Policy Options											
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	(1): Support proposals in Workington to create a multi modal transport interchange with potential for mixed use development and additional car parking.	(2): Facilitating the expansion of the Port of Workington by enhancing the infrastructure such as road and rail access.	(3): Encourage proposals that will actively support the further development of the nuclear industry in the area such as rail and highway improvements.	(4): Work with partners to support any future proposals for the strategic infrastructure projects, such as the Workington Southern Link Road, and seek to protect proposed routes through planning policy.	(5): Work with partners to maximise the roll out of superfast and next generation broadband across the locality to both residential and business users.	Comments					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↑↑	This enables people to participate in democratic processes even if they live in rural areas or have access or other issues that may restrict them from participating in a more usual manner.	The policy options are either generally very supportive of this objective or are showing no effect.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This policy positively supports this sustainability objective, by enabling the Workington interchange to help improve accessibility to services by increasing mobility within and between Workington, other settlements and the countryside.	↑	Ultimately, this option will support the strategic future development of the Borough's transport network within and beyond its administrative area and will help increase access to services and facilities wider than just for the Port's uses.	↑	Ultimately, this option will support the strategic future development of the Borough's transport network within and beyond its administrative area, although there may be disruptions during the construction period.	↑↑	This option fully supports this sustainability objective because it addresses future potential need for integrated on and off road networks.	↑↑	This enables people to access facilities and services even if they live in rural areas or have access or other issues that may restrict them from participating in a more usual manner.	The policy options are strongly supportive in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	→	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services, thus improving quality of life where people live.	→	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services, thus improving quality of life where people live.	The policy options are either potentially indirectly supportive of this objective or are showing no effect.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve this sustainability objective, by enabling the Workington interchange to help improve accessibility to education and training services by increasing mobility.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	→	This policy has indirect potential to help achieve this sustainability objective, by enabling improved access opportunities to education and training services by increasing mobility.	↑	This policy option provides the opportunity for remote access to educational and training facilities.	The policy options are either potentially supportive of this objective or are showing no effect.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	→→	By providing increased mobility where demand exists, this policy has the potential to help towards increasing people's health and sense of well-being, by enabling easy access to essential services in Workington and out to the countryside.	↔	No significant effects	→	By enabling better traffic flows around the Borough during and post construction, this option would help to maintain quality of life and sense of well-being, especially within and adjacent to the main transport construction areas of the NNB.	→	By protecting existing and possible future routes, this policy has the potential to help towards increasing people's health and sense of well-being, by enabling easy access to essential services and the countryside.	→	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services and potential employment, thus improving quality of life and a sense of well-being.	The policy options are indirectly supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	→→	Increased mobility to meet proven demand for greater access to and from Workington can indirectly help to increase participation in local events/festivals, clubs and informal social interaction. This type of provision may also help to foster increasing levels of social activity.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	→	Safeguarding existing and future routes should aid easier access which will indirectly help to enable participation in local events/festivals, clubs and informal social interaction. This policy may indirectly help to foster increasing levels of social activity.	→	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services and potential employment, thus improving quality of life and retaining people in more rural areas strengthening local community vibrancy.	The policy options are indirectly supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	This policy could possibly have adverse effects on biodiversity through the provision of new facilities in edge of town areas in Workington, especially if greenfield land is needed.	↔	No significant effects	↓	Through good strategic planning to enable better traffic flows around the town during and post construction, this option would help to protect special sites and habitats of high biodiversity interest, as well as buffer areas. There may well be some loss of biodiversity resource and quality in the construction areas/sites however, but losses could be mitigated to some extent over time through substitution via S106 and CIL.	↓	As time moves on through the next LTP period, this option may adversely affect greenfield sites and countryside areas, thus working against this objective, because new routes may be created. It will be important that unavoidable effects are effectively mitigated.	↔	No significant effects	The policy options will potentially result in an adverse impact in terms of this objective, however, it will depend on the location of the development in terms of the scale of the potential biodiversity impact and therefore this needs to be considered in terms of the HRA and on a site specific basis.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↕	Through good strategic planning to enable better traffic flows around the borough during and post construction, this option would help to retain existing landscape character, although the creation of new road links and the widening of existing rail and road routes may well have some adverse impacts. These could be mitigated to some extent over time through S106 and CIL measures.	↓	As for the above, over time during the next LTP period, this option may adversely affect greenfield sites and countryside areas, thus working against this objective, because new routes may be created. It will be important that unavoidable effects on landscape character are effectively mitigated.	↔	No significant effects	The policy options will potentially result in an adverse impact in terms of this objective, however, it will depend on the location of the development in terms of the scale of the potential landscape impact and therefore this needs to be considered on a site specific basis, development within the town itself is less likely to have an adverse impact than development on the edge of the town and the more rural hinterland..

EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	→	Well planned, needed transport interchange facilities could help to relieve traffic congestion in Workington centre, indirectly contributing towards a higher quality built environment	↔	No significant effects	↕	Through good strategic planning to enable better traffic flows around the borough during and post construction, this option would help to retain existing built environment quality, although the creation of new road links and the widening of existing rail and road routes may well have some adverse impacts. These could be mitigated to some extent over time through S106 and CIL measures.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	Only (1) and (3) are indicating potential effects, these effects may be positive or adverse and will depend a great deal on the planning and implementation, good design policies set out in the BE section will be important to consider in conjunction with this policy.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑	The provision of well planned, strategically located interchange facilities in Workington should help to reduce levels of private car use and thus help towards reducing traffic emissions, helping to improve local air quality.	↕	This option will help to alleviate local air quality issues both by promoting the use of Workington Port as a sustainable mode of transport for commercial businesses etc and developing the rail infrastructure as a sustainable mode of land transport to support this. However, increased traffic levels, whether rail or especially by road, will add to local emissions in the Workington and wider West Cumbria area.	↕	This option will help to alleviate local air quality issues both during the construction and operational stages. However, increased traffic levels, whether rail or especially by road, will add to local emissions.	→	This policy may actually help to regulate emissions by enabling better traffic flow and better on/off road network integration, thus alleviating traffic congestion. It would not necessarily encourage increased traffic volumes.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home, reducing overall levels of commuting and therefore emissions.	The policy options are generally supportive of this objective, however, supporting improvements to road and rail infrastructure will increase emissions.
NK2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↓	This policy could possibly have adverse effects through the provision of new facilities in an edge of town area in Workington, especially if greenfield land is proposed to be used for the interchange, as this could result in land take and soil sealing.	↕	This option could help to keep freight off the roads and by making greater use of rail access, could protect land and soils from road development. On the other hand, if improved access leads to new road development, there would probably be an adverse impact on land and soils. This option will at least help to prevent further land-take and soil sealing from new development that may also affect access to the port at Workington and thus its viability.	↓	This option will result in the loss of land and soil sealing through land-take to provide new infrastructure.	↓	Over time during the next LTP period, this option may adversely affect land and soils as new routes are created, thus working against this objective. It will be important that unavoidable effects on land and soil are effectively mitigated, using the NE policies to help guide location, design and route hierarchy.	↔	No significant effects	With the exception of (5), these policy options will result in the loss of land and soil and therefore will need to be considered in terms of other policies that prioritise the use of PDL in order to minimise the effect as far as possible.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects	→	By protecting port access at Workington, this option makes it possible to import minerals to the area, helping to protect local sources from being depleted. It also enables waste materials to be exported sustainably from the area for re-use and recycling in other locations with appropriate infrastructure and facilities that Allerdale may not have.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	(2) is potentially indirectly supportive of the objective, all other policies have no effect.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→	Well planned transport interchange facilities in Workington could help to increase employee and customer mobility, thus providing indirect support to retain existing jobs and help to create new job opportunities. It should be noted that increasing mobility also needs to be affordable not only by the majority but those who are most economically disadvantaged.	↑	By protecting port access this option makes it possible to maintain the viability of Workington and Silloth, helping to protect existing jobs and creating opportunities for new ones.	↑	The construction activity and post construction improvements to strategic routes and network use will all help to secure existing jobs and help to create new employment opportunities, both directly and indirectly	→	This policy has indirect potential to help achieve this sustainability objective, by enabling improved access opportunities between urban centres, rural settlements and places of work in both town and country, for employees and customers.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity, it also helps to support rural businesses to develop and grow, where previously the lack of infrastructure would have restricted this opportunity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home.	The policies are supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑	The provision of well planned, strategically located interchange facilities in Workington should help to improve access to jobs by improving mobility and mode of transport choice, especially for people who need to commute from and to more rural areas. Levels of mobility are also dependant on affordability so it is not possible to score this policy option any higher at present.	↑↑	By protecting port access this option makes it possible to import minerals to the area, helping to protect regional sources from being depleted. It also enables waste materials to be exported sustainably from the area and beyond Allerdale for re-use and recycling in other locations with appropriate facilities.	↑	As for the above, the construction activity and post construction improvements to strategic routes and network use will all help to improve accessibility to existing job and new employment opportunities.	→	This policy has good indirect potential to help achieve this sustainability objective, by enabling improved access/mobility opportunities between urban centres, rural settlements and places of work in both town and country.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home, reducing overall levels of commuting and therefore emissions.	The policies are supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→	Well planned transport interchange facilities in Workington to meet existing demand could well help to enable economic diversification, contributing to a stronger economy in local areas, e.g. by helping to increase employee and customer mobility.	↑↑	By protecting port access this option makes it possible to maintain the viability of Workington and Silloth, helping to protect existing jobs and attracting new inward investment into not only the ports but in their wider hinterlands, for new businesses that need to make use of the port facilities.	→	This option will help towards enabling the economy within Allerdale to diversify and become stronger because the NNB and its legacy will help to attract inward investment and local diversification to other markets	→	This policy has indirect potential to help achieve this sustainability objective, by enabling improved access/mobility between urban centres, rural settlements and places of work in both town and country for all types of economic activity, i.e. it should aid inward investment.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity, it also helps to support rural businesses to develop and grow, where previously the lack of infrastructure would have restricted this opportunity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home.	The policies are supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇦	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S10 Area Based Strategy - Workington

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S10: Area Based Strategy - Workington		
	Alternative Policy Option		Comments
	S10a: Do not provide area based policies, instead addressing policies through the strategic objective themes of climate change and sustainable development, housing, economy, transport, natural and built environment.		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↓	This will result in residents of Workington feeling that the particular issues of importance to them locally are not being adequately addressed by the Council.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↔	No significant effect, Workington will remain the main centre for facilities and services in the Borough and for adjacent Copeland, however, without specific policies there is the potential that the baseline level will not be improved upon.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⇕	Whilst the policy does not restrict future housing development, without the specific guidance of the preferred options the needs of the Workington community in terms of type and mix and affordable needs may not be met.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect, Workington has existing schools and new development will be able to access these facilities.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effect, development in the town regardless of guidance from the preferred options will enable access to the existing facilities.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↓	Without the specific guidance provided by the preferred options, there will be no strategic approach to future development within the Workington area, and therefore there is the risk that the proposals will not contribute to the vibrancy and vitality of the town and not develop social cohesion.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	Whilst the designated sites will be protected by national policy, without the guidance provided by the preferred options, the strategic approach to development in Workington there is the risk that new development will result in adverse impacts and limited opportunities to identify enhancement.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓	Whilst the designated sites will be protected by national policy, without the guidance provided by the preferred options, the strategic approach to development in Workington there is the risk that new development will result in adverse impacts and limited opportunities to identify enhancement.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇕	The preferred policies provide guidance and steer new development to provide high quality design and reflect the character of the town, without this guidance there is a risk that new development will be out of scale character with the current town.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↓	The preferred policy approaches provide a steer towards ensuring development is sustainably located and improves transport infrastructure within the town.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇕	Whilst there are Core strategy policies related to reuse of brownfield land specific guidance at the local level will ensure that land and soil are protected as far as possible.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	The current level of employment within the town will be unaffected by the alternative policy option, however, there is potential that the approach to employment development in the town will not be appropriate for its needs.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↓	Without the specific guidance provided by the economic policies there is the potential that the market forces driving development will not contribute to diversifying the economy or addressing deficits in facilities and services.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		Indirect Effects	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	→	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	←	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S11 Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S11: Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth						
	Housing Policy Options			(1): Identify land for new housing provision, with a high priority given to meeting local affordable needs	(2): Expect new residential development to make a positive contribution to the overall mix of housing in the locality in which it is located	(3): Encourage the provision of housing to meet the needs of the elderly and for people with special needs	Comments
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	This reflects the desires of the public to see affordable housing provided in the town to ensure a good balanced community.	↑	This reflects the desires of the public to see a range of housing provided in the town to ensure a good balanced community.	↑	This reflects the increasing demand for adaptable housing to meet the needs of the ageing community in the town and those with disabilities.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	This policy option will provide housing in one of the main centres within the Borough and therefore will ensure that the new population will have good access to the services and facilities within the town, however, the town has relatively poor public transport access and therefore cannot be scored more highly.	↔	No significant effect, as policy relates to the type and mix of housing rather than actual delivery of housing.	↑	This reflects the increasing demand for adaptable housing to meet the needs of the ageing community in the town and those with disabilities, which will enable them to live more independently and be located close to services and facilities.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of this objective, particularly as it provides an emphasis towards affordable housing, as Cockermouth has one of the highest affordability issues in the Borough.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of this objective.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of this objective.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑	Cockermouth has particularly highly performing schools and therefore provision of additional housing in the locality of the town will enable better access to these educational facilities.	↔	No significant effect, as policy relates to the type and mix of housing rather than actual delivery of housing.	↔	No significant effect, as policy relates to the type of housing rather than actual delivery of housing.	(1) is supportive of this objective, the other options have no significant effect. The capacities of educational facilities will need to be considered in advance of any development to ensure that the increase in population does not exceed them.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Provision of new affordable housing will help to improve general well-being through ensuring that people have access to affordable homes. Locating new development within the town will also ensure good access to local healthcare facilities for all.	↑	Provision of new affordable housing will help to improve general well-being through ensuring that people have access to decent homes that meet their needs.	↑	Provision of new affordable housing will help to improve general well-being through ensuring that people have access to decent homes that meet their needs.	(The policy options are supportive of this objective. The capacities of healthcare facilities will need to be considered in advance of any development to ensure that the increase in population does not exceed them.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	Cockermouth has a particularly vibrant and thriving town and spirit and a good range of cultural activities, provision of additional development within the town at the appropriate scale should help to support this further.	↑	Through ensuring a good mix of housing is developed in the town, there will be a range of population residing in them, this will contribute to the mix of the community and help to develop the vibrancy of the existing community further.	↑	Through ensuring a good mix of housing is developed in the town, there will be a range of population residing in them, this will contribute to the mix of the community and help to develop the vibrancy of the existing community further.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. Cockermouth is a fairly constrained town in terms of designated sites, including the River Derwent SAC, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and the findings of the HRA.	↑	Whilst this policy does not relate to the actual delivery of housing, the issues of which are addressed in (1), there is the potential that new development can enhance biodiversity through sensitive design, incorporation of wildlife features within the scheme design, e.g. SuDS ponds, and the incorporation of measures such as bat and bird boxes etc.	↔	No significant effect, as policy relates to the type of housing rather than actual delivery of housing.	The policy options have the potential to have an adverse impact on biodiversity of varying scales, this will be entirely dependent on the locations proposed for new development and the impact that they will have on designated sites and species in the proximity of the town. All new development should be encouraged to incorporate biodiversity features into the design to mitigate and enhance any impacts.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. Cockermouth is a fairly constrained town in terms of its proximity to high quality landscapes, in particular the Lake District National Park, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and be subject to a full LVIA.	↑	Whilst this policy does not relate to the actual delivery of housing, the issues of which are addressed in (1), there is the potential that new development can enhance the local landscape through sensitive landscape design following a LVIA.	↔	No significant effect, as policy relates to the type of housing rather than actual delivery of housing.	The policy options have the potential to have an adverse impact on landscape of varying scales, this will be entirely dependent on the locations proposed for new development and the impact that they will have on the wider landscape and particularly the Lake District National Park. All new development should be subject to a LVIA and the landscape design of the scheme should take account of local character and minimise and enhance impacts where possible.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↕	The town is one of the main centres for the Borough after Workington and is relatively well served by facilities, services, educational and employment opportunities. However, the town does not have a railway and has limited bus connections, as such the opportunities to travel sustainably to and from the town are limited. Therefore locating new housing here will be a balance between the sustainability of locating housing within an existing centre reducing need to travel and the emissions that will arise from travel outside of the town, recognising that this will need to be done, even if the population reside and work within Cockermouth.	↕	Whilst the same issues apply here as with (1), there is the potential that the housing will be designed to be efficient and reduce overall emissions from residential properties, however, this will depend on design.	↑	Provision of housing of this type within an existing community with facilities and services on hand should reduce the need for transport to and from the town to access the services.	The policy options have the potential to be supportive as through locating new housing within the existing town where services, facilities and employment opportunities are present, there should be a reduced need to travel. However, with Cockermouth's poor public transport connections, residents here still need to rely on the use of the private car. These policies therefore need to be considered in conjunction with transport policies to achieve better transport infrastructure within the town.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↓	There is a currently a major issue relating to drainage capacity and flooding within Cockermouth, where development is currently restricted related to these issues. These will need to be resolved prior to any new development within the town being permitted.	↓	There is a currently a major issue relating to drainage capacity and flooding within Cockermouth, where development is currently restricted related to these issues. These will need to be resolved prior to any new development within the town being permitted.	↓	There is a currently a major issue relating to drainage capacity and flooding within Cockermouth, where development is currently restricted related to these issues. These will need to be resolved prior to any new development within the town being permitted.	These policy options will potentially result in an adverse impact. There is a currently a major issue relating to drainage capacity and flooding within Cockermouth, where development is currently restricted related to these issues. These will need to be resolved prior to any new development within the town being permitted.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↓	The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, there are few opportunities for reuse of brownfield land within Cockermouth and its hinterland and therefore new development is likely to be on greenfield land.	↔	No significant effect, as policy relates to the type and mix of housing rather than actual delivery of housing.	↔	No significant effect, as policy relates to the type and mix of housing rather than actual delivery of housing.	These policy options will potentially result in an adverse impact. The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, there are few opportunities for reuse of brownfield land within Cockermouth and its hinterland and therefore new development is likely to be on greenfield land.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities.	→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities.	→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities.	The policy options are potentially indirectly supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↕	Through locating housing in one of the main centres there is the potential for good access to employment, however as the town has poor public transport links, access to employment outside of the town, or for those employees not residing in the town is less easy.	↕	Through locating housing in one of the main centres there is the potential for good access to employment, however as the town has poor public transport links, access to employment outside of the town, or for those employees not residing in the town is less easy.	↕	Through locating housing in one of the main centres there is the potential for good access to employment, however as the town has poor public transport links, access to employment outside of the town, or for those employees not residing in the town is less easy.	The policy options have the potential to be supportive as through locating new housing within the existing town where employment opportunities are present, there should be good accessibility. However, with Cockermouth's poor public transport connections, residents here still need to rely on the use of the private car. These policies therefore need to be considered in conjunction with transport policies to achieve better transport infrastructure within the town.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.	→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.	→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.	The policy options are potentially indirectly supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects

S11 Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth

Sustainability Objectives	S11: Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth								Comments
	Economy Policy Options								
	(1): Address the lack of available employment sites and increase the range of offer to meet both local needs and those of the nuclear supply sectors	(2): Support proposals which build upon the existing vitality and viability of Cockermouth town centre including, improve the retail provision (particularly convenience), develop the evening economy, support the representation of independent local retailers and revitalise the market place	(3): Support the provision, improvement and protection of small scale retail, leisure and community services in rural settlements	(4): Encourage tourism proposals which capitalise on the high visitor numbers to the Cockermouth area, particularly sustainable forms of tourism and leisure attractions, such as Roman Papcastle, and high quality accommodation					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes		The policy option addresses the need and desire for local employment opportunities.		No significant effect		This option supports stakeholders views, helping to indirectly meet this objective		No significant effect	(1) and (3) are supportive of the objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces		The option will help to provide additional employment opportunities across the area, and therefore increases access to employment.		This option directly supports this objective through provision of promoting proposals within the town centre wherever possible increasing access to these types of facilities within the town and reducing the need to travel further afield. Focussing on convenience in particular will be key to address the current deficiencies of this type of retail within the town.		This policy is directly supportive of this objective in terms of supporting small local facilities which improves access for the more isolated rural communities.		The policy option supports improving access to services, facilities, and the countryside primarily for visitors to the area, however, this will also benefit access for residents.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home		No significant effect		This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to ensure that people have access to services and facilities close to their home, improving the quality of their home in the wider sense.		This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to ensure that people have access to services and facilities close to their home, improving the quality of their home in the wider sense.		No significant effect	(2) and (3) are potentially indirectly supportive of the objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training		Dependent on the type of proposals, this has the potential to be supportive to this objective.		Dependent on the type of proposals, this has the potential to be supportive to this objective.		No significant effect.		No significant effect	(1) and (2) are potentially supportive of the objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people		No significant effect		No significant effect		This option supports this objective because it will improve overall quality of life for those living in rural areas to have access to some services and facilities within their communities, contributing to health and well-being.		No significant effect	(3) is supportive of the objective, the other options show no identifiable effects.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history		No significant effect		This option strongly supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities, particularly building on the strong existing blend of independent retailers within Cockermouth protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town.		This option strongly supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities protects the vitality and vibrancy of local communities and enables them to continue to thrive as living communities.		This option supports this objective because improving local services and facilities in Cockermouth protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town and promoting the town as a tourist attraction could result in additional cultural and recreation events and festivals further developing the sense of community and preserving the sense of character and history of the town.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity		The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Cockermouth town centre it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts than development on the edge of the settlement. Proposals for new development will need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies and the findings of the HRA.		The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Cockermouth town centre it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts than development on the edge of the settlement. Proposals for new development will need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies and the findings of the HRA.		No significant effect.		This option could indirectly help to support measures to enhance biodiversity interest, as the value of the area in terms of tourist potential is inextricably linked to its biodiversity value. However, this will need to be managed against the promotion of the area as a tourist attraction and the potential issues that could result from increased access and recreation on existing biodiversity assets.	The policy options indicate the potential for both beneficial and adverse impacts, the actual scale of the impacts will depend on location. The town is particularly constrained in terms of ecological designations and new economic development will need to take account of the findings of the HRA and seek to enhance biodiversity where possible.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations		The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Cockermouth town centre it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less landscape impacts than development on the edge of the settlement. The impact of new development on the setting of the National Park will need to be considered prior to development proposals being considered.		The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Cockermouth town centre it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less landscape impacts than development on the edge of the settlement. The impact of new development on the setting of the National Park will need to be considered prior to development proposals being considered.		No significant effect.		This option could indirectly help to support measures to enhance landscape interest, as the value of the area in terms of tourist potential is inextricably linked to its landscape value. However, this will need to be managed against the promotion of the area as a tourist attraction and the potential issues that could result from increased access and recreation on existing landscape assets and sense of place and tranquillity that contribute to its current character.	The policy options indicate the potential for both beneficial and adverse impacts, the actual scale of the impacts will depend on location. The town is particularly constrained in terms of landscape designations and new economic development will need to take account of the potential impact of new development on the setting of these landscapes and the wider impacts on landscape character and quality and the NE policies.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment		This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Cockermouth to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs		This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Cockermouth to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs		No significant effect.		This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Cockermouth to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs	The policy options are generally strongly supportive in terms of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions		The policy promotes the growth of employment opportunities within the area, which should address the current deficit of employment within the area, this potentially will reduce the need to travel out of the area for work, reducing emissions.		The policy option promotes the growth of services and facilities within the town, this should increase the overall offer of the town and therefore potentially reduce some of the need to travel to other towns in the Borough particularly through the increased provision of convenience retail, reducing emissions related to this travel.		Through continued protection of small scale services and facilities within communities, there should be a slight reduction in the need to travel for those residents served by these facilities.		The policy option will encourage increased visitors to the Cockermouth area which has the potential to increase emissions and reduce local air quality. However, the option seeks to promote sustainable tourism and leisure attractions which should help to address this. Such a policy needs to be coupled with investment in sustainable transport in order to minimise effects as far as possible.	The policy options are supportive of the objective, however, promotion of the area as a tourist destination, will inevitably increase visitor numbers to the area, and their related transport emissions, promotion of such a policy needs to be done in conjunction with promotion and investment in sustainable transport and infrastructure in order to ensure that this does not result in adverse impacts in terms of local air quality.

NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↓	Drainage capacity is a particularly constraining issue for development within the town, and any new development to support the tourist economy in the area will need to address these capacity issues. The development and promotion of tourism will need to ensure that hydrological links to watercourses and particularly designated sites such as the Derwent are not compromised. Large areas of the town are also at risk from flooding which will further constrain the location for new development.	↓	Drainage capacity is a particularly constraining issue for development within the town, and any new development to support the tourist economy in the area will need to address these capacity issues. The development and promotion of tourism will need to ensure that hydrological links to watercourses and particularly designated sites such as the Derwent are not compromised. Large areas of the town are also at risk from flooding which will further constrain the location for new development.	↔	No significant effect.	↓	Drainage capacity is a particularly constraining issue for development within the town, and any new development to support the tourist economy in the area will need to address these capacity issues. The development and promotion of tourism will need to ensure that hydrological links to watercourses and particularly designated sites such as the Derwent are not compromised. Large areas of the town are also at risk from flooding which will further constrain the location for new development.	There are potential adverse impacts related to this objective, by virtue of the current issues related to drainage capacity within the town which need to be resolved prior to new development being permitted. The potential water quality impacts on the Derwent will also need to be considered in conjunction with the findings of the HRA.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇅	Promoting development within the town itself should promote the use of brownfield land prior to greenfield land therefore potentially meeting the aims of this objective, however, the opportunities for this in the town are limited. Development in the wider Cockerthorpe area is less likely to be taking place on brownfield land. The value of the area in terms of tourism is dependent on the quality of the environment, therefore the two are linked in terms of the need to maintain and protect the land.	↑	Promoting development within the town centre should promote the use of brownfield land prior to greenfield land therefore potentially meeting the aims of this objective.	↔	No significant effect.	⇅	Promoting development within the town itself should promote the use of brownfield land prior to greenfield land therefore potentially meeting the aims of this objective, however, the opportunities for this in the town are limited. Development in the wider Cockerthorpe area is less likely to be taking place on brownfield land. The value of the area in terms of tourism is dependent on the quality of the environment, therefore the two are linked in terms of the need to maintain and protect the land.	(2) is potentially supportive of the objective, (1) and (4) highlight potential concerns over the limited availability of brownfield and therefore the potential reliance on greenfield land to enable new development within the town.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effect.	↔	No significant effect.	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive.	↑	This should on a small scale protect existing jobs in these services and facilities, although there will be limited opportunities to grow these further.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive, providing greater employment opportunities within the town, therefore increasing access for residents to employment opportunities locally.	↔	No significant effect.	↑↑	This option supports this objective through increased access to jobs in the leisure services industry in the town.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive, strengthening the local economy.	↔	No significant effect.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, and diversifies the economy in terms of tourism.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive in terms of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇒	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇐	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S11 Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S11: Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth		
	Built Environment Policy Option		Comments
	(1): Safeguard and enhance buildings sites and areas of heritage and cultural importance		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	Potentially supports the desire for the local population to see their historic areas protected and enhanced resulting in a more pleasant local environment.	The policy option is potentially supportive of the objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↔	No significant effect	None
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↕	The policy option has the potential to improve the quality of existing old housing making it more decent for people to live in. However, there is the potential that older housing can be less resource efficient and more expensive than more modern housing which may make it too costly for some residents.	The policy option is potentially supportive of the objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↕	The policy option has the potential to improve the quality of existing old housing making it more decent for people to live in, improving health and quality of life. However, there is the potential that older housing can be less resource efficient and more expensive than more modern housing which may make it too costly for some residents.	The policy option is potentially supportive of the objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	A policy to protect and enhance the buildings and areas of cultural and heritage importance will promote and enhance the sense of local history within the Cockermouth community.	The policy is supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	Policy is supportive of this objective	The policy is supportive of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑	Policy is supportive of this objective	The policy is supportive of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	Policy is directly supportive of this objective.	Policy is directly supportive of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive as the areas of historic and cultural interest directly contribute to the existing character of the town and its environs and protecting this and enhancing will further benefit the wider character and quality of the landscape.	Policy is directly supportive of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	This policy relates to the protection and enhancement of existing land and buildings and therefore does not result in the use of additional land.	Policy is directly supportive of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑	The policy protects and enhances buildings rather than developing new properties and therefore there will be less waste generated.	Policy is directly supportive of this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effect	None
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effect	None
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	No significant effect	None

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S11 Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S11: Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth			
	Natural Environment Policy Options			Comments
	(1): Recognise and protect the special character of the River Derwent and River Derwent Corridor (SAC)	(2): Support proposals which minimise the risk of flooding and effectively contribute to defence management		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	Policy reflects the desire of people to protect and enhance the assets of their community.	↑↑	Policy directly reflects the desire for people to reside in areas that are free from the risk of flooding. Policy options are supportive of the objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↕	Protection of the SAC, will ensure continued access to the wider countryside through the SAC environment, however, promoting access to this area, has the potential to affect the integrity of the site and its qualifying features, therefore the potential impacts of this will need to be considered further in the HRA.	↑↑	The policy option aims to ensure that the population of Cockermouth are not adversely affected as a result of flooding, therefore enabling them to maintain access to services and facilities and the wider countryside, when they may have been at risk of being cut off through flooding events. Policy options are generally supportive of the objective, however, there is a potential conflict relating to promoting access to the site and the integrity of the site, the HRA and NE policies should help to address this potential issue further.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect.	↑	Protecting properties from the risk of flooding will ensure that people have access to a decent and safe home. (2) is supportive of the objective, (1) has no effect.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect.	↔	No significant effect. None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effect.	↑	Protecting properties from the risk of flooding will ensure that people have access to a decent and safe home and therefore continued access to healthcare facilities, improving overall health and well-being. (2) is supportive of the objective, (1) has no effect.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↔	No significant effect.	↔	No significant effect. None
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective	↕	There is a potential conflict with this objective in terms of the river Derwent being the main source of flooding within the town and therefore measures to manage and mitigate against flood risk have the potential to conflict against the management measures specified for the SAC. However, there is the potential that the two can be compatible in terms of the use of sustainable means of management and mitigation that can combine to enhance biodiversity. The policy options are generally supportive, however, consideration of flood defences and management techniques will need to be taken with full consideration of the impacts upon the SAC and decisions will need to be taken in conjunction with the findings of the HRA.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	→→	The policy option is indirectly supportive of this objective as protection and enhancement of the designated site, which also forms a major landscape features within the town and its environs will also contribute to protection and enhancement of the town's landscape character.	↕	The potential impacts of this policy option will depend entirely on design and implementation. The policy options are generally supportive, however full impacts will need to be considered in conjunction with the other policies and findings of HRA.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↔	No significant effect.	↕	This is an uncertain effect as it depends on the form of the defences proposed as part of any ongoing improvements or new development. The council will need to ensure that as far as possible flood management is considered in a sustainable manner, through the use of means such as SuDS and that any hard measures retain the character of the town whilst also protecting from potential flood risk. The policy options present potentially uncertain effects and therefore they will need to be considered in more detail, in particular the potential form and design of any defences within the town will need to be considered in conjunction with the other policies within the Core Strategy.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effect.	↔	No significant effect. None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective as protection of water quality is key to protection of the SAC overall.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of this objective. The policy options are strongly supportive of the objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	This policy option will seek to protect the designated site and ensure good management of the land within it and within its buffer zone, therefore it is complementary to this objective.	↑	The policy option will seek to protect areas of land from future flood events. The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect.	↔	No significant effect. None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effect.	↑	The policy option will enable businesses within Cockermouth to be protected as far as possible from the risk of flooding, which will reduce the potential adverse impact that arises from flood events in terms of loss of business, interruptions to operations and logistical and clean up costs. This will ensure continued access to employment both for residents of the local area, and will ensure that businesses are able to continue operating and providing employment locally. Policy option (2) is supportive of the objective, (1) does not have any recognisable effect.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effect.	↑	The policy option will enable businesses within Cockermouth to be protected as far as possible from the risk of flooding, which will reduce the potential adverse impact that arises from flood events in terms of loss of business, interruptions to operations and logistical and clean up costs. This will ensure continued access to employment both for residents of the local area, and will ensure that businesses are able to continue operating and providing employment locally. Policy option (2) is supportive of the objective, (1) does not have any recognisable effect.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	No significant effect.	↑	The policy option will enable businesses within Cockermouth to be protected as far as possible from the risk of flooding, which will reduce the potential adverse impact that arises from flood events in terms of loss of business, interruptions to operations and logistical and clean up costs. This provides a greater strength to the local economy and will provide reassurance to businesses considering starting up or moving to the area. Policy option (2) is supportive of the objective, (1) does not have any recognisable effect.

Key: Significance of Effects	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects
Major beneficial	Major beneficial
Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial
Potentially beneficial	Potentially beneficial
Potentially adverse	Potentially adverse
Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Major adverse	Major adverse
Potentially beneficial or adverse	
No significant effect	

S11 Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth

Sustainability Objectives	S11: Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth				Comments
	Transport / Infrastructure Policy Options				
	(1): Support proposals which improve utility provision	(2): Encourage improvements to the accessibility of the town centre through improvements to the town car parks, with linked improvement to local public transport provision	(3): Support improvements in traffic management measures	(4): Work with partners to maximise the roll out of superfast and next generation broadband across the locality to both residential and business users	
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	Major beneficial	No significant effect	No significant effect	Major beneficial	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	No significant effect	Major beneficial	Minor beneficial	Major beneficial	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	Minor beneficial	No significant effect	No significant effect	Potentially beneficial	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	No significant effect	No significant effect	No significant effect	Minor beneficial	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	No significant effect	No significant effect	No significant effect	Potentially beneficial	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	No significant effect	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial	Potentially beneficial	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	No significant effect	No significant effect	No significant effect	No significant effects	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	No significant effect	Potentially beneficial or adverse	Potentially beneficial or adverse	No significant effects	The potential impact of these policies will depend on design and implementation as there is the potential for both positive and adverse impacts in respect to the objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	Minor beneficial	Potentially beneficial or adverse	Potentially beneficial or adverse	No significant effects	The potential impact of these policies will depend on design and implementation as there is the potential for both positive and adverse impacts in respect to the objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	No significant effects	Potentially beneficial or adverse	Major adverse	Major beneficial	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective, however, there is the potential that the policies seek to promote travel by private car, and therefore greater emphasis should be placed upon promoting sustainable modes of transport including public transport, footpaths and cycleways.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	Major beneficial	No significant effects	No significant effects	No significant effects	Policy option (1) is strongly supportive of this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	No significant effects	No significant effects	No significant effects	No significant effects	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	No significant effects	No significant effects	No significant effects	No significant effects	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial	Major beneficial	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	No significant effect	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial	Major beneficial	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial	Major beneficial	The policy options are supportive of the objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	→	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	←	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S11 Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S11: Area Based Strategy - Cockermouth		
	Alternative Policy Option		Comments
	S11a: Do not provide area based policies, instead addressing policies through the strategic objective themes of climate change and sustainable development, housing, economy, transport, natural and built environment.		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↓	The policy option fails to reflect the specific needs and desires of the Cockermouth community.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↕	Whilst the policy does not restrict future development in the area, it does not guide the specific development such as convenience retail that the area currently suffers a deficit, therefore access issues to certain services and facilities may still exist post development.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↕	Whilst the policy does not restrict future housing development, without the specific guidance of the preferred options the needs of the Cockermouth community in terms of type and mix and affordable needs may not be met.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect, Cockermouth has existing good schools and new development will be able to access these facilities.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effect, development in the town regardless of guidance from the preferred options will enable access to the existing facilities.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↓	Without the specific guidance provided by the preferred options, there will be no strategic approach to future development within the Cockermouth area, and therefore there is the risk that the proposals will not contribute to the vibrancy and vitality of the town and not develop social cohesion.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	Whilst the designated sites will be protected by national policy, without the guidance provided by the preferred options, the strategic approach to development in Cockermouth, there is the risk that new development will result in adverse impacts and limited opportunities to identify enhancement.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓	Whilst the designated sites will be protected by national policy, without the guidance provided by the preferred options, the strategic approach to development in Cockermouth, there is the risk that new development will result in adverse impacts and limited opportunities to identify enhancement.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↕	The preferred policies provide guidance and steer new development to provide high quality design and reflect the character of the town, without this guidance there is a risk that new development will be out of scale character with the current town.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↓	The preferred policy approaches provide a steer towards ensuring development is sustainably located and improves transport infrastructure within the town.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↕	Regardless of the preferred policies, the issue related to drainage capacity in the town remains and will need to be addressed by any future development within the town.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↕	Whilst there are Core strategy policies related to reuse of brownfield land specific guidance at the local level will ensure that land and soil are protected as far as possible.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	The current level of employment within the town will be unaffected by the alternative policy option, however, there is potential that the approach to employment development in the town will not be appropriate for its needs.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↓	Without the specific guidance provided by the economic policies there is the potential that the market forces driving development will not contribute to diversifying the economy or addressing deficits in facilities and services.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	→	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	←	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S12 Area Based Strategy - Maryport

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S12: Area Based Strategy - Maryport				
	Housing Policy Options				
	(1): Identify land for new housing reflecting the settlement hierarchy, recognising the importance of the locality to future residential development in Allerdale	(2): Seek to encourage new housing across the area to provide a mix of tenures and types, including affordable to meet current and future need, aspirations and regeneration objectives	Comments		
democratic processes	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	Prioritising Maryport as a centre for new housing development will increase accessibility to services and facilities as Maryport is identified as a KSC and is also well connected to other centres such as Workington. It is well served by public transport and cycle routes further improving accessibility.	↑	Prioritising Maryport as a centre for new housing development will increase accessibility to services and facilities as Maryport is identified as a KSC and is also well connected to other centres such as Workington. It is well served by public transport and cycle routes further improving accessibility.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑↑	Policy option directly supports this objective, Maryport is the most affordable part of the Borough but has high levels of deprivation and due to the lowest wage rate in the Borough remains unaffordable. Provision of new housing in the town should help to address these issues and provide the population with a decent home.	↑↑	Policy option directly supports this objective, Maryport is the most affordable part of the Borough but has high levels of deprivation and due to the lowest wage rate in the Borough remains unaffordable. Provision of new housing in the town should help to address these issues and provide the population with a decent home.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	Provision of decent affordable housing in the town and its environs will help to address issues of high levels of deprivation currently experienced and contribute to health and well-being	↑	Provision of decent affordable housing in the town and its environs and regenerating the town's housing stock will help to address issues of high levels of deprivation currently experienced and contribute to health and well-being	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↕	This option directly supports the achievement of this objective because it will help to build on the existing community within Maryport and its suburbs.	↕	This option directly supports the achievement of this objective because it will help to encourage mixed communities in Maryport	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↕	The policy relates to the town of Maryport and the wider environs, whilst it is unlikely that new housing development within the town itself will have adverse impacts on biodiversity, there is the potential that development in the wider area could take place on greenfield land or result in habitat fragmentation. There is also the need to ensure that new housing development does not adversely impact on designated sites including the those associated with the Solway coast.	↕	The policy relates to the town of Workington and the wider environs, whilst it is unlikely that new housing development within the town itself will have adverse impacts on biodiversity, there is the potential that development in the wider area could take place on greenfield land or result in habitat fragmentation. There is also the need to ensure that new housing development does not adversely impact on designated sites including the River Derwent Corridor SAC.	Further impact assessment will need to be undertaken as part of the HRA to assess the potential impact of the development upon biodiversity and in particular the Solway Coast designated sites.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↕	The policy relates to the town of Maryport and the wider environs, whilst it is unlikely that new housing development within the town itself will have adverse impacts on landscape there is the potential that development in the wider area could take place on greenfield land or result in landscape fragmentation and potentially adversely affect the setting and character of the Solway Coast AONB or the Hadrian's Wall WHS. However, there is also the potential that new development could contribute to the GI network in conjunction with NE policies.	↕	The policy relates to the town of Workington and the wider environs, whilst it is unlikely that new housing development within the town itself will have adverse impacts on landscape there is the potential that development in the wider area could take place on greenfield land or result in landscape fragmentation. However, there is also the potential that new development could contribute to the GI network in conjunction with NE policies.	The policy options are generally supportive of this objective, further consideration will need to be given to LCA and implementation. The options will also need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies. Of particular consideration will be the impact on the character and setting of the Solway Coast AONB and the Hadrian's Wall WHS.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑↑	The town is generally well served by public transport and cycle routes, and facilities, services and employment opportunities and has a low level of car ownership, therefore locating new housing here should result in a sustainable approach reducing the need to travel and therefore emissions, currently there are no air quality issues within the town.	↑↑	The town is generally well served by public transport and cycle routes, and facilities, services and employment opportunities and has a low level of car ownership, therefore locating new housing here should result in a sustainable approach reducing the need to travel and therefore emissions, currently there are no air quality issues within the town.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil and minimise waste	↓	There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development that is hydrologically linked to the Solway Coast or other watercourses in the vicinity.	↓	There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development that is hydrologically linked to the Solway Coast or other watercourses in the vicinity.	The policy options will potentially result in adverse impacts, but these will be dependent on location. The findings of the SFRA and HRA will need to be considered in combination in order to determine those areas of the town that are unsuitable for further development.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑	This option should help towards avoiding excessive soil-sealing and impacts on drainage by helping to guide the location of new development to the town of Maryport and its environs, including the restoration of brownfield sites.	↑	This option should help towards avoiding excessive soil-sealing and impacts on drainage by helping to guide the location of new development to the town of Maryport and its environs, including the restoration of brownfield sites.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities.	↔	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities.	The policy options are indirectly supportive of this objective
	↑	Locating new housing in Maryport ensures that good sustainable access to employment opportunities within the town and from the town for the population is maintained.	↑	Locating new housing in Maryport ensures that good sustainable access to employment opportunities within the town and from the town for the population is maintained.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
	↔	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.	↔	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.	The policy options are indirectly supportive of this objective

Key: Significance of Effects		S12 Area Based Strategy - Maryport	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
	Major beneficial		Major beneficial
	Minor beneficial		Minor beneficial
	Potentially beneficial		Potentially beneficial
	Potentially adverse		Potentially adverse
	Minor adverse		Minor adverse
	Major adverse		Major adverse
	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
	No significant effect		

Sustainability Objectives	S12: Area Based Strategy - Maryport										
	Economy Policy Options										
	(1): Provide a mix of employment land opportunities across the locality and support high quality development and refurbishment of existing employment sites such as the Glasson, Solway and Risehow industrial estates	(2): Support existing and new businesses by promoting proposals for flexible business start up and move on space	(3): Actively seek to improve the vitality and viability of Maryport town centre by directing retail and leisure developments to town centre and edge of centre sites; by supporting a wide and diverse range of shops and leisure uses within the centre and by encouraging a thriving economy	(4): Promote Maryport as a key tourism destination and encourage the development of strategic visitor attractions such as Roman Maryport and the Harbour / Marina	(5): Support proposals for the redevelopment of the Harbour and Marina for a mix of uses which may include the leisure, retail, employment and residential uses. Particular encouragement will be given for proposals which seek to improve the area's tourism offer with high quality hotel and leisure facilities.	Comments					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		This option supports stakeholders views, helping to indirectly meet this objective		Policy reflects the desire of the local population to achieve a high quality redevelopment of the area with an identified need for regeneration	(4) and (5) are generally supportive, the other options show no identified effect.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces		The policy option directly supports the objective through increased access.		This provides increases access to small scale employment opportunities and facilities and services.		The policy option directly supports the objective through increased access.		This option helps to focus support for Maryport which has high potential as a key tourism and leisure service area. Through supporting improvements to the leisure service industries in the town, this will improve access for visitors and for residents.		The policy option directly supports this objective, the Harbour and Marina proposals aim to provide a leisure, retail, employment and residential uses, improving access to the whole range of services and facilities and open space for local residents.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		The policy will improve the local environment which in turn contributes to provision of decent homes where people will want to live.	(5) is supportive of the objective, the other policies show no identified effect.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training		This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC policies.		No significant effect		No significant effect		This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC policies.		No significant effect	(1) and (4) are indirectly supportive of the objective, the other options show no identified effect.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people		No significant effect		No significant effect		The policy will improve the local environment and therefore improved quality of life which benefits sense of well-being. The proposals will also provide access to open space and sport and recreational facilities, providing opportunities for people to live healthy lifestyles.		This option supports this objective because it will improve overall quality of life for those living in rural areas to have access to some services and facilities within their communities, contributing to health and well-being		The policy will improve the local environment and therefore improved quality of life which benefits sense of well-being. The proposals will also provide access to open space and sport and recreational facilities, providing opportunities for people to live healthy lifestyles.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history		No significant effect		The policy option will help to support smaller businesses and potentially businesses in more rural settlements in the area, potentially contributing the vitality and vibrancy of local communities.		This option supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town.		This option supports this objective because improving local services and facilities in Maryport protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town and promoting the town as a tourist attraction could result in additional cultural and recreation events and festivals further developing the sense of community and preserving the sense of character and history of the town.		The proposals support the development of new facilities and services and therefore contribute to the vibrancy of Maryport.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity		The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals both within Maryport town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which is more likely to be on greenfield land. Proposals for new development will need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies and the findings of the HRA.		The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals both within Maryport town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which is more likely to be on greenfield land. Proposals for new development will need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies and the findings of the HRA.		The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals both within Maryport town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which is more likely to be on greenfield land. Proposals for new development will need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies and the findings of the HRA.		This option could indirectly help to support measures to enhance biodiversity interest, as the value of the area in terms of tourist potential is inextricably linked to its biodiversity value. However, this will need to be managed against the promotion of the area as a tourist attraction and the potential issues that could result from increased access and recreation on existing biodiversity assets.		The town is adjacent to the Solway Firth therefore there is potential that new development in this location could adversely impact on water quality here. This will need to be considered in conjunction with the HRA and NE policies.	The policy options have the potential to realise beneficial and adverse effects, dependent on location and implementation, consideration of the policies will need to be in conjunction with NE policies and findings of the HRA.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations		The potential effects are dependent on location, as the policy focuses on new proposals both within Maryport town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less landscape impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which has the potential to impact on the setting of designated landscapes and result in fragmentation.		The potential effects are dependent on location, as the policy focuses on new proposals both within Maryport town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less landscape impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which has the potential to impact on the setting of designated landscapes and result in fragmentation.		The potential effects are dependent on location, as the policy focuses on new proposals both within Maryport town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less landscape impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which has the potential to impact on the setting of designated landscapes and result in fragmentation.		This option could indirectly help to support measures to enhance landscape interest, as the value of the area in terms of tourist potential is inextricably linked to its landscape value. However, this will need to be managed against the promotion of the area as a tourist attraction and the potential issues that could result from increased access and recreation on existing landscape assets and sense of place and tranquillity that contribute to its current character.		Appropriate regeneration of the area, with a co-ordinated approach to landscape proposals will improve the overall landscape character and local environment.	The policy options have the potential to realise beneficial and adverse effects, dependent on location and implementation, consideration of the policies will need to be in conjunction with NE policies and LCA, the impacts on the setting of designated sites will be a key consideration.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment		This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Maryport to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs		This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Maryport to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs		This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Maryport to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs		This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Maryport to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs		The policy option is directly supportive of this objective as it promotes regeneration of an existing area in the town.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive of the objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions		No significant effect		No significant effect		The policy option promotes the growth of services and facilities within the town, this should increase the overall offer of the town and reinforce its role as a KSC for the Borough, therefore this will potentially reduce some of the need to travel to Workington and other towns outside the Borough, reducing emissions related to this travel.		The town is currently an accessible location with rail and bus services, therefore there is the potential to promote sustainable tourism in the town. However, through promotion of the town as a major tourist service centre, this will encourage additional visitors to the town, therefore potentially increasing emissions and reducing local air quality. This policy needs to be coupled with a targeted approach in terms of policy and investment for sustainable transport to ensure that new tourism development is as sustainable as possible.		The proposals aim to develop the area as a sustainable location with mixed use development providing services, facilities, residential and employment opportunities within the same location potentially reducing the need to travel, reducing emission and benefitting local air quality.	(3) and (5) are supportive of the objective, (4) has the potential for adverse effects through promotion of the town as a tourist destination resulting in increased visitors to the area. Such a policy needs to be undertaken in conjunction with policies and investment in sustainable transport and infrastructure.

NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⚡	The town is adjacent to the Solway Firth and any hydrological links to this will need to be considered as part of any development. Parts of the town are also at risk from flooding, development will need to be directed away from these areas.	⚡	The town is adjacent to the Solway Firth and any hydrological links to this will need to be considered as part of any development. Parts of the town are also at risk from flooding, development will need to be directed away from these areas.	⚡	The town is adjacent to the Solway Firth and any hydrological links to this will need to be considered as part of any development. Parts of the town are also at risk from flooding, development will need to be directed away from these areas.	⬇	There are unlikely to be significant effects, however, there may be issues in terms of drainage capacity and utilities within the town which will need to be considered prior to new development, and new development will need to ensure that it is not hydrologically linked to watercourses that would result in adverse water quality impacts.	⚡	The town is adjacent to the Solway Firth therefore there is potential that new development in this location could adversely impact on water quality here. This will need to be considered in conjunction with the HRA and NE policies.	The policy options have the potential to impact on water quality if development proposed is hydrologically linked to the Solway Firth, consideration of NE policies and the HRA are required to protect this.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⚡	The policy option will enable the redevelopment of existing sites which will involve the reuse of PDL, however, the policy option will promote development of new employment sites and depending on the location of these, if it is on greenfield land then there is the potential for soil sealing.	⚡	The policy option will enable the redevelopment of existing sites which will involve the reuse of PDL, however, the policy option will promote development of new employment sites and depending on the location of these, if it is on greenfield land then there is the potential for soil sealing.	⚡	The policy primarily focuses on development within the town, which will prioritise the use of brownfield land, however, it does also enable edge of centre development which is more likely to involve the use of greenfield land.	⬆	Promoting development within the town should promote the use of brownfield land prior to greenfield land therefore potentially meeting the aims of this objective. The value of the area in terms of tourism is dependent on the quality of the environment, therefore the two are linked in terms of the need to maintain and protect the land.	⬆	The proposals aim to regenerate an existing part developed area.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective, although (1)-(3) have the potential to result in development on greenfield land and resultant issues in terms of soil sealing.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⬆	Refurbishment of existing low quality employment sites, will be more efficient than developing new sites.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	(1) has the potential to support this objective through the reuse of existing sites.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	⬆⬆	The policy option directly supports the objective, particularly addressing the current low quality of existing employment sites in the area.	⬆⬆	The policy option directly supports the objective.	⬆⬆	The policy option directly supports the objective.	⬆⬆	This option strongly supports this objective.	⬆⬆	The proposals aim to make the Harbour and Marina a focus for investment with realistic opportunities for new economic development and that contributes to economic regeneration in the area.	The policy options are strongly supportive of the objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	⬆⬆	The policy option directly supports the objective.	⬆⬆	The policy option directly supports the objective.	⬆⬆	The policy option directly supports the objective.	⬆⬆	This option supports this objective through increased access to jobs in the tourism related services industry in the town.	⬆⬆	The proposals aim to make the Harbour and Marina a focus for investment with realistic opportunities for new economic development and that contributes to economic regeneration in the area.	The policy options are strongly supportive of the objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	⬆⬆	The policy option directly supports the objective.	⬆⬆	The policy option directly supports the objective.	⬆⬆	The policy option directly supports the objective.	⬆⬆	This option strongly supports this objective, and diversifies the economy in terms of tourism.	⬆⬆	The proposals aim to make the Harbour and Marina a focus for investment with realistic opportunities for new economic development and that contributes to economic regeneration in the area. The focus on promotion of the area in terms of tourism will contribute to diversification of the economy.	The policy options are strongly supportive of the objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S12 Area Based Strategy - Maryport

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S12: Area Based Strategy - Maryport				
	Built Environment Policy Option				
	(1): Seek the continued protection of the attractive historic buildings within the Conservation Area of Fleming Square	(2): Continue to recognise the national archaeological importance of the Roman Fort at Camp Farm. Efforts to increase archaeological investigation in the area shall be supported and protection of the archaeological and historical integrity of Roman Maryport will be given.	Comments		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	This supports the public's views in terms of protection of historic character and features.	↑	This supports the public's views in terms of protection of historic character and features.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect	↑	This policy option provides the opportunity for training and skills to be developed to support and present the project.	(2) is supportive of this objective, (1) has no significant effects.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	This policy has the potential to have an indirect effect on this objective, by enhancing the local historic environment	↔	No significant effect	(1) is potentially supportive of this objective, (2) has no significant effects.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	By protecting and preserving Fleming Square, this option helps to support this objective .	↑↑	By protecting the archaeological and historical integrity of Roman Maryport, this option helps to support this objective .	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	This policy includes the protection of soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees and hedges within Fleming Square, which could support this objective.	↔	No significant effect	(1) is potentially supportive of this objective, (2) has no significant effects.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	This policy includes the protection of hard and soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees, hedges, fences and surfacing within Fleming Square and so supports this objective.	↑↑	By protecting the archaeological and historical integrity of Roman Maryport, this option helps to support this objective .	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	This policy supports the sympathetic development in Fleming Square and alteration/extensions to listed buildings and so supports this objective	↔	No significant effect	(1) is supportive of this objective, (2) has no significant effects.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect, this policy option relates to preserving the archaeological site of the Roman Fort but would not result in significant change in the baseline.	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This policy aims to enhance social and economic regeneration in Maryport by promoting the role of heritage; historic properties can provide an income, source of employment and supplement the regional tourism industry.	↑↑	This policy aims to enhance social and economic regeneration in Maryport by promoting the role of heritage; development of a strong tourism brand as a result of Roman Maryport has the potential to create new employment opportunities.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This policy will provide additional jobs in tourism and other associated industries by promoting the role of heritage in Maryport	↑↑	This policy will provide additional jobs in tourism and other associated industries by promoting the role of heritage in Maryport	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	This policy promotes the role of heritage within the local economy and supplements the facilities available to visitors to Maryport.	↑↑	This policy promotes the role of heritage within the local economy and supplements the facilities available to visitors to Maryport.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇄	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇄	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇄	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
⇄	No significant effect		

S12 Area Based Strategy - Maryport

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S12: Area Based Strategy - Maryport						
	Natural Environment Policy Options				Comments		
	(1): Support the development of the Cumbrian Coastal Access project which seeks to establish an unbroken public right of way across the coast of Britain. As one of the first areas being considered by Natural England for the project, Maryport will have established new rights of way and enhanced routes along the coast of the locality.	(2): Continue to protect the nationally designated Historical Park of Netherhall which is a locally important area of green space within the town.	(3): Continue to safeguard the internationally protected areas of the Solway Coast AONB by ensuring all development is consistent with the objectives within the AONB Management Plan.				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑↑	The policy options supports the public in being able to access and enjoy the countryside in their locality.	⇄	This policy supports the public's views in terms of the value placed on Netherhall as an asset to the town and recreational resource.	⇄	This policy supports the public's views in terms of the value placed on the AONB and the desire to protect the landscape	(1) is strongly supportive of the objective, the other policy options are potentially indirectly supportive.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of increasing access opportunities to the countryside and open space.	⇄	No significant effects, this will continue to maintain the existing levels of access to the park.	↑	The policy seeks to safeguard the AONB and the Management Plan provides a focus for public to access and enjoy the landscape, therefore this is complementary to this objective.	The policies are generally supportive of the objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⇄	No significant effect.	⇄	No significant effects.	⇄	No significant effect.	None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	⇄	No significant effect.	⇄	No significant effects.	⇄	No significant effect.	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Access to the countryside and open space can contribute to general health and well-being through an improved quality of life and active recreational opportunities.	↑	Reinforcing and enhancing highly valued the landscape of Netherhall could help to further support this objective.	⇄	No significant effects, whilst access to the countryside and open space can contribute to health and well-being, the access to the AONB currently exists and therefore there will be no significant changes to the baseline.	The policies are generally supportive of the objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	This policy option strongly encourages communities to become connected with their environment.	↑↑	Reinforcing and enhancing highly valued landscape of Netherhall within the town could help to further support this objective and create a strong sense of local history amongst residents.	↑	The management plan objectives for the AONB focus on providing locally distinctive communities and focus on environmental and heritage initiatives and therefore support this objective.	The policies are supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	There are potential conflicts between improving access to the countryside and the potential impact that increased access may have on biodiversity and the integrity of designated sites, this would need to be considered in more detail with other policies and the HRA.	↑↑	There will be considerable synergy and overlap between biodiversity and landscape criteria, with high potential for enhancement of both as the park is a highly valued resource in biodiversity and landscape terms.	↑	Whilst the AONB is primarily a landscape designation, biodiversity is an interlinked feature and a priority within the Management Plan.	The policies are generally supportive of this option, however there is a potential risk that increasing access to the countryside will have an adverse effect on biodiversity, this needs to be considered further through the HRA and NE policies.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	⇄	This policy option seeks to protect and enhance the landscape through future provision of increased access, however, there is the potential that this increased access will reduce levels of tranquillity in the countryside and development of footpaths etc, may adversely impact the current character of the landscape.	↑↑	There will be considerable synergy and overlap between biodiversity and landscape criteria, with high potential for enhancement of both as the park is a highly valued resource in biodiversity and landscape terms.	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	The policies are generally strongly supportive of the objective, there is a potential concern over whether increased access to the countryside would have an adverse effect on the landscape and tranquillity, which will need to be considered in more detail in conjunction with the NE policies.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇄	No significant effect.	↑↑	Taking direct account of specific local character of Netherhall in shaping the setting and design of new development and regeneration schemes within Maryport town centre will help to enhance and reinforce the quality of the built environment within the town.	↑	Whilst the AONB is primarily a landscape designation, the quality of the built environment within the area is an interlinked feature and a priority within the Management Plan.	The policies are generally supportive of the objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	⇄	No significant effect.	⇄	No significant effects.	⇄	No significant effects.	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⇄	No significant effect.	⇄	No significant effect.	⇄	No significant effect.	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇄	No significant effect.	→→	There is strong indirect potential for improvements in landscape features and elements in the park to also help improve land and soil quality: soil type strongly influences key landscape characteristics. In turn, these characteristics can help to conserve soil resources.	→→	There is strong indirect potential for improvements in landscape features and elements in the AONB to also help improve land and soil quality: soil type strongly influences key landscape characteristics. In turn, these characteristics can help to conserve soil resources.	The policy options are strongly indirectly supportive of the objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⇄	No significant effect.	⇄	No significant effects.	↑	The AONB Management Plan considers the issue of mineral resources within its boundaries and seeks sustainable and sensitive management of such resources, therefore the policy option is complementary.	(3) is supportive of the objective, the other two policy options have no effect.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→	There is the potential that through Maryport being one of the first areas and in conjunction with other attractions in the area, that this could lead to an increase in tourism, which could result in the creation of additional jobs.	⇄	No significant effects.	⇄	No significant effects.	There are potential indirect positive effects from this policy option in terms of growth in tourism industry as in conjunction with other policies in the strategy.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	⇄	No significant effect.	⇄	No significant effects.	⇄	No significant effects.	None
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→	There is the potential that through Maryport being one of the first areas and in conjunction with other attractions in the area, that this could lead to an increase in tourism, which could result in the creation of additional jobs.	⇄	No significant effects.	⇄	No significant effects.	There are potential indirect positive effects from this policy option in terms of growth in tourism industry as in conjunction with other policies in the strategy.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇧	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S12 Area Based Strategy - Maryport

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S12: Area Based Strategy - Maryport					Comments	
	Transport / Infrastructure Policy Options						
	(1): Work with partners to support the improvement and integration of bus and rail services through the development of a Maryport Transport Interchange	(2): Seek improvements to the West Cumbrian Coastal Railway service	(3): Work with partners to maximise the roll out of superfast and next generation broadband across the locality to both residential and business users				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↑↑	This enables people to participate in democratic processes even if they live in rural areas or have access or other issues that may restrict them from participating in a more usual manner.	The policy options are either generally very supportive of this objective or are showing no effect.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This policy positively supports this sustainability objective, by enabling the Maryport interchange to help improve accessibility to services by increasing mobility within and between Maryport other settlements and the countryside.	↑	Ultimately, this option will support the strategic future development of the Borough's rail network within and beyond its administrative area.	↑↑	This enables people to access facilities and services even if they live in rural areas or have access or other issues that may restrict them from participating in a more usual manner.	The policy options are strongly supportive in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	⇨	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services, thus improving quality of life where people live.	The policy options are either potentially indirectly supportive of this objective or are showing no effect.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	⇨	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve this sustainability objective, by enabling the Maryport interchange to help improve accessibility to education and training services by increasing mobility.	↔	No significant effects	↑	This policy option provides the opportunity for remote access to educational and training facilities.	The policy options are either potentially supportive of this objective or are showing no effect.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	→→	By providing increased mobility where demand exists, this policy has the potential to help towards increasing people's health and sense of well-being, by enabling easy access to essential services in Maryport and out to the countryside.	→	This policy option provides improved access and mobility for people, to access healthcare facilities and out to the wider countryside, potentially benefitting health and well-being through improvements to quality of life.	⇨	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services and potential employment, thus improving quality of life and a sense of well-being.	The policy options are indirectly supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	→→	Increased mobility to meet proven demand for greater access to and from Maryport can indirectly help to increase participation in local events/festivals, clubs and informal social interaction. This type of provision may also help to foster increasing levels of social activity.	→	Increased mobility to meet proven demand for greater access to and from Maryport by rail can indirectly help to increase participation in local events/festivals, clubs and informal social interaction. This type of provision may also help to foster increasing levels of social activity.	⇨	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services and potential employment, thus improving quality of life and retaining people in more rural areas strengthening local community vibrancy.	The policy options are indirectly supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	This policy could possibly have adverse effects on biodiversity through the provision of new facilities in edge of town areas in Maryport especially if greenfield land is needed.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	The policy options will potentially result in an adverse impact in terms of this objective, however, it will depend on the location of the development in terms of the scale of the potential biodiversity impact and therefore this needs to be considered in terms of the HRA and on a site specific basis.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	The policy options will potentially result in an adverse impact in terms of this objective, however, it will depend on the location of the development in terms of the scale of the potential landscape impact and therefore this needs to be considered on a site specific basis, development within the town itself is less likely to have an adverse impact than development on the edge of the town and the more rural hinterland.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	→	Well planned, needed transport interchange facilities could help to relieve traffic congestion in Maryport centre, indirectly contributing towards a higher quality built environment	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	Only (1) indicates potential effects, these effects may be positive or adverse and will depend a great deal on the planning and implementation, good design policies set out in the BE section will be important to consider in conjunction with this policy.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑	The provision of well planned, strategically located interchange facilities in Maryport should help to reduce levels of private car use and thus help towards reducing traffic emissions, helping to improve local air quality.	↑	This policy option should result in an improved quality of service, which should help to encourage commuters and visitors to use rail services and reduce reliance on the private car, thereby reducing emissions and contributing to local air quality.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home, reducing overall levels of commuting and therefore emissions.	The policy options are generally supportive of this objective, however, supporting improvements to road and rail infrastructure will increase emissions.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↓	This policy could possibly have adverse effects through the provision of new facilities in an edge of town area in Maryport especially if greenfield land is proposed to be used for the interchange, as this could result in land take and soil sealing.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	(1) will potentially result in the loss of land and soil and therefore will need to be considered in terms of other policies that prioritise the use of PDL in order to minimise the effect as far as possible.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→	Well planned transport interchange facilities in Maryport could help to increase employee and customer mobility, thus providing indirect support to retain existing jobs and help to create new job opportunities. It should be noted that increasing mobility also needs to be affordable not only by the majority but those who are most economically disadvantaged.	→	Improvements to the rail service could help to increase employee and customer mobility, thus providing indirect support to retain existing jobs and help to create new job opportunities. It should be noted that increasing mobility also needs to be affordable not only by the majority but those who are most economically disadvantaged.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity, it also helps to support rural businesses to develop and grow, where previously the lack of infrastructure would have restricted this opportunity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home.	The policies are supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑	The provision of well planned, strategically located interchange facilities in Maryport should help to improve access to jobs by improving mobility and mode of transport choice, especially for people who need to commute from and to more rural areas. Levels of mobility are also dependant on affordability so it is not possible to score this policy option any higher at present.	↑	The provision of an improved rail services should help to improve access to jobs by improving mobility and mode of transport choice, especially for people who need to commute from and to more rural areas. Levels of mobility are also dependant on affordability so it is not possible to score this policy option any higher at present.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home, reducing overall levels of commuting and therefore emissions.	The policies are supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→	Well planned transport interchange facilities in Maryport to meet existing demand could well help to enable economic diversification, contributing to a stronger economy in local areas, e.g. by helping to increase employee and customer mobility.	→	Improvements to the rail service to meet existing and future demand could well help to enable economic diversification, contributing to a stronger economy in local areas, e.g. by helping to increase employee and customer mobility.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity, it also helps to support rural businesses to develop and grow, where previously the lack of infrastructure would have restricted this opportunity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home.	The policies are supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		S13 Area Based Strategy - Wigton	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S13: Area Based Strategy - Wigton				Comments
	Housing Policy Options				
	(1): Promote the appropriate level of housing through the spatial strategy, with a high priority given to local affordable needs.	(2): Support efforts to make use of long term empty housing, especially within town centres.			
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	This reflects the desires of the public to see affordable housing provided in the area to ensure a good balanced community.	↑	This reflects the desire of residents to see redundant properties to be put back into use, improving the quality of the local environment and presenting opportunities for additional housing within the area.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	This policy option will provide housing in one of the main centres within the Borough and therefore will ensure that the new population will have good access to the services and facilities within the town, and to the wider range of facilities and services in Carlisle which are easily accessible from Wigton. However the remainder of the rural area has far less accessibility and therefore this cannot be scored more highly.	↑	This policy option will provide additional housing in one of the KSCs within the Borough and therefore will ensure that the new population will have good access to the services and facilities within the town and the town also has good links to the rail network, however, the wider rural north area suffers from poor rural accessibility, which this option will not address.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of this objective, particularly as it provides an emphasis towards affordable housing, as Wigton and the rural north has one of the highest affordability issues in the Borough.	↑↑	Policy option directly supports this objective.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑	Wigton has good educational facilities and therefore provision of additional housing in the locality of the town will enable better access to these educational facilities.	↑	Wigton has good educational facilities within the town and therefore provision of additional housing in the locality of the town will enable better access to these educational facilities.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Wigton has good educational facilities and therefore provision of additional housing in the locality of the town will enable better access to these educational facilities.	↑	Policy of making use of long term empty housing will aid health and well-being through provision of decent affordable homes in the area.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	Wigton has an existing vibrant with good services and a good range of cultural activities, provision of additional development within the town at the appropriate scale should help to support this further. Provision of housing in the more rural areas, should help to support the vitality and vibrancy of these too to ensure that younger people can afford to remain within them and therefore contribute to the community.	→→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community through bringing back empty properties into use should help foster community vibrancy and inclusiveness.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. Wigton and the rural north is a fairly constrained area in terms of designated sites, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and the findings of the HRA.	↕	This policy relates to the reuse of existing buildings rather than relating to new development on potentially greenfield or biodiverse sites, however, there is the potential that species may be residing in the properties, e.g. bats, which would need to be investigated and appropriately managed and mitigated prior to any development taking place.	There is the potential that new housing development in a predominantly rural area will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, dependent on the location. Potential impacts will need to be considered in terms of the HRA and NE policies. The potential impacts on biodiversity within empty properties will also need to be considered prior to development taking place.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. Wigton and the rural north is a fairly constrained area in terms of its proximity to high quality landscapes, in particular the Lake District National Park, the AONB and the WHS, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and be subject to a full LVIA.	→	This option works well with NE policies to improve GI provision and landscape character in the Wigton area through appropriate housing development, i.e. the reuse of existing empty properties and natural environment improvements can be compatible.	There is the potential that new housing development in a predominantly rural area will have an adverse impact on landscape character and quality dependent on the location. Potential impacts will need to be considered in terms of the NE policies and LCA. The impacts on the setting on the AONB, WHS and National Park will be important to consider prior to determining the location of future development.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↕	The town is one of the main centres for the Borough, particularly for the rural north and is relatively well served by facilities, services, educational and employment opportunities. The town itself does have a rail station but poor public transport access is a feature of the wider area. Therefore locating new housing here will be a balance between the sustainability of locating housing within an existing centre reducing need to travel and the emissions that will arise from travel outside of the town, recognising that this will need to be done, even if the population reside and work within Wigton.	↑	Through reuse of existing housing stock there is the potential to make the properties more efficient and therefore the potential to reduce the volume of emissions currently arising through the use of the properties.	The policy options have the potential to be supportive of this objective, but further support should be provided in terms of improving sustainable means of access for the rural population.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↓	The potential impact will be dependent on location, location will need to be considered in terms of the NE policies and findings of the HRA to ensure that there are no hydrological links to watercourses and in particular designated sites such as the Solway Firth. The issue of drainage capacity will need to be considered before new development can take place.	↕	Depending on the location of the housing identified for reuse within the town the issues relating to (1) may also be relevant, however, it is assumed that if identified as suitable for reuse that these issues have been addressed.	The policy options have the potential to be supportive of this objective, but further consideration will need to be given to specific locations, utility capacities and the findings of the HRA.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↓	The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, there are few opportunities for reuse of brownfield land within Wigton and but less so in the rural hinterland and therefore new development is likely to be on greenfield land.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it relates to the reuse of existing buildings.	(2) is strongly supportive of this objective. Further consideration in terms of (1) will need to be given in terms of location and preference should be to identify opportunities to use PDL before developing greenfield land.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing reuse will help to support existing job security and potentially create new opportunities.	The policy options are indirectly supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↕	Through locating housing in one of the main centres there is the potential for good access to employment, both within Wigton and also into Carlisle where there is currently a lot of outcommuting to, access to jobs for rural populations is not directly affected by this policy option.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing reuse should help to improve access to employment by supporting existing job security and create new opportunities.	The policy options are potentially indirectly supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing reuse will help to encourage inward investment, economic diversification and a stronger local economy.	The policy options are indirectly supportive of this objective.

Key Significance of Effects		S13 Area Based Strategy - Wigan	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects	Direct Effects	Indirect Effects
↑ Major beneficial	→ Major beneficial	↑ Major beneficial	→ Major beneficial
↑ Minor beneficial	→ Minor beneficial	↑ Minor beneficial	→ Minor beneficial
↓ Major adverse	→ Major adverse	↓ Major adverse	→ Major adverse
↓ Minor adverse	→ Minor adverse	↓ Minor adverse	→ Minor adverse
↔ Potentially beneficial or adverse			
⊕ No significant effect			

S13 Area Based Strategy - Wigan											
Economy Policy Options											
Sustainability Objectives	(1): Encourage appropriate levels of employment growth following the spatial strategy through the identification of additional employment land.	(2): Supporting existing and new businesses by promoting proposals for small flexible business start-up and move-on space as well as alternative methods of provision, such as the role of work hubs in providing facilities as a focal point for rural businesses.	(3): Promote the sustainability of Wigan town centre by: Directing retail, leisure and cultural proposals within the town centre wherever possible: Encouraging vibrant and diverse evening and leisure uses to serve local communities and attract visitors: Actively encouraging improvements to the built environment, public realm and architectural heritage of the market town; Working with partners to support traffic management and infrastructure projects in order to tackle congestion, ease heavy traffic movement and improve the public realm within Wigan town centre.	(4): Encourage appropriate levels of employment growth following the spatial strategy and promote alternative methods of provision, such as the utilisation of live-work units.	(5): Protect and maximise appropriate use of local employment sites.	(6): Support appropriate rural and farm diversification schemes, recognising the important role these have for the wider Allerdale economy.	(7): Protecting the character and sustainability of rural settlements by setting policies which vigorously protect village and community services such as shops and pubs.	Comments			
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	→ This option supports stakeholders views, helping to indirectly meet this objective	→ This option supports stakeholders views, helping to indirectly meet this objective	(6) and (7) are indirectly supportive of the objective, the other options show no identified effect.			
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑ The policy option provides employment opportunities within the town and potentially within the wider rural area. Increased access to employment opportunities for the population, and potentially increasing access to services and facilities dependent on the type of employment opportunities provided, this would provide much needed investment to this part of the Borough.	↑ This provides increased access to small scale employment opportunities and facilities and services.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective through increased access both through provision of new services and facilities within the town and through improvements to access in terms of reducing congestion within the town.	↑ The policy option provides employment opportunities within the town and potentially within the rural area, increasing access to services and facilities dependent on the type of employment opportunities provided, this would provide much needed investment to the isolated areas in the Borough.	⊕ No significant effect, employment sites within the area already exist therefore there is no significant change to the baseline in terms of this objective.	→ This option indirectly but strongly supports this objective.	↑↑ This policy is directly supportive of this objective in terms of supporting small local facilities which improves access for the more isolated rural communities in the north of the Borough.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.			
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↑ The policy will improve the local environment and public realm and will therefore improve quality of life providing in the wider sense a decent home.	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to help make decent housing more affordable in rural areas.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to ensure that people have access to services and facilities close to their home, improving the quality of their home in the wider sense.	(3) is supportive of the objective, (6) and (7) are potentially indirectly supportive, the other options show no identified effect.			
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔ Dependent on the type of employment opportunities developed, there will potentially be the opportunity for growth in educational and training opportunities linked into the employment, which would help to retain workers in the area.	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↔ Dependent on the type of employment opportunities developed, there will potentially be the opportunity for growth in educational and training opportunities linked into the employment, which would help to retain workers in the area.	⊕ No significant effect	→ This option indirectly but strongly supports this objective.	⊕ No significant effect.	(1) and (4) are potentially indirectly supportive of the objective, (6) is strongly indirectly supportive of the objective.			
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↑ The policy will improve the local environment and public realm and will therefore improve quality of life providing in the wider sense a decent home.	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	↑↑ This option strongly supports this objective because a strong rural economy contributes towards a general sense of individual well-being and health.	↑ This option supports this objective because it will improve overall quality of life for those living in rural areas to have access to some services and facilities within their communities, contributing to health and well-being.	(3), (5), (6) and (7) are supportive of the objective, the other options show no identified effect.			
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑ The enabling of economic development within the town and the more rural settlements according to the hierarchy will provide a positive effect in terms of retaining vitality and vibrancy within the settlements and enabling younger people to remain within them.	↑ The policy option will help to support smaller businesses and potentially businesses in more rural settlements in the wider Wigan area, potentially contributing the vitality and vibrancy of local communities.	↑ This option supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town, the policy option focuses on improving the public realm and supporting the evening and leisure uses of the town, potentially further supporting developing cultural and recreational opportunities.	↑ The enabling of economic development within the town and the more rural settlements according to the hierarchy will provide a positive effect in terms of retaining vitality and vibrancy within the settlements and enabling younger people to remain within them.	⊕ No significant effect	↑↑ This option strongly supports this objective because a strong rural economy contributes towards community vibrancy and inclusiveness, in the north of the Borough agricultural industries are the key economic driver and therefore the communities are generally small agricultural communities that this policy will help to sustain.	↑↑ This option strongly supports this objective because supporting settlements according to the hierarchy will provide a positive effect in terms of retaining vitality and vibrancy of local communities and enables them to continue to thrive as living communities.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.			
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓ The policy depends on the specific locations where development will take place, the rural north is highly constrained in terms of biodiversity and potential development in rural areas is most likely to take place on greenfield land therefore there will be potential impacts and the policy would need to be considered in conjunction with the HBA and NE policies.	⊕ The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals both within Wigan town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which is more likely to be on greenfield land. Proposals for new development will need to be considered in conjunction with the NE policies and the findings of the HBA.	⊕ The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Wigan town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which has the potential to impact on the setting of designated landscapes and result in fragmentation.	↓ The policy depends on the specific locations where development will take place, the rural north is highly constrained in terms of biodiversity and potential development in rural areas is most likely to take place on greenfield land therefore there will be potential impacts and the policy would need to be considered in conjunction with the HBA and NE policies.	⊕ No significant effect, the employment sites in relation to this policy already exist, there could be opportunities however, to enhance biodiversity through landscaping and incorporating wildlife friendly features.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's natural environment is important to its economic performance, particularly in the north of the Borough where agriculture is such a key element of the economy.	⊕ No significant effect.	The policy options have the potential to realise beneficial and adverse effects, dependent on location and implementation, consideration of the policies will need to be in conjunction with NE policies and findings of the HBA.			
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓ The policy depends on the specific locations where development will take place, the rural north is highly constrained in terms of landscape and potential development in rural areas is most likely to take place on greenfield land therefore there will be potential impacts on the setting of the AONB and WWS and fragmentation of the landscape and the policy would need to be considered in conjunction with NE policies.	⊕ The potential effects are dependent on location, as the policy focuses on new proposals both within Wigan town centre, where it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less landscape impacts, and development on the edge of the settlement, which has the potential to impact on the setting of designated landscapes and result in fragmentation.	⊕ This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Wigan to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the town and wider rural area's needs.	↓ The policy depends on the specific locations where development will take place, the rural north is highly constrained in terms of landscape and potential development in rural areas is most likely to take place on greenfield land therefore there will be potential impacts on the setting of the AONB and WWS and fragmentation of the landscape and the policy would need to be considered in conjunction with NE policies.	⊕ No significant effect, the employment sites in relation to this policy already exist, there could be opportunities however, to enhance landscape quality at the sites through appropriate landscaping.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's landscapes are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	⊕ No significant effect.	The policy options have the potential to realise beneficial and adverse effects, dependent on location and implementation, consideration of the policies will need to be in conjunction with NE policies and LCA, the impacts on the setting of designated sites will be a key consideration.			
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑ The policy option will result in new development which has the potential to contribute to the improvement and enhancement of the built environment within Wigan and the rural settlements, in addition provision of live work units would provide an efficient use of buildings in the smaller settlements, ensuring that new development is not out of scale with current character.	↑ This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Wigan to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the town and wider rural area's needs.	↑↑ This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Wigan to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the town's needs.	↑ The policy option will result in new development which has the potential to contribute to the improvement and enhancement of the built environment within Wigan and the rural settlements.	⊕ No significant effect, the employment sites in relation to this policy already exist.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's built environment is important to its economic performance in rural areas.	⊕ No significant effect.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive of the objective.			
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑ Following the spatial strategy for the Borough will ensure that most new economic development will be focused in Wigan where the highest level of population for this area is based, this should help to reduce potential emissions arising as a result of commuting, in addition the promotion of some economic development in the smaller rural areas, should further benefit this. However, currently there is such a lack of suitable employment within this area and a high level of outcommuting, there will need to be significant economic investment to realise significant benefits in this area.	⊕ No significant effect	↑ The policy option promotes the growth of services and facilities within the town, this should increase the overall offer of the town and reinforce its role as a TIC for the Borough, therefore this will potentially reduce some of the need to travel to Carlisle and potentially Worthington reducing emissions related to this travel.	↑ Following the spatial strategy for the Borough will ensure that most new economic development will be focused in Wigan where the highest level of population for this area is based, this is a generally sustainable area, with rail access through poor bus provision, this should help to reduce potential emissions arising as a result of commuting, in addition the promotion of some economic development in the smaller rural areas, should further benefit this. However, there is significant levels of outcommuting from the town to employment located within Carlisle and beyond and this needs to be recognised and will not be significantly altered by the implementation of this policy.	⊕ The current employment sites within Wigan are generally modern units of reasonable quality, however, those in the wider rural north tend to be subject to poor infrastructure and generally not very accessible, therefore there is high reliance on the private car to access them. Maximising the use of these sites will potentially make this situation worse as it will encourage more travel by private car to them, however, further investment may also help to drive investment in infrastructure to improve access by sustainable means.	⊕ No significant effects	↑ Through continued protection of small scale services and facilities within communities, there should be a slight reduction in the need to travel for those residents served by these facilities.	(3) and (5) are supportive of the objective, (4) has the potential for adverse effects through promotion of the town as a tourist destination resulting in increased visitors to the area. Such a policy needs to be undertaken in conjunction with policies and investment in sustainable transport and infrastructure.			
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↓ There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development that is hydrologically linked to the Solway Coast or other watercourses in the vicinity.	⊕ The area is adjacent to the Solway Firth and any hydrological links to this will need to be considered as part of any development. Parts of the town are also at risk from flooding, development will need to be directed away from these areas.	⊕ The town is in close proximity to the Solway Firth and any hydrological links to this will need to be considered as part of any development.	↓ There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development that is hydrologically linked to the Solway Coast or other watercourses in the vicinity.	⊕ No significant effects, the sites in relation to this policy already exist.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's water resources are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	⊕ No significant effect.	The policy options have the potential to impact on water quality if development proposed is hydrologically linked to the Solway Firth, consideration of NE policies and the HBA are required to protect this.			
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↓ The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, there are few opportunities for reuse of brownfield land within Wigan and its hinterland and therefore new development is likely to be on greenfield land. The capacity of drainage etc. will also need to be considered and potentially invested in to ensure that it can cope with new development in this area.	⊕ The policy option will enable the redevelopment of existing sites which will involve the reuse of RDL, however, the policy option will promote development of new employment sites and depending on the location of these, if it is on greenfield land then there is the potential for soil sealing.	⊕ The policy primarily focuses on development within the town, which will preserve the use of brownfield land.	↓ The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, there are few opportunities for reuse of brownfield land within Wigan and its hinterland and therefore new development is likely to be on greenfield land. The capacity of drainage etc. will also need to be considered and potentially invested in to ensure that it can cope with new development in this area.	⊕ No significant effects, the sites in relation to this policy already exist.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's land and soil resources are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	⊕ No significant effect.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective, although (1)-(4) have the potential to result in development on greenfield land and resultant issues in terms of soil sealing.			
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⊕ No significant effects	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effect	⊕ No significant effects, the sites in relation to this policy already exist, dependent on the types of businesses and operations at the sites, maximising their use may result in additional waste generated, however, at this strategic stage this is not deemed significant.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's mineral resources are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	⊕ No significant effect.	(6) has the potential to support this objective.			
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as economic development in the area will result in employment growth and therefore increased access to employment opportunities.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as economic development in the area will result in employment growth.	↑ The policy option promotes the retention of existing jobs at the employment sites within the area, and aims to maximise the use of those sites that are not at full capacity which should help to generate further employment growth.	→ This option strongly supports this objective	↑ This should on a small scale protect existing jobs in these services and facilities, although there will be limited opportunities to grow these further.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.			
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as economic development in the area will result in employment growth and therefore increased access to employment opportunities.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as economic development in the area will result in employment growth and therefore increased access to employment opportunities.	⊕ The current employment sites within Wigan are modern and of reasonable quality, however, those in the wider rural north tend to be subject to poor infrastructure and generally not very accessible, therefore there is high reliance on the private car to access them. Maximising the use of these sites will potentially make this situation worse as it will encourage more travel by private car to them, however, further investment may also help to drive investment in infrastructure to improve access by sustainable means.	→ This option strongly supports this objective	⊕ No significant effect.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.			
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as economic development in the area will result in employment growth both within the town and in the rural areas, supporting the agricultural economy with farm diversification etc therefore diversifying the economy.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option directly supports the objective.	↑↑ The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as economic development in the area will result in employment growth both within the town and in the rural areas, supporting the agricultural economy with farm diversification etc therefore diversifying the economy.	↑ The policy option promotes the retention of existing jobs at the employment sites within the area, and aims to maximise the use of those sites that are not at full capacity which should help to generate further employment growth.	→ This option strongly supports this objective	⊕ No significant effect.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.			

Key: Significance of Effects **S13 Area Based Strategy - Wigton**

Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse

↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse
↔	No significant effect

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S13: Area Based Strategy - Wigton			
	Built Environment Policy Option			Comments
	(1): Safeguard the attractive and distinctive Georgian architectural heritage within the Wigton town centre and the wider rural villages, promoting improvements and enhancements to maximise the character of the buildings and public realm within these Conservation Areas.	(2): Protect the distinctive character of villages and settlements by ensuring that all new development respects and enhances existing traditional designs and features.		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	This supports the public's views in terms of protection of historic character and features.	↑	Supports the need to retain individual character and design within and amongst settlements. The policy option is supportive of the objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect None
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	This policy has the potential to have an indirect effect on this objective, by enhancing the local historic environment	↑	Contributes to the quality of life and environment within settlements which can benefit the general sense of health and well-being. The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	By protecting and preserving the architectural heritage of Wigton town centre and the surrounding rural settlements, this option helps to support this objective .	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective as it helps to promote local distinctiveness and a sense of identity and community. The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	This policy includes the protection of soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees and hedges within the Conservation Areas, which could support this objective.	↔	No significant effect (1) is potentially supportive of this objective, (2) will not have any identifiable effects.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	This policy includes the protection of hard and soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees, hedges, fences and surfacing within the Conservation Areas and so supports this objective.	↑↑	This policy option will contribute to the quality of the built environment and wider landscape by ensuring new development is in character and scale and therefore contributes to wider landscape character and does not affect the setting of designated sites. The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	This policy supports the sympathetic development in the Conservation Areas and alteration/extensions to listed buildings and so supports this objective	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective. The policy options are supportive of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This policy aims to enhance social and economic regeneration in Wigton and the rural north of the Borough by promoting the role of heritage; historic properties can provide an income, source of employment and supplement the regional tourism industry.	↔	No significant effect (1) is strongly supportive of this objective, (2) will not have any identifiable effects.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This policy will provide additional jobs in tourism and other associated industries by promoting the role of heritage in Wigton and the rural north of the Borough.	↔	No significant effect (1) is strongly supportive of this objective, (2) will not have any identifiable effects.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	This policy promotes the role of heritage within the local economy and supplements the facilities available to visitors to Wigton and the rural north of the Borough.	↔	No significant effect (1) is strongly supportive of this objective, (2) will not have any identifiable effects.

Key: Significance of Effects		S13 Area Based Strategy - Wigton	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇧	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S13: Area Based Strategy - Wigton		
	Natural Environment Policy Option		Comments
	(1): Continue to safeguard the internationally protected areas of the Solway Coast AONB by ensuring that all development is consistent with the objectives within the AONB Management Plan.		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⇨	This policy supports the public's views in terms of the value placed on the AONB and the desire to protect the landscape	The policy option is potentially supportive of the objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	The policy seeks to safeguard the AONB and the Management Plan provides a focus for public to access and enjoy the landscape, therefore this is complementary to this objective.	The policy option is supportive of the objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect.	None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect.	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effects, whilst access to the countryside and open space can contribute to health and well-being, the access to the AONB currently exists and therefore there will be no significant changes to the baseline.	None
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	The management plan objectives for the AONB focus on providing locally distinctive communities and focus on environmental and heritage initiatives and therefore support this objective.	The policy option is supportive of the objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	Whilst the AONB is primarily a landscape designation, biodiversity is an interlinked feature and a priority within the Management Plan.	The policy option is supportive of the objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	The policy option is strongly supportive of the objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	Whilst the AONB is primarily a landscape designation, the quality of the built environment within the area is an interlinked feature and a priority within the Management Plan.	The policy option is supportive of the objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effects.	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect.	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	→→	There is strong indirect potential for improvements in landscape features and elements in the AONB to also help improve land and soil quality; soil type strongly influences key landscape characteristics. In turn, these characteristics can help to conserve soil resources.	The policy option is indirectly supportive of the objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑	The AONB Management Plan considers the issue of mineral resources within its boundaries and seeks sustainable and sensitive management of such resources, therefore the policy option is complementary.	The policy option is supportive of the objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effects.	None
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects.	None
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	No significant effects.	None

Key: Significance of Effects		S13 Area Based Strategy - Wigton	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
	Major beneficial		Major beneficial
	Minor beneficial		Minor beneficial
	Potentially beneficial		Potentially beneficial
	Potentially adverse		Potentially adverse
	Minor adverse		Minor adverse
	Major adverse		Major adverse
	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S13: Area Based Strategy - Wigton										
	Transport / Infrastructure Policy Options										
	(1): Work with partners to support appropriate, proposed and aspirational future strategic infrastructure projects, such as the Wigton Eastern Bypass, and seek to protect proposed routes through planning policy.	(2): Support proposals to improve facilities at Wigton rail station such as the creation of additional car parking.	(3): Work with partners to maximise the roll out of superfast and next generation broadband across the locality to both residential and business users	(4): Support proposals which improve utility provision.	(5): Support improvements to open space provision.	Comments					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes		No significant effects		No significant effect		This enables people to participate in democratic processes even if they live in rural areas or have access or other issues that may restrict them from participating in a more usual manner.		The policy option reflects the need to improve utility provision within the area to support the area's existing and future population.		The policy option reflects the need to improve open space provision within the area to support the area's existing and future population.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective or have no identifiable effect.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces		Ultimately, this option will support the strategic future development of the Borough's transport network within and beyond its administrative area, although there may be disruptions during the construction period. This will help to address the current congestion in the town centre and therefore improve the length of time that it takes to travel within and through the town, benefitting overall accessibility.		The policy option aims to promote access to and from Wigton through improving the services and facilities offered at the rail station.		This enables people to access facilities and services even if they live in rural areas or have access or other issues that may restrict them from participating in a more usual manner.		No significant effect		The policy option is directly supportive of the objective through increasing access to public open space within the area, particularly within Wigton which has the highest deficit of POS in the Borough.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home		No significant effects		No significant effect		This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services, thus improving quality of life where people live.		Constraints in terms of utility provision both within the town and the more rural settlements has the potential to restrict the amount of development that can take place in the area, therefore improvements to provision will ensure that more of the population will have access to decent affordable homes.		The policy option contributes to the wider improvements in quality of life that are bought about through accessible POS provision and the benefits that this brings to decent homes.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective or have no identifiable effect.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training		No significant effects		No significant effect		This policy option provides the opportunity for remote access to educational and training facilities.		No significant effect		No significant effect	Generally the policy options have no identifiable effect, however (3) may potentially result in beneficial effects.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people		By enabling better traffic flows around the north of the Borough and particularly within the congested town centre, this option would help to maintain quality of life and sense of well-being, especially within the town centre itself.		No significant effect		This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services and potential employment, thus improving quality of life and a sense of well-being.		No significant effect		The policy option contributes to the wider improvements in quality of life that are bought about through accessible POS provision and the benefits that this brings to health and well-being.	The policies may potentially result in indirect benefits in terms of the objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history		No significant effects		No significant effect		This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services and potential employment, thus improving quality of life and retaining people in more rural areas strengthening local community vibrancy.		This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this objective, by enabling more affordable homes and economic investment to take place in the town and rural areas strengthening local community vibrancy.		The policy option provides more community space that is publicly accessible, this could provide opportunities for local events to be hosted but also provides a central focus for communities.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive of this objective or have no identifiable effects.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity		Through good strategic planning to enable better traffic flows around the town during and post construction, this option would help to protect special sites and habitats of high biodiversity interest, as well as buffer areas. There may well be some loss of biodiversity resource and quality in the construction areas/sites however, but losses could be mitigated to some extent over time through substitution via S106 and CIL.		No significant effect		No significant effects		No significant effect		There are potential opportunities for biodiversity benefits through the creation of new open space, particularly if it is natural space and / or has wildlife areas incorporated. The provision of space could help form part of wildlife corridors further benefitting biodiversity. However, the provision of formal space such as play areas and sports pitches will have less of a beneficial effect as these tend to be of lower biodiversity value than informal spaces.	The policy options generally have no identifiable effect. In terms of (1), the effects will depend on location and implementation and considerations over such a policy will need to be taken in conjunction with the findings of the HRA. In terms of (5), new POS provision should reflect the needs of the local community but also look to achieve a good mix of formal and informal space and identify opportunities to enhance biodiversity.

EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↕	Through good strategic planning to enable better traffic flows around the town and the north of the Borough during and post construction, this option would help to retain existing landscape character, although the creation of new road links and road routes may well have some adverse impacts. These could be mitigated to some extent over time through S106 and CIL measures.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effect	↑	There are potential opportunities for landscape benefits through the creation of new open space, particularly if it is natural / informal space. The provision of space could help form part of extended GI networks across the Borough. However, the provision of formal space such as play areas and sports pitches will have less of a beneficial effect as these tend to be of lower landscape value than informal spaces.	The policy options generally have no identifiable effect. In terms of (1), the effects will depend on location and implementation and considerations over such a policy will need to be taken in conjunction with the findings of LCA. In terms of (5), new POS provision should reflect the needs of the local community but also look to achieve a good mix of formal and informal space and identify opportunities to enhance the GI network.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↕	Through good strategic planning to enable better traffic flows around the town and the north of the Borough during and post construction, this option would help to retain existing built environment quality, although the creation of new road links and the widening of existing road routes may well have some adverse impacts. These could be mitigated to some extent over time through S106 and CIL measures. Through support of the bypass scheme, the quality of the built environment in Wigton centre will be improved through a reduction in congestion.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effects	↑	This policy option has the potential to enable new development within the town and villages which has the potential to contribute to the overall quality of the built environment.	↑	The policy option enables the provision of increased areas of POS within settlements, the provision of this space will contribute to the overall quality of the built environment.	The policy options have the potential to be supportive of this objective, particular benefits will be within Wigton town centre where the reduced levels of congestion will improve the local environment.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↕	This option will help to alleviate local air quality issues both during the construction and operational stages, particularly with the bypass which will help address the congestion and related air quality issues in Wigton town centre. However, increased traffic levels, that may result as a product of road improvement schemes will add to local emissions.	↕	Whilst the policy option includes the provision of improved car parking within the town, this should ultimately enable the more rural population to commute to their employment through more sustainable means, i.e. the train rather than relying on the private car for the whole journey.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home, reducing overall levels of commuting and therefore emissions.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	The policy options have the potential to result in both positive and negative effects in terms of the objective. The promotion of schemes such as the Wigton bypass will help to alleviate air quality issues in Wigton, an promotion of facilities at the rail station should help to make this a more attractive option for commuters into Carlisle and other main centres. However, through improvements to road infrastructure there is the potential that road traffic will increase, therefore further promotion of sustainable transport needs to be carried out in conjunction with such policies in order to make sure that such benefits are not offset by the adverse impacts.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↑	Potential to improve drainage capacity through an upgrade in utility provision.	↔	No significant effects	Generally there are no identifiable effects for this objective, however, (4) may result in positive effects as a result of improvements to utility provision.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↓	This option will result in the loss of land and soil sealing through land-take to provide new infrastructure.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective through the provision of public open space.	Generally there are no identifiable effects for this objective, however, (1) may result in the loss of land and soil sealing through infrastructure provision, the location and approach taken to new infrastructure will need to be done in conjunction with other policies to minimise this effect as far as possible. (5) is strongly supportive of the objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑	The construction activity and post construction improvements to strategic routes and network use will all help to secure existing jobs and help to create new employment opportunities, both directly and indirectly	↑	The policy option will directly support a small number of jobs but also increase mobility for customers and employers both into and out of the town supporting existing jobs and potentially helping to create additional employment opportunities.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity, it also helps to support rural businesses to develop and grow, where previously the lack of infrastructure would have restricted this opportunity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home.	↑	Currently the limited utility infrastructure in the area in conjunction with available land, constrains the amount of development that can take place, this has the potential to put off potential businesses setting up in the town and / or relocating to the town, limiting the available employment opportunities in Wigton.	↔	No significant effects	The policy options are generally supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑	As for the above, the construction activity and post construction improvements to strategic routes and network use will all help to improve accessibility to existing job and new employment opportunities.	↑	The policy option improves facilities at the existing rail station which should enable the rural population to better access employment opportunities outside of the Wigton area, primarily into Carlisle.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home, reducing overall levels of commuting and therefore emissions.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effects	The policy options are generally supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑	As for the above, the construction activity and post construction improvements to strategic routes and network use will all help to improve accessibility to existing job and new employment opportunities.	↔	No significant effect	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity, it also helps to support rural businesses to develop and grow, where previously the lack of infrastructure would have restricted this opportunity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home.	↑	Currently the limited utility infrastructure in the area in conjunction with available land, constrains the amount of development that can take place, this has the potential to put off potential businesses setting up in the town and / or relocating to the town, limiting the available employment opportunities in Wigton.	↔	No significant effects	The policy options are generally supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇦	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S13: Area Based Strategy - Wigton		
	Alternative Policy Option		Comments
	S15a: Do not provide area based policies, instead addressing policies through the strategic objective themes of climate change and sustainable development, housing, economy, transport, natural and built environment.		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↓	The policy option fails to reflect the specific needs and desires of the Wigton community.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	⇕	Whilst the policy does not restrict future development in the area, it does not guide the specific development that the town currently experiences a deficit in, therefore access to certain services and facilities may still exist post development.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⇕	Whilst the policy does not restrict future housing development, without the specific guidance of the preferred options the needs of the Wigton community in terms of type and mix and affordable needs may not be met.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect, Wigton has existing schools and new development will be able to access these facilities.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effect, development in the town regardless of guidance from the preferred options will enable access to the existing facilities.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↓	Without the specific guidance provided by the preferred options, there will be no strategic approach to future development within the Wigton area, and therefore there is the risk that the proposals will not contribute to the vibrancy and vitality of the town and not develop social cohesion.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	Whilst the designated sites will be protected by national policy, without the guidance provided by the preferred options, the strategic approach to development in Wigton there is the risk that new development will result in adverse impacts and limited opportunities to identify enhancement.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓	Whilst the designated sites will be protected by national policy, without the guidance provided by the preferred options, the strategic approach to development in Wigton there is the risk that new development will result in adverse impacts and limited opportunities to identify enhancement.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇕	The preferred policies provide guidance and steer new development to provide high quality design and reflect the character of the town, without this guidance there is a risk that new development will be out of scale character with the current town.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↓	The preferred policy approaches provide a steer towards ensuring development is sustainably located and improves transport infrastructure within the town.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇕	Whilst there are Core strategy policies related to reuse of brownfield land specific guidance at the local level will ensure that land and soil are protected as far as possible.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	The current level of employment within the town will be unaffected by the alternative policy option, however, there is potential that the approach to employment development in the town will not be appropriate for its needs.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↓	Without the specific guidance provided by the economic policies there is the potential that the market forces driving development will not contribute to diversifying the economy or addressing deficits in facilities and services.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		S14 Area Based Strategy - Silloth	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇩	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S14: Area Based Strategy - Silloth							
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Housing Policy Options			Comments			
	(1): Promote the appropriate level of housing through the spatial strategy, with a high priority given to meeting local needs.	(2): Provide a supportive policy framework for the development of housing to support local affordable needs through rural exception sites and community right to build.	(3): Support efforts to make use of long term empty housing, especially within town centres.				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	This reflects the desires of the public to see affordable housing provided in the town to ensure a good balanced community.	→	This option recognises that rural communities have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, it supports the ability of young people to remain within their community through the provision of local affordable housing.	↑	This reflects the desire of residents to see redundant properties to be put back into use, improving the quality of the local environment and presenting opportunities for additional housing within the area.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	This policy option will provide housing in one of the KSCs within the Borough and therefore will ensure that the new population will have good access to the services and facilities within the town, however, the town has a generally poor retail and leisure offer and therefore there will still be a need for residents to travel to other towns, in addition the wider Silloth area suffers from poor rural accessibility, which this option will not address.	↑	The option will provide access to services and facilities through the provision of new housing although if the development takes place in rural areas there is less potential access. However, it may also help to secure the viability of existing services and facilities for the wider community.	↑	This policy option will provide additional housing in one of the KSCs within the Borough and therefore will ensure that the new population will have good access to the services and facilities within the town, however, the town has a generally poor retail and leisure offer and therefore there will still be a need for residents to travel to other towns, in addition Silloth and the wider rural north area suffers from poor rural accessibility, which this option will not address.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of this objective, particularly as it provides an emphasis towards affordable housing.	↑↑	This option recognises that the rural communities in the Silloth area have specific housing needs that this policy option will help to address.	↑↑	Policy option directly supports this objective.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑	Silloth has good educational facilities within the town and therefore provision of additional housing in the locality of the town will enable better access to these educational facilities.	↑	Silloth has good educational facilities within the town and therefore provision of additional housing in the locality of the town will enable better access to these educational facilities.	↑	Silloth has good educational facilities within the town and therefore provision of additional housing in the locality of the town will enable better access to these educational facilities.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Provision of new affordable housing will help to improve general well-being through ensuring that people have access to affordable homes. Locating new development within the town will also ensure good access to local healthcare facilities for all.	↑↑	This option has the potential to support this objective by relieving disadvantage and reducing levels of stress to help improve health and well-being in rural communities in the Silloth area via the provision of affordable local housing.	↑	Policy of making use of long term empty housing will aid health and well-being through provision of decent affordable homes in the area.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	Currently the Silloth area suffers from high levels of outcommuting and a general lack of economic investment, so community spirit and vibrancy has the potential to be improved, further housing and related economic investment in the town and surrounding villages could help to develop and strengthen the existing community.	↑↑	By enabling young people and families to stay in their community, this option directly supports this objective, helping to rural communities to stay strong and vibrant, as the Silloth area has the most elderly population in Allerdale.	→→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community through bringing back empty properties into use should help foster community vibrancy and inclusiveness.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. The Silloth area is very constrained in terms of designated sites, including the Solway Firth SAC and SPA and numerous SSSIs, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and the findings of the HRA.	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. The Silloth area is very constrained in terms of designated sites, including the Solway Coast SAC and SPA, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and the findings of the HRA.	⇕	This policy relates to the reuse of existing buildings rather than relating to new development on potentially greenfield or biodiverse sites, however, there is the potential that species may be residing in the properties, e.g. bats, which would need to be investigated and appropriately managed and mitigated prior to any development taking place.	There is the potential that new housing development in a predominantly rural area will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, dependent on the location. Potential impacts will need to be considered in terms of the HRA and NE policies. The potential impacts on biodiversity within empty properties will also need to be considered prior to development taking place.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. The Silloth area is a fairly constrained area in terms of its proximity to high quality landscapes, in particular the Solway Coast AONB and Hadrian's Wall WHS, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and be subject to a full LVIA.	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. The Silloth area is a fairly constrained area in terms of its proximity to high quality landscapes, in particular the Solway Coast AONB and Hadrian's Wall WHS, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and be subject to a full LVIA.	→	This option works well with NE policies to improve GI provision and landscape character in the Silloth area through appropriate housing development, i.e. the reuse of existing empty properties and natural environment improvements can be compatible.	There is the potential that new housing development in a predominantly rural area will have an adverse impact on landscape character and quality dependent on the location. Potential impacts will need to be considered in terms of the NE policies and LCA. The impacts on the setting on the AONB, WHS and National Park will be important to consider prior to determining the location of future development.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	⇕	This depends on implementation, the policy will result in new development in rural areas, therefore policies on development and design need to ensure that it is in keeping with scale and design in the existing settlement.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	The policy options are supportive of this objective, there will need to be safeguards to ensure that new development in rural areas is appropriate in design and scale..
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↓	The town is a supportive centre to the larger centres of Carlisle and Workington with a limited retail and leisure offer and high levels of outcommuting, in addition the town is highly inaccessible with poor road links, no access to rail services and very poor public transport provision. Therefore locating new housing here will without significant economic investment in employment opportunities and transport infrastructure improvements will result in increased emissions as residents need to rely on the private car to access services, facilities and employment opportunities.	↓	The policy relates to promoting development in rural areas which is generally an unsustainable approach in terms of transport and travel opportunities, as the population within rural settlements generally have a high reliance on the private car to access services, facilities and employment opportunities. However, provision of housing in these areas could support local agricultural works etc to live close to their place of work reducing their need to commute.	↑	Through reuse of existing housing stock there is the potential to make the properties more efficient and therefore the potential to reduce the volume of emissions currently arising through the use of the properties.	The policy options have the potential to have an adverse impact by virtue of the fact that they are promoting new housing development in a predominantly rural area, with limited services, facilities and employment opportunities. New development in the area should be coupled with economic investment in the area to ensure that increasing the population does not increase the level of outcommuting and therefore emissions.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↓	There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development that is hydrologically linked to the Solway Coast or other watercourses in the vicinity.	↓	There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development that is hydrologically linked to the Solway Coast or other watercourses in the vicinity.	⇕	Depending on the location of the housing identified for reuse within the town the issues relating to (1) and (2) may also be relevant, however, it is assumed that if identified as suitable for reuse that these issues have been addressed.	The policy options are supportive of this objective, there will need to be safeguards to ensure that new development does not place undue strain on existing infrastructure and does not have the potential to adversely affect the water quality of local watercourses.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↓	The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, there are few opportunities for reuse of brownfield land within Silloth and its hinterland and therefore new development is likely to be on greenfield land.	↓	The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, as the policy promotes limited development in rural areas, there is greater potential that this will involve the use of greenfield land rather than PDL.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it relates to the reuse of existing buildings.	The policy options are potentially supportive in some areas, but potentially adverse in terms of promoting development of predominantly rural areas, and the scale of impact will be dependent on location and need to be considered in terms of wider core strategy policies.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	⇕	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities, however this would need to be considered in terms of the EC policies as without economic investment in the area there will continue to be high levels of outcommuting which will increase with additional level of housing.	→	By helping people/families to stay in their community, this option indirectly supports this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing reuse will help to support existing job security and potentially create new opportunities.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	⇕	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities, however this would need to be considered in terms of the EC policies as without economic investment in the area there will continue to be high levels of outcommuting which will increase with additional level of housing.	→	By helping people/families to stay in their community, this option indirectly supports this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing reuse should help to improve access to employment by supporting existing job security and create new opportunities.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.	→	By helping people/families to stay in their community, this option indirectly supports this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing reuse will help to encourage inward investment, economic diversification and a stronger local economy.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		S14 Area Based Strategy - Sillioth	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↕	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse	↔	No significant effect

S14: Area Based Strategy - Sillioth													
Economy Policy Options													
Sustainability Objectives													
(1): Encourage appropriate levels of employment growth following the spatial strategy and promote alternative methods of provision, such as the opportunity for live work units. (2): Protect and maximise appropriate use of local employment sites. (3): Promote the sustainability of the Sillioth locality by supporting the vitality and viability of Sillioth town centre, to be achieved by directing retail, leisure and cultural proposals of appropriate scale and nature within Sillioth town centre wherever possible. (4): Recognise and promote the importance of Sillioth as a visitor destination, particularly as the main service centre for visitors to the Solway Coast AONB. Supporting improvements to the leisure services industries within the town. (5): Support appropriate rural and farm diversification schemes, recognising the important role these have for the wider Alerdale economy (6): Protecting the character and sustainability of rural settlements by setting policies which vigorously protect village and community services such as shops and pubs.													
											Comments		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	→	This option supports stakeholders views, helping to indirectly meet this objective	→	This option supports stakeholders views, helping to indirectly meet this objective	→	This option supports stakeholders views, helping to indirectly meet this objective	(3), (4) and (5) are indirectly supportive of the objective, the other options have no identifiable effect.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	The policy option provides employment opportunities within the town and potentially within the rural area, increasing access to employment opportunities for the population, and potentially increasing access to services and facilities dependent on the type of employment opportunities provided, this would provide much needed investment to the isolated area in the Borough.	↔	No significant effect, employment sites within the area already exist therefore there is no significant change to the baseline in terms of this objective.	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective through provision of promoting proposals within the town centre wherever possible increasing access to these types of facilities within the town and reducing the need to travel further afield.	↑	This option helps to focus support for Sillioth which has high potential as a key tourism and leisure service area. Through supporting improvements to the leisure service industries in the town, this will improve access for visitors and for residents.	→→	This option indirectly but strongly supports this objective.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of this objective in terms of supporting small local facilities which improves access for the more isolated rural communities in the north of the Borough.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to ensure that people have access to services and facilities close to their home, improving the quality of their home in the wider sense.	↔	No significant effect	↔	This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to help make decent housing more affordable in rural areas.	↔	This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to ensure that people have access to services and facilities close to their home, improving the quality of their home in the wider sense.	The policy options are potentially indirectly supportive of the objective or show no identifiable effects.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	Dependent on the type of employment opportunities developed, there will potentially be the opportunity for growth in educational and training opportunities linked into the employment, which would help to retain workers in the area.	↔	No significant effect	↑	Dependent on the type of proposals, this has the potential to be supportive to this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC policies.	→→	This option indirectly but strongly supports this objective.	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective or show no identifiable effects.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↑	This option supports this objective because it will improve overall quality of life for those living in rural areas to have access to some services and facilities within their communities, contributing to health and well-being.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective because a strong rural economy contributes towards a general sense of individual well-being and health.	↑	This option supports this objective because it will improve overall quality of life for those living in rural areas to have access to some services and facilities within their communities, contributing to health and well-being.	(3), (4) and (5) are supportive of the objective, the other options have no identifiable effect.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	The enabling of economic development within the town and the more rural settlements according to the hierarchy will provide a positive effect in terms of retaining vitality and vibrancy within the settlements and enabling younger people to within them.	↔	No significant effect	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities in Sillioth protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town.	↑	This option supports this objective because improving local services and facilities in Sillioth protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town and promoting the town as a tourist attraction could result in additional cultural and recreation events and festivals further developing the sense of community and preserving the sense of character and history of the town.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective because a strong rural economy contributes towards community vibrancy and inclusiveness, in the north of the Borough agricultural industries are the key economic driver and therefore the communities are generally small agricultural communities that this policy will help to sustain.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities protects the vitality and vibrancy of local communities and enables them to continue to thrive as living communities.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	The policy depends on the specific locations where development will take place, the rural north is highly constrained in terms of biodiversity and potential development in rural areas is most likely to take place on greenfield land therefore there will be potential impacts and the policy would need to be considered in conjunction with the HRA and NE policies.	↔	No significant effect, the employment sites in relation to this policy already exist, there could be opportunities however, to enhance biodiversity through landscaping and incorporating wildlife friendly features.	↕	The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Sillioth town centre it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts than development on the edge of the settlement or in the villages.	↕	This option could indirectly help to support measures to enhance biodiversity interest, as the value of the area in terms of tourist potential is inextricably linked to its biodiversity value. However, this will need to be managed against the promotion of the area as a tourist attraction and the potential issues that could result from increased access and recreation on existing biodiversity assets.	↔	This option indirectly supports this objective because Alerdale's natural environment is important to its economic performance, particularly in the north of the Borough where agriculture is such a key element of the economy.	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options could potentially result in beneficial or adverse impacts depending on the location and the impact on biodiversity. New development has the potential to enhance biodiversity through wildlife friendly measures, however the location will need to be considered in context of the findings of the HRA
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓	The policy depends on the specific locations where development will take place, the rural north is highly constrained in terms of landscape and potential development in rural areas is most likely to take place on greenfield land therefore there will be potential impacts on the setting of the AONB and WHS and fragmentation of the landscape and the policy would need to be considered in conjunction with NE policies.	↔	No significant effect, the employment sites in relation to this policy already exist, there could be opportunities however, to enhance landscape quality at the sites through appropriate landscaping.	↕	The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Sillioth town centre it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less landscape impacts than development on the edge of the settlement or in the villages.	↕	This option could indirectly help to support measures to enhance landscape interest, as the value of the area in terms of tourist potential is inextricably linked to its landscape value. However, this will need to be managed against the promotion of the area as a tourist attraction and the potential issues that could result from increased access and recreation on existing landscape assets and sense of place and tranquility that contribute to its current character.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because Alerdale's landscapes are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options could potentially result in beneficial or adverse impacts depending on the location and the impact on landscape. New development has the potential to enhance landscape through appropriate landscape schemes, however the location will need to be considered in context of the NE policies.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	The policy option will result in new development which has the potential to contribute to the improvement and enhancement of the built environment within Sillioth and the rural settlements. In addition provision of live work units would provide an efficient use of buildings in the smaller settlements, ensuring that new development is not out of scale with current character.	↔	No significant effect, the employment sites in relation to this policy already exist.	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Sillioth, to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs	↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Sillioth, to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because Alerdale's built environment is important to its economic performance in rural areas.	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↕	Following the spatial strategy for the Borough will ensure that most new economic development will be focussed in Sillioth where the highest level of population for this area is based, this should help to reduce potential emissions arising as a result of commuting. In addition the promotion of some economic development in the smaller rural areas, should further benefit this. However, currently there is such a lack of suitable employment within this area and a high level of outcommuting, there will need to be significant economic investment to realise significant benefits in this area.	↕	The current employment sites within Sillioth and the wider rural north tend to be subject to poor infrastructure and generally not very accessible, therefore there is high reliance on the private car to access them. Maximising the use of these sites will potentially make this situation worse as it will encourage more travel by private car to them, however, further investment may also help to drive investment in infrastructure to improve access by sustainable means.	↑	This option promotes the growth of services and facilities within the town, this should increase the overall offer of the town and therefore potentially reduce some of the need to travel to other towns in the Borough and Carlisle, reducing emissions related to this travel. However, the town will always play a supporting role and constrained by its size, population and poor accessibility so the growth will not be able to support all the services and facilities required by residents and therefore travelling will still be required to meet the needs of the population.	←	The town is currently very poor in terms of accessibility, particularly by sustainable means. Through promotion of the town as a major tourist service centre, this will encourage additional visitors to the town, who will inevitably travel by road and generally by private car, therefore increasing emissions and reducing local air quality. This policy needs to be coupled with a targeted approach in terms of policy and investment for sustainable transport.	↔	No significant effects	↑	Through continued protection of small scale services and facilities within communities, there should be a slight reduction in the need to travel for those residents served by these facilities.	(1), (3) and (6) are potentially beneficial in relation to locating new development in sustainable locations, (2) and (4) are potentially adverse, recognising the poor infrastructure and sustainable transport provision in the area, new policies related to new economic development need to be coupled with policies and investment in sustainable transport and infrastructure.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↓	There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development that is hydrologically linked to the Solway Coast or other watercourses in the vicinity.	↔	No significant effects, the sites in relation to this policy already exist.	↓	There are unlikely to be significant effects, however, there may be issues in terms of drainage capacity and utilities within the town which will need to be considered prior to new development, and new development will need to ensure that it is not hydrologically linked to watercourses that would result in adverse water quality impacts.	↓	There are unlikely to be significant effects, however, there may be issues in terms of drainage capacity and utilities within the town which will need to be considered prior to new development, and new development will need to ensure that it is not hydrologically linked to watercourses that would result in adverse water quality impacts.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because Alerdale's water resources are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	↔	No significant effect.	(1), (3) and (4) are potentially adverse in terms of the new development being hydrologically linked to areas such as the Solway Coast and the potential issues related to drainage capacity within the area. New proposals will need to be considered in terms of the HRA and NE policies.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↓	The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, there are few opportunities for reuse of brownfield land within Sillioth and its hinterland and therefore new development is likely to be on greenfield land. The capacity of drainage etc will also need to be considered and potentially invested in to ensure that it can cope with new development in this area.	↔	No significant effects, the sites in relation to this policy already exist.	↑	Promoting development within the town centre should promote the use of brownfield land prior to greenfield land therefore potentially meeting the aims of this objective.	↑	Promoting development within the town centre should promote the use of brownfield land prior to greenfield land therefore potentially meeting the aims of this objective. The value of the area in terms of tourism is dependent on the quality of the environment, therefore the two are linked in terms of the need to maintain and protect the land.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because Alerdale's land and soil resources are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options are generally potentially supportive of the objective, however (1) will potentially result in adverse effects as a result of the potential requirement for development on brownfield land.

NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects, the sites in relation to this policy already exist, dependent on the type of businesses and operations at the sites, maximising their use may result in additional waste generated, however, at this strategic stage this is not deemed significant.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effect	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's mineral resources are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	↔	No significant effect.	(5) will be indirectly supportive of the objective, all other options show no identifiable effect.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as economic development in the area will result in employment growth.	↑	The policy option promotes the retention of existing jobs at the employment sites within the area, and aims to maximise the use of those sites that are not at full capacity which should help to generate further employment growth.	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective	↑	This should on a small scale protect existing jobs in these services and facilities, although there will be limited opportunities to grow these further.	The policy options are supportive of the objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as economic development in the area will result in employment growth and therefore increased access to employment opportunities.	↔	The current employment sites within Silloth and the wider rural north tend to be subject to poor infrastructure and generally not very accessible, therefore there is high reliance on the private car to access them. Maximising the use of these sites will potentially make this situation worse as it will encourage more travel by private car to them, however, further investment may also help to drive investment in infrastructure to improve access by sustainable means.	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive, providing greater employment opportunities within the own, therefore increasing access for residents to employment opportunities locally.	↑↑	This option supports this objective through increased access to jobs in the leisure services industry in the town.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective, however, (2) will potentially result in creating additional jobs in currently inaccessible areas. The policy needs to be developed in conjunction with transport and infrastructure policies and investment in order to meet this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as economic development in the area will result in employment growth both within the town and in the rural areas, supporting the agricultural economy with farm diversification etc therefore diversifying the economy.	↑	The policy option promotes the retention of existing jobs at the employment sites within the area, and aims to maximise the use of those sites that are not at full capacity which should help to generate further employment growth.	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive, strengthening the local economy.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, and diversifies the economy in terms of tourism.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options support this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		S14 Area Based Strategy - Silloth	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S14: Area Based Strategy - Silloth				
	Built Environment Policy Option				
	(1): Safeguard the attractive and distinctive Victorian architectural heritage within the Silloth town centre and the wider rural villages, promoting improvements and enhancements to maximise the character of the buildings and public realm within these Conservation Areas.	(2): Protect the distinctive character of villages and settlements by ensuring that all new development respects and enhances existing traditional designs and features.	Comments		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	This supports the public's views in terms of protection of historic character and features.	↑	Supports the need to retain individual character and design within and amongst settlements.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	This policy has the potential to have an indirect effect on this objective, by enhancing the local historic environment	↑	Contributes to the quality of life and environment within settlements which can benefit the general sense of health and well-being.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	By protecting and preserving the architectural heritage of Silloth town centre and the surrounding rural settlements, this option helps to support this objective .	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective as it helps to promote local distinctiveness and a sense of identity and community.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	This policy includes the protection of soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees and hedges within the Conservation Areas, which could support this objective.	↔	No significant effect	(1) is potentially supportive of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	This policy includes the protection of hard and soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees, hedges, fences and surfacing within the Conservation Areas and so supports this objective.	↑↑	This policy option will contribute to the quality of the built environment and wider landscape by ensuring new development is in character and scale and therefore contributes to wider landscape character and does not affect the setting of designated sites.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	This policy supports the sympathetic development in the Conservation Areas and alteration/extensions to listed buildings and so supports this objective	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This policy aims to enhance social and economic regeneration in Silloth and the rural north of the Borough by promoting the role of heritage; historic properties can provide an income, source of employment and supplement the regional tourism industry.	↔	No significant effect	(1) is strongly supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This policy will provide additional jobs in tourism and other associated industries by promoting the role of heritage in Silloth and the rural north of the Borough.	↔	No significant effect	(1) is strongly supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	This policy promotes the role of heritage within the local economy and supplements the facilities available to visitors to Silloth and the rural north of the Borough.	↔	No significant effect	(1) is strongly supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects **S14 Area Based Strategy - Silloth**

Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇧	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse

⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse
↔	No significant effect

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S14: Area Based Strategy - Silloth				
	Natural Environment Policy Options			Comments	
	(1): Continue to safeguard the internationally protected areas of the Solway Coast AONB by ensuring that all development is consistent with the objectives within the AONB Management Plan.	(2): Protect and enhance the Silloth Green open space and recognise the importance of this area for recreational uses, attracting visitors to the town and as a significant GI asset.			
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⇨	This policy supports the public's views in terms of the value placed on the AONB and the desire to protect the landscape	⇨	This policy supports the public's views in terms of the value placed on Silloth Green as an asset to the town and recreational resource.	The preferred options are potentially supportive of the objective
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	The policy seeks to safeguard the AONB and the Management Plan provides a focus for public to access and enjoy the landscape, therefore this is complementary to this objective.	↔	No significant effects, this will continue to maintain the existing levels of access to the park.	The preferred options are potentially supportive of the objective
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect.	↔	No significant effects.	None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect.	↔	No significant effects.	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effects, whilst access to the countryside and open space can contribute to health and well-being, the access to the AONB currently exists and therefore there will be no significant changes to the baseline.	↑	Reinforcing and enhancing highly valued the landscape of Silloth Green could help to further support this objective.	The preferred options are potentially supportive of the objective
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	The management plan objectives for the AONB focus on providing locally distinctive communities and focus on environmental and heritage initiatives and therefore support this objective.	↑↑	Reinforcing and enhancing highly valued landscape of Silloth Green within the town could help to further support this objective and create a strong sense of local history amongst residents.	The preferred options are supportive of the objective
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	Whilst the AONB is primarily a landscape designation, biodiversity is an interlinked feature and a priority within the Management Plan.	↑↑	There will be considerable synergy and overlap between biodiversity and landscape criteria, with high potential for enhancement of both as the Green is a highly valued resource in biodiversity and landscape terms.	The preferred options are supportive of the objective
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	↑↑	There will be considerable synergy and overlap between biodiversity and landscape criteria, with high potential for enhancement of both as the Green is a highly valued resource in biodiversity and landscape terms.	The preferred options are strongly supportive of the objective
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	Whilst the AONB is primarily a landscape designation, the quality of the built environment within the area is an interlinked feature and a priority within the Management Plan.	↑↑	Taking direct account of specific local character of Silloth Green in shaping the setting and design of new development and regeneration schemes within Silloth will help to enhance and reinforce the quality of the built environment within the town.	The preferred options are supportive of the objective
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect.	→	There may be further potential for improvements in the quality and extent of adjacent watercourses that also help towards improving water quality and resources in the wider area and protect the water quality of designated site such as the Solway SAC and SPA.	The preferred options are supportive of the objective
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	→→	There is strong indirect potential for improvements in landscape features and elements in the AONB to also help improve land and soil quality; soil type strongly influences key landscape characteristics. In turn, these characteristics can help to conserve soil resources.	→→	There is strong indirect potential for improvements in landscape features and elements in the Green to also help improve land and soil quality; soil type strongly influences key landscape characteristics. In turn, these characteristics can help to conserve soil resources.	The preferred options are supportive of the objective
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑	The AONB Management Plan considers the issue of mineral resources within its boundaries and seeks sustainable and sensitive management of such resources, therefore the policy option is complementary.	↔	No significant effects.	The preferred options are potentially supportive of the objective
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	None
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	None
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	No significant effects.	↔	No significant effects.	None

Key: Significance of Effects		S14 Area Based Strategy - Silloth	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↕	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S14: Area Based Strategy - Silloth				
	Transport / Infrastructure Policy Options				
	(1): Encourage the enhancement of rural transport links in order to provide access to local facilities to address the issue of rural isolation.	(2): Work with partners to maximise the roll out of superfast and next generation broadband across the locality to both residential and business users	Comments		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	The policy aims to promote accessibility and reduce rural isolation.	↑↑	This enables people to participate in democratic processes even if they live in rural areas or have access or other issues that may restrict them from participating in a more usual manner.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	The policy is directly supportive of this objective in aiming to improve the current level of poor accessibility to services for rural areas.	↑↑	This enables people to access facilities and services even if they live in rural areas or have access or other issues that may restrict them from participating in a more usual manner.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services, thus improving quality of life where people live.	↔	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services, thus improving quality of life where people live.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→	The policy option will provide improved access for the rural population to education and training.	↑	This policy option provides the opportunity for remote access to educational and training facilities.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑↑	The policy option will improve access in a physical sense to healthcare services and facilities, however the option is also strongly supportive in the wider sense of health and well-being through directly working to reduce rural isolation.	↔	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services and potential employment, thus improving quality of life and a sense of well-being.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	The policy option should ensure that the more rural settlements are sustained rather than becoming more isolated, therefore contributing to their vibrancy and sense of community.	↔	This policy indirectly has potential to help achieve towards achieving this sustainability objective, by enabling improved accessibility to all types of services and potential employment, thus improving quality of life and retaining people in more rural areas strengthening local community vibrancy.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑	This policy option is supportive of this objective as it aims to promote more sustainable forms of access for the rural population. However, the scale of this effect will be determined by the level of investment in the service offered and therefore the likelihood of the population to change their approach to transport and travel from reliance on the private car.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home, reducing overall levels of commuting and therefore emissions.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effects	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity, it also helps to support rural businesses to develop and grow, where previously the lack of infrastructure would have restricted this opportunity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home.	(2) is strongly supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑	The policy option promotes improved access for the rural population, enabling them to have better access to employment opportunities.	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home, reducing overall levels of commuting and therefore emissions.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	No significant effect	↑↑	This policy option enables businesses to work more effectively and remain in local towns and more rural areas rather than needing to relocate due to lack of infrastructure capacity, it also helps to support rural businesses to develop and grow, where previously the lack of infrastructure would have restricted this opportunity. This also enables residents to be more effective in their work patterns and potentially work from home.	(2) is strongly supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇄	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇄	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇄	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S14: Area Based Strategy - Silloth		
	Alternative Policy Option		Comments
	S14a: Do not provide area based policies, instead addressing policies through the strategic objective themes of climate change and sustainable development, housing, economy, transport, natural and built environment.		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↓	The policy option fails to reflect the specific needs and desires of the Silloth community.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	⇄	Whilst the policy does not restrict future development in the area, it does not guide the specific development that the area currently suffers a deficit of or would benefit from in order to achieve its supportive role to the main towns, therefore access issues to certain services and facilities may still exist post development.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⇄	Whilst the policy does not restrict future housing development, without the specific guidance of the preferred options the needs of the Silloth community in terms of type and mix and affordable needs may not be met.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect, Silloth has educational facilities and new development will be able to access these facilities.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effect, development in the town regardless of guidance from the preferred options will enable access to the existing facilities.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↓	Without the specific guidance provided by the preferred options, there will be no strategic approach to future development within the Silloth area, and therefore there is the risk that the proposals will not contribute to the vibrancy and vitality of the town and not develop social cohesion.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	Whilst the designated sites will be protected by national policy, without the guidance provided by the preferred options, the strategic approach to development in Silloth there is the risk that new development will result in adverse impacts and limited opportunities to identify enhancement.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓	Whilst the designated sites will be protected by national policy, without the guidance provided by the preferred options, the strategic approach to development in Silloth there is the risk that new development will result in adverse impacts and limited opportunities to identify enhancement.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇄	The preferred policies provide guidance and steer new development to provide high quality design and reflect the character of the town and villages within the area, without this guidance there is a risk that new development will be out of scale character with the current built environment.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↓	The preferred policy approaches provide a steer towards ensuring development is sustainably located and improves transport infrastructure within the town and rural area.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇄	Whilst there are Core strategy policies related to reuse of brownfield land specific guidance at the local level will ensure that land and soil are protected as far as possible.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	The current level of employment within the area will be unaffected by the alternative policy option, however, there is potential that the approach to employment development in the area will not be appropriate for its needs.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↓	Without the specific guidance provided by the economic policies there is the potential that the market forces driving development will not contribute to diversifying the economy or addressing deficits in facilities and services.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		S15 Area Based Strategy - Aspatria	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S15: Area Based Strategy - Aspatria						
	Housing Policy Options						
	(1): Promote the appropriate level of housing through the spatial strategy, with a high priority given to meeting local affordable needs.	(2): Provide a supportive policy framework for the development of housing to support local affordable needs through rural exception sites and community right to build.	(3): Support efforts to make use of long term empty housing, especially within town centres.	Comments			
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	This reflects the desires of the public to see affordable housing provided in the town to ensure a good balanced community.	→	This option recognises that rural communities have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, it supports the ability of young people to remain within their community through the provision of local affordable housing.	↑	This reflects the desire of residents to see redundant properties to be put back into use, improving the quality of the local environment and presenting opportunities for additional housing within the area.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	This policy option will provide housing in one of the KSCs within the Borough and therefore will ensure that the new population will have good access to the services and facilities within the town and the town also has good links to the rail network, however, the town has a generally poor retail and leisure offer and therefore there will still be a need for residents to travel to other towns, in addition the wider Aspatria area suffers from poor rural accessibility, which this option will not address.	↑	The option will provide access to services and facilities through the provision of new housing although if the development takes place in rural areas there is less potential access. However, it may also help to secure the viability of existing services and facilities for the wider community.	↑	This policy option will provide additional housing in one of the KSCs within the Borough and therefore will ensure that the new population will have good access to the services and facilities within the town and the town also has good links to the rail network, however, the town has a generally poor retail and leisure offer and therefore there will still be a need for residents to travel to other towns, in addition the wider Aspatria area suffers from poor rural accessibility, which this option will not address.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of this objective, particularly as it provides an emphasis towards affordable housing.	↑↑	This option recognises that the rural communities in the Aspatria area have specific housing needs that this policy option will help to address.	↑↑	Policy option directly supports this objective.	The policy options are strongly supportive of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑	Aspatria has good educational facilities within the town and therefore provision of additional housing in the locality of the town will enable better access to these educational facilities.	↑	Aspatria has good educational facilities within the town and therefore provision of additional housing in the locality of the town will enable better access to these educational facilities.	↑	Aspatria has good educational facilities within the town and therefore provision of additional housing in the locality of the town will enable better access to these educational facilities.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Provision of new affordable housing will help to improve general well-being through ensuring that people have access to affordable homes. Locating new development within the town will also ensure good access to local healthcare facilities for all.	↑↑	This option has the potential to support this objective by relieving disadvantage and reducing levels of stress to help improve health and well-being in rural communities in the Aspatria area via the provision of affordable local housing.	↑	Policy of making use of long term empty housing will aid health and well-being through provision of decent affordable homes in the area.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	Currently the Aspatria area suffers from high levels of outcommuting and a general lack of economic investment, so community spirit and vibrancy has the potential to be improved, further housing and related economic investment in the town and surrounding villages could help to develop and strengthen the existing community.	↑↑	By enabling young people and families to stay in their community, this option directly supports this objective, helping to rural communities to stay strong and vibrant.	→→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community through bringing back empty properties into use should help foster community vibrancy and inclusiveness.	The policy options are supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. The Aspatria area is fairly constrained in terms of designated sites, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and the findings of the HRA.	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. The Aspatria area is fairly constrained in terms of designated sites, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and the findings of the HRA.	↕	This policy relates to the reuse of existing buildings rather than relating to new development on potentially greenfield or biodiverse sites, however, there is the potential that species may be residing in the properties, e.g. bats, which would need to be investigated and appropriately managed and mitigated prior to any development taking place.	There is the potential that new housing development in a predominantly rural area will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, dependent on the location. Potential impacts will need to be considered in terms of the HRA and NE policies. The potential impacts on biodiversity within empty properties will also need to be considered prior to development taking place.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. The Aspatria area is a fairly constrained area in terms of its proximity to high quality landscapes, in particular the Solway Coast AONB, Hadrian's Wall WHS and further afield the Lake District National Park, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and be subject to a full LVIA.	↓	The impact of this policy option will be dependent on location. The Aspatria area is a fairly constrained area in terms of its proximity to high quality landscapes, in particular the Solway Coast AONB, Hadrian's Wall WHS and further afield the Lake District National Park, any new development will need to take account of NE policies and be subject to a full LVIA.	→	This option works well with NE policies to improve GI provision and landscape character in the Aspatria area through appropriate housing development, i.e. the reuse of existing empty properties and natural environment improvements can be compatible.	There is the potential that new housing development in a predominantly rural area will have an adverse impact on landscape character and quality dependent on the location. Potential impacts will need to be considered in terms of the NE policies and LCA. The impacts on the setting on the AONB, WHS and National Park will be important to consider prior to determining the location of future development.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	↕	This depends on implementation, the policy will result in new development in rural areas, therefore policies on development and design need to ensure that it is in keeping with scale and design in the existing settlement.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it will ensure that the quality of housing within the town is improved.	The policy options are supportive of this objective, there will need to be safeguards to ensure that new development in rural areas is appropriate in design and scale.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↕	The town is a supportive centre to Workington with a limited retail and leisure offer and high levels of outcommuting. However, the town does have a railway presenting good opportunities for sustainable travel. Therefore locating new housing here will be a balance between the sustainability of locating housing within an existing centre reducing need to travel and the emissions that will arise from travel outside of the town, recognising that this will need to be done, even if the population reside and work within Aspatria	↓	The policy relates to promoting development in rural areas which is generally an unsustainable approach in terms of transport and travel opportunities, as the population within rural settlements generally have a high reliance on the private car to access services, facilities and employment opportunities. However, provision of housing in these areas could support local agricultural works etc to live close to their place of work reducing their need to commute.	↑	Through reuse of existing housing stock there is the potential to make the properties more efficient and therefore the potential to reduce the volume of emissions currently arising through the use of the properties.	The policy options have the potential to have an adverse impact by virtue of the fact that they are promoting new housing development in a predominantly rural area, with limited services, facilities and employment opportunities. New development in the area should be coupled with economic investment in the area to ensure that increasing the population does not increase the level of outcommuting and therefore emissions.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↓	There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development that is hydrologically linked to the Solway Coast or other watercourses in the vicinity.	↓	There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development that is hydrologically linked to the Solway Coast or other watercourses in the vicinity.	↕	Depending on the location of the housing identified for reuse within the town the issues relating to (1) and (2) may also be relevant, however, it is assumed that if identified as suitable for reuse that these issues have been addressed.	The policy options are supportive of this objective, there will need to be safeguards to ensure that new development does not place undue strain on existing infrastructure and does not have the potential to adversely affect the water quality of local watercourses.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↓	The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, there are few opportunities for reuse of brownfield land within Aspatria and its hinterland and therefore new development is likely to be on greenfield land.	↓	The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, as the policy promotes limited development in rural areas, there is greater potential that this will involve the use of greenfield land rather than PDL.	↑↑	This policy is directly supportive of the objective as it relates to the reuse of existing buildings.	The policy options are potentially supportive in some areas, but potentially adverse in terms of promoting development of predominantly rural areas, and the scale of impact will be dependent on location and need to be considered in terms of wider core strategy policies.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↕	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities, however this would need to be considered in terms of the EC policies as without economic investment in the area there will continue to be high levels of outcommuting which will increase with additional level of housing.	→	By helping people/families to stay in their community, this option indirectly supports this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing reuse will help to support existing job security and potentially create new opportunities.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↕	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities, however this would need to be considered in terms of the EC policies as without economic investment in the area there will continue to be high levels of outcommuting which will increase with additional level of housing.	→	By helping people/families to stay in their community, this option indirectly supports this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing reuse should help to improve access to employment by supporting existing job security and create new opportunities.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.	→	By helping people/families to stay in their community, this option indirectly supports this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing reuse will help to encourage inward investment, economic diversification and a stronger local economy.	The policy options are potentially supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		S15 Area Based Strategy - Aspatria	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑↑	Potentially beneficial	⇄	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇄	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇄	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S15: Area Based Strategy - Aspatria									
Economy Policy Options									
Sustainability Objectives	(1): Encourage appropriate levels of employment growth following the spatial strategy and promote alternative methods of provision, such as the opportunity for live work units.	(2): Protect and maximise appropriate use of local employment sites.	(3): Promote the sustainability of the Aspatria locality by supporting the vitality and viability of Aspatria town centre, to be achieved by directing retail, leisure and cultural proposals of appropriate scale and nature within the town centre wherever possible.	(4): Set policies which create and protect a town centre boundary with Aspatria in order to improve the retail and leisure services on offer to both residents and visitors.	(5): Support appropriate rural and farm diversification schemes, recognising the important role these have for the wider Allerdale economy	(6): Protecting the character and sustainability of rural settlements by setting policies which vigorously protect village and community services such as shops and pubs.	Comments		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔ No significant effect	↔ No significant effect	↔ No significant effect	↔ No significant effect	→ This option supports stakeholders views, helping to indirectly meet this objective	→ This option supports stakeholders views, helping to indirectly meet this objective	The policy options are indirectly supportive of this objective.		
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑ The policy option provides employment opportunities within the town and potentially within the rural area, increasing access to employment opportunities for the population, and potentially increasing access to services and facilities dependent on the type of employment opportunities provided, this would provide much needed investment in this part of the Borough.	↔ No significant effect, employment sites within the area already exist therefore there is no significant change to the baseline in terms of this objective.	↑↑ This option directly supports this objective through provision of promoting proposals within the town centre wherever possible increasing access to these types of facilities within the town and reducing the need to travel further afield.	↑↑ This option directly supports this objective through provision of promoting proposals within the town centre wherever possible increasing access to these types of facilities within the town and reducing the need to travel further afield.	→→ This option indirectly but strongly supports this objective.	↑↑ This policy is directly supportive of this objective in terms of supporting small local facilities which improves access for the more isolated rural communities in this part of the Borough.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive of this objective.		
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔ No significant effect	↔ No significant effect	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to ensure that people have access to services and facilities close to their home, improving the quality of their home in the wider sense.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to ensure that people have access to services and facilities close to their home, improving the quality of their home in the wider sense.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to help make decent housing more affordable in rural areas.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to ensure that people have access to services and facilities close to their home, improving the quality of their home in the wider sense.	The policy options are generally potentially indirectly supportive of the objective.		
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→ Dependent on the type of employment opportunities developed, there will potentially be the opportunity for growth in educational and training opportunities linked into the employment, which would help to retain workers in the area.	↔ No significant effect	↑ This option indirectly supports this objective because it has the potential to be supportive to this objective.	↑ Dependent on the type of proposals, this has the potential to be supportive to this objective.	→→ This option indirectly but strongly supports this objective.	↔ No significant effect.	(1), (3) and (4) and potentially supportive of the objective, (5) is strongly indirectly supportive of the objective.		
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔ No significant effect	↔ No significant effect	↔ No significant effect	↔ No significant effect	↑↑ This option strongly supports this objective because a strong rural economy contributes towards a general sense of individual well-being and health.	↑ This option supports this objective because it will improve overall quality of life for those living in rural areas to have access to some services and facilities within their communities, contributing to health and well-being.	(5) is strongly supportive of the objective, (6) is supportive, all other options show no identified effect.		
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑ The enabling of economic development within the town and the more rural settlements according to the hierarchy will provide a positive effect in terms of retaining vitality and vibrancy within the settlements and enabling younger people to remain within them.	↔ No significant effect	↑↑ This option strongly supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities in Aspatria protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town.	↑↑ This option strongly supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities in Aspatria protects the vitality and vibrancy of the town.	↑↑ This option strongly supports this objective because a strong rural economy contributes towards community vibrancy and inclusiveness, in the north of the Borough agricultural industries are the key economic driver and therefore the communities are generally small agricultural communities that this policy will help to sustain.	↑↑ This option strongly supports this objective because supporting local services and facilities protects the vitality and vibrancy of local communities and enables them to continue to thrive as living communities.	The policy options are generally strongly supportive of this objective.		
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓ The policy depends on the specific locations where development will take place, the area is highly constrained in terms of biodiversity and potential development in rural areas is most likely to take place on greenfield land therefore there will be potential impacts and the policy would need to be considered in conjunction with the HRA and NE policies.	↔ No significant effect, the employment sites in relation to this policy already exist, there could be opportunities however, to enhance biodiversity through landscaping and incorporating wildlife friendly features.	⇄ The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Aspatria town centre it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts than development on the edge of the settlement or in the villages.	⇄ The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Aspatria town centre it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less biodiversity impacts than development on the edge of the settlement or in the villages.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's natural environment is important to its economic performance, particularly in this part of the Borough where agriculture is such a key element of the economy.	↔ No significant effect.	The policy options could potentially result in beneficial or adverse impacts depending on the location and the impact on biodiversity. New development has the potential to enhance biodiversity through wildlife friendly measures, however the location will need to be considered in context of the findings of the HRA		
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓ The policy depends on the specific locations where development will take place, the area is highly constrained in terms of landscape and potential development in rural areas is most likely to take place on greenfield land therefore there will be potential impacts on the setting of the AONB and WHS and fragmentation of the landscape and the policy would need to be considered in conjunction with NE policies.	↔ No significant effect, the employment sites in relation to this policy already exist, there could be opportunities however, to enhance landscape quality at the sites through appropriate landscaping.	⇄ The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Aspatria town centre it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less landscape impacts than development on the edge of the settlement or in the villages.	⇄ The potential effects are dependent on location, however as the policy focuses on new proposals within Aspatria town centre it is more likely that development will take place on brownfield land and have less landscape impacts than development on the edge of the settlement or in the villages.	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's landscapes are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	↔ No significant effect.	The policy options could potentially result in beneficial or adverse impacts depending on the location and the impact on landscape. New development has the potential to enhance landscape through appropriate landscape schemes, however the location will need to be considered in context of the NE policies.		
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑ The policy option will result in new development which has the potential to contribute to the improvement and enhancement of the built environment within Aspatria and the rural settlements. In addition provision of live work units would provide an efficient use of buildings in the smaller settlements, ensuring that new development is not out of scale with current character.	↔ No significant effect, the employment sites in relation to this policy already exist.	↑↑ This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Aspatria to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs	↑↑ This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity in Aspatria to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to the towns needs	→ This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's built environment is important to its economic performance in rural areas.	↔ No significant effect.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.		
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑ Following the spatial strategy for the Borough will ensure that most new economic development will be focussed in Aspatria where the highest level of population for this area is based, this should help to reduce potential emissions arising as a result of commuting, in addition the promotion of some economic development in the smaller rural areas, should further benefit this. However, currently there is such a lack of suitable employment within this area and a high level of out commuting, there will need to be significant economic investment to realise significant benefits in this area.	⇄ The current employment sites within Aspatria and the wider rural areas tend to be subject to poor infrastructure and generally not very accessible, therefore there is high reliance on the private car to access them. Maximising the use of these sites will potentially make this situation worse as it will encourage more travel by private car to them, however, further investment may also help to drive investment in infrastructure to improve access by sustainable means.	↑ The policy option promotes the growth of services and facilities within the town, this should increase the overall offer of the town and therefore potentially reduce some of the need to travel to other towns in the Borough and Carlisle, reducing emissions related to this travel. However, the town will always play a supporting role and constrained by its size, population and poor accessibility so the growth will not be able to support all the services and facilities required by residents and therefore travelling will still be required to meet the needs of the population.	↑ The policy option promotes the growth of services and facilities within the town, this should increase the overall offer of the town and therefore potentially reduce some of the need to travel to other towns in the Borough and Carlisle, reducing emissions related to this travel. However, the town will always play a supporting role and constrained by its size, population and poor accessibility so the growth will not be able to support all the services and facilities required by residents and therefore travelling will still be required to meet the needs of the population.	↔ No significant effects	↑ Through continued protection of small scale services and facilities within communities, there should be a slight reduction in the need to travel for those residents served by these facilities.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective, (2) however has the potential for both beneficial and adverse effects as a result of the additional travel associated with the development of employment sites.		

NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↓	There is potential that there could be adverse impacts arising from inappropriately located development that is hydrologically linked to the Solway Coast or other watercourses in the vicinity.	↔	No significant effects, the sites in relation to this policy already exist.	↓	There are unlikely to be significant effects, however, there may be issues in terms of drainage capacity and utilities within the town which will need to be considered prior to new development, and new development will need to ensure that it is not hydrologically linked to watercourses that would result in adverse water quality impacts.	↓	There are unlikely to be significant effects, however, there may be issues in terms of drainage capacity and utilities within the town which will need to be considered prior to new development, and new development will need to ensure that it is not hydrologically linked to watercourses that would result in adverse water quality impacts.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's water resources are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	↔	No significant effect.	There are potentially adverse effects identified if the development is inappropriately located and therefore is hydrologically linked to watercourses and in particular the designated Solway Firth. Locations of new development will need to be determined in conjunction with NE policies and the findings of the HRA.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↓	The impact of this policy option is dependent on location, there are few opportunities for reuse of brownfield land within Aspatria and its hinterland and therefore new development is likely to be on greenfield land.	↔	No significant effects, the sites in relation to this policy already exist.	↑	Promoting development within the town centre should promote the use of brownfield land prior to greenfield land therefore potentially meeting the aims of this objective.	↑	Promoting development within the town centre should promote the use of brownfield land prior to greenfield land therefore potentially meeting the aims of this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's land and soil resources are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	↔	No significant effect.	(3), (4) and (5) are potentially indirectly supportive of the objective, however, (1) is potentially adverse in terms of the limited brownfield land that is available in the area, therefore resulting in increased development on greenfield land.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects, the sites in relation to this policy already exist, dependent on the type of businesses and operations at the sites, maximising their use may result in additional waste generated, however, at this strategic stage this is not deemed significant.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because Allerdale's mineral resources are important to its economic performance in rural areas.	↔	No significant effect.	(5) is indirectly supportive of the objective, all other options show no identified effect.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective as economic development in the area will result in employment growth.	↑	The policy option promotes the retention of existing jobs at the employment sites within the area, and aims to maximise the use of those sites that are not at full capacity which should help to generate further employment growth.	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive.	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective	↑	This should on a small scale protect existing jobs in these services and facilities, although there will be limited opportunities to grow these further.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective, as economic development in the area will result in employment growth and therefore increased access to employment opportunities.	↓	The current employment sites within Aspatria and the wider rural area tend to be subject to poor infrastructure and generally not very accessible, therefore there is high reliance on the private car to access them. Maximising the use of these sites will potentially make this situation worse as it will encourage more travel by private car to them, however, further investment may also help to drive	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive, providing greater employment opportunities within the town, therefore increasing access for residents to employment opportunities locally.	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive, providing greater employment opportunities within the town, therefore increasing access for residents to employment opportunities locally.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective as economic development in the area will result in employment growth both within the town and in the rural areas, supporting the agricultural economy with farm diversification etc therefore diversifying the economy.	↑	The policy option promotes the retention of existing jobs at the employment sites within the area, and aims to maximise the use of those sites that are not at full capacity which should help to generate further employment growth.	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive, strengthening the local economy.	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of the objective as it seeks to protect the existing town centre and encourage proposals to enable it to grow and thrive, strengthening the local economy.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective	↔	No significant effect.	The policy options are generally supportive of the objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇧	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S15: Area Based Strategy - Aspatia		
	Built Environment Policy Option		Comments
	(1): Protect the distinctive character of villages and settlements by ensuring that all new development respects and enhances existing traditional designs and features.		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	Supports the need to retain individual character and design within and amongst settlements.	The policy option is supportive of the objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↔	No significant effect	None
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect	None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Contributes to the quality of life and environment within settlements which can benefit the general sense of health and well-being.	The policy option is potentially supportive of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective as it helps to promote local distinctiveness and a sense of identity and community.	The policy option is strongly supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↔	No significant effect	None
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	This policy option will contribute to the quality of the built environment and wider landscape by ensuring new development is in character and scale and therefore contributes to wider landscape character and does not affect the setting of designated sites.	The policy option is strongly supportive of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective.	The policy option is strongly supportive of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effect	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effect	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effect	None
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effect	None
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	No significant effect	None

Key: Significance of Effects		S15 Area Based Strategy - Aspatria	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇧	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S15: Area Based Strategy - Aspatria	
	Natural Environment Policy Option	Comments
	(1): Continue to safeguard the internationally protected areas of the Solway Coast AONB by ensuring that all development is consistent with the objectives within the AONB Management Plan.	
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⇨	This policy supports the public's views in terms of the value placed on the AONB and the desire to protect the landscape The policy option is potentially supportive of the objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	The policy seeks to safeguard the AONB and the Management Plan provides a focus for public to access and enjoy the landscape, therefore this is complementary to this objective. The policy option is supportive of the objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect. None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect. None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effects, whilst access to the countryside and open space can contribute to health and well-being, the access to the AONB currently exists and therefore there will be no significant changes to the baseline. None
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	The management plan objectives for the AONB focus on providing locally distinctive communities and focus on environmental and heritage initiatives and therefore support this objective. The policy option is supportive of the objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	Whilst the AONB is primarily a landscape designation, biodiversity is an interlinked feature and a priority within the Management Plan. The policy option is supportive of the objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	The policy option is directly supportive of this objective. The policy option is strongly supportive of the objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	Whilst the AONB is primarily a landscape designation, the quality of the built environment within the area is an interlinked feature and a priority within the Management Plan. The policy option is supportive of the objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effects. None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect. None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	→→	There is strong indirect potential for improvements in landscape features and elements in the AONB to also help improve land and soil quality; soil type strongly influences key landscape characteristics. In turn, these characteristics can help to conserve soil resources. The policy option is indirectly supportive of the objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑	The AONB Management Plan considers the issue of mineral resources within its boundaries and seeks sustainable and sensitive management of such resources, therefore the policy option is complementary. The policy option is supportive of the objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effects. None
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects. None
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	No significant effects. None

Key: Significance of Effects		BE1 Design and Development	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇦	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	BE1: Design and Development						Comments
	Preferred Option	Alternative Options					
	(1): Include a criteria based design and development policy to encourage high standards of design and a consideration of sustainable development principles	BE1a: No design policy in the core strategy	BE1b: Include a design policy that addresses the traditional issues of design				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑↑	By adopting a development principle policy the concerns and aspirations of the local community can be addressed directly	↓	No local community views considered, development proposals would be based on national planning guidance	↑	Some of the community views, such as scale of the development and appearance of buildings, are met with this policy.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This policy would provide the means to ensure that infrastructure, parking and access to services improvements were made to support the development.	↓	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	↓	Sustainable development considerations are classed as "traditional" design issues and so will not consistently be included.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This policy will address the existing poor quality built environment and flood risk issues in some parts of the Borough.	↓	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	↓	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so will not satisfy this objective.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→	By addressing the infrastructure issues this policy should improve the access to colleges and training centres.	⇦	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	⇦	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so may not satisfy this objective.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	→	This policy will provide standards to developers on open spaces, access to public transport and overall improved quality of built environment which should in turn have an indirect benefit on the health and well-being of residents and visitors alike.	⇦	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	⇦	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so may not satisfy this objective.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	→→	This policy will improve the quality of built environment and the conservation of local heritage assets which will indirectly help to achieve this objective	⇦	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	⇦	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so may not satisfy this objective.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	This objective has to potential to satisfy this objective, however more specific policies are better placed to support this objective	↓	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	↓	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so may not satisfy this objective.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	When considering the built environment there is always an direct impact on the natural environment, especially the development of green belt land. So an improvement on the quality of one should have a benefit to the other.	↓	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	↓	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so may not satisfy this objective, e.g. loss of open space.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This policy aims to satisfy this objective and so has the ability to have a major direct benefit.	↓	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	↓	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so may not satisfy this objective, e.g. sustainable design and methods	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	By addressing the traffic, parking congestion and access to public transport issues through this policy there is a major benefit to improving local air quality and reducing GHG emissions.	↓	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	↓	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so may not satisfy this objective, e.g. reducing traffic congestion	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑↑	By addressing the flood risk issues within this policy, this objective can be satisfied	↓	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	↓	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so may not satisfy this objective, e.g. SUDS	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑↑	This policy can provide the overarching requirement to develop and remediate brownfield land over the development of greenbelt land.	⇨	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	⇨	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so may not satisfy this objective.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑↑	The use of sustainable development designs, methods and the use of local materials become mandatory under this policy.	↓	The lack of a design policy means no consistent approach to satisfying this objective	↓	Not all the current elements of good design will be met by the "traditional" issues and so may not satisfy this objective, e.g. reducing traffic congestion	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→→	By improving the infrastructure, social inclusion and access to services should enable greater mobility and access. creating a more attractive place to work.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options have no bearing on this objective
EC2: To improve access to jobs	→→	By improving the infrastructure, social inclusion and access to education and training facilities provides people the opportunity greater access to jobs.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options have no bearing on this objective
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→→	Improved infrastructure and greater social inclusion provides opportunities for new businesses to enter the area and foster a greater variety of start-up businesses by locals.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options have no bearing on this objective

Key: Significance of Effects		BE2 Previously developed and contaminated land	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
⇅	Potentially beneficial	⇅	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇅	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse

⇅	Potentially beneficial or adverse
⇅	No significant effect

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	BE2: Previously Developed and Contaminated Land								
	Preferred options			Alternative Option					
	(1): Seek to secure effective reuse of PDL and vacant sites, presumption in favour of redevelopment of brownfield sites in the key and local service centres subject to criteria	(2): On greenfield sites the sequential test must demonstrate that there are no PDL sites within the settlement that could suitably accommodate the scheme	(3): Allow the development of land where there is a risk of contamination subject to site investigation and any remediation works being undertaken prior to the commencement of the development	BE2b: No policy in relation to previously developed land in the core strategy		Comments			
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	There is potential to redevelop PDL rather than leaving it derelict which satisfies the views of the community.	↑	This policy satisfies the views of the community to prioritise the redevelopment of PDL over greenbelt sites.	↑↑	There is potential to redevelop PDL rather than leaving it contaminated which satisfies the views of the community.	↓↓	This policy does not consider the local issues and is against this objective.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	This policy can improve access for locals to facilities and services within existing local and key centres, using or improving existing infrastructure.	⇅	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective as the option relates to development within the same settlement.	→	This policy will indirectly satisfy this objective	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	→	This policy indirectly supports this objective by ensuring that areas are restored and regenerated, improving housing conditions.	⇅	This policy has the potential to support the provision of decent, affordable homes to all in the borough, regardless of location.	⇅	This policy has the potential to support the provision of decent, affordable homes to all in the borough, regardless of location, ensuring that the contaminated land has been made safe.	←←	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→	This policy encourages new dwellings to be built within existing key centres and therefore be close to educational and training centres, thus making access to this facilities easy for residents.	⇅	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	⇅	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	⇅	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	→	This policy indirectly supports this objective by ensuring that areas are restored and regenerated, helping to improve general health and well-being.	→	This policy indirectly supports this objective by ensuring that areas are restored and regenerated, helping to improve general health and well-being.	→	This policy indirectly supports this objective by ensuring that areas are restored and regenerated, helping to improve general health and well-being.	⇅	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	→	By encouraging redevelopment of PDL, there will be less redundant land within key services and local centres, improving social inclusion.	→	This policy will encourage the redevelopment of brownfield sites over greenfield sites, developing and improving existing communities which may be declined when traditional industries left the borough.	→	This policy will encourage the redevelopment of contaminated sites over greenfield sites, developing and improving existing communities which may be declined when traditional industries left the borough.	⇅	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑	In combination with NE policies, this option restricts the number of new dwellings built on greenfield sites, thus reducing pressure on biodiversity interest. Some industrial sites can support high biodiversity interest so this option must be used carefully with NE policies.	↑↑	This policy guides development to brownfield sites over greenfield land, reducing pressure on biodiversity.	↑	Remediation measures have the potential to enhance the existing biodiversity	↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	The policy aims to restrict the number of new dwellings built in greenfield land and so helps to conserve landscape quality and character.	↑↑	This policy favours redevelopment of brownfield sites over greenfield land and so would preserve more natural landscapes	↑↑	Remediation measures have the potential to enhance and preserve existing landscape and character, especially the built, historic, industrial landscape	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This policy can help to considerably improve the quality of existing built environment and conserve open space.	↑↑	This policy can help to considerably improve the quality of existing built environment and conserve open space.	↑↑	Remediation measures will satisfy this objective	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This policy encourages new dwellings to be built within existing key centres and infrastructure should reduce the travel required for people to access services and facilities and encourage increased use of public transport over use of private car.	↑	There is potential for this policy to support this objective	↑↑	Remediation of contaminated land fully supports this objective	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑↑	This policy encourages new dwellings to be built on PDL, the remediation measures required for this development will improve water quality and reduce the potential of polluting greenfield land.	↑	There is potential for this policy to support this objective	↑↑	Remediation of contaminated land fully supports this objective	↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑↑	This policy encourages new dwellings to be built on PDL, the remediation measures required for this development will improve land / soil quality and reduce the potential of polluting greenfield land.	↑↑	This option supports this objective	↑↑	Remediation of contaminated land fully supports this objective	↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⇅	The remediation of contaminated land and/or PDL may produce more waste; however by employing onsite cleaning processes will allow the existing building material and remediated land from being reused on site.	↑↑	This option supports this objective	↑↑	Remediation of contaminated land can provide reusable materials and reduce the amount of virgin materials required.	↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→→	Encouraging new dwellings to be built on PDL reduces the need to travel to and from home and work and improves existing communities	→	There is potential for this policy to support this objective	⇅	There is potential for this policy to support this objective	↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	→→	Encouraging new dwellings to be built on PDL reduces the need to travel to and from home and work and improves existing communities	→	There is potential for this policy to support this objective	→	There is potential for this policy to support this objective	↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→	Encouraging new dwelling built on PDL improves the self-containment of larger settlements and minimises the need to travel	→	There is potential for this policy to support this objective	→→	There is potential for this policy to support this objective	↓	This policy does not support this objective at all.	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		BE3 Reuse of rural buildings	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↕	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←←	Major adverse

↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse
↔	No significant effect

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	BE3: Reuse of Rural Buildings												
	Preferred options					Alternative Options					Comments		
	(1): Encourage proposals that involve the conversion and reuse of redundant rural buildings in the open countryside where the scheme will contribute to the ongoing sustainability and vitality of the local economy and community through use of a criteria based policy to determine acceptability	(2) Permit conversion when the building(s) are structurally sound and are of traditional construction / materials	(3): Give preference to proposals for business or community uses before residential can be considered	BE3a: Do not include a policy in the core strategy relating to the conversions of rural buildings outside of settlements included in the settlement hierarchy	BE3b: Include a policy in the core strategy where the conversions of rural buildings are not permitted under any circumstances	BE3c: Allow conversions without demonstrating the requirement for commercial or community use							
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑	This policy supports community views to convert existing redundant buildings especially in rural areas.	↕	The use of local materials support community views on the conversion of rural building	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↓	This policy does not respond to locally important issues.	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	This policy does not provide sufficient controls to protect locally important buildings	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	→	This policy supports the sustainability of rural communities, encouraging accessibility of rural clusters and consideration of accessibility and amenity	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↑↑	By prioritising economic, commercial or mixed use purposes before residential increases the opportunities for services and facilities to be added to the area, and so improving accessibility.	↔	PPS4 provides national guidance on conversion of rural building for commercial use and so supports this objective	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↕	This policy could have both negative and positive effects depending on the locality	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This policy meets the demand for increased numbers of houses, and reduces the number of existing empty properties	↕	This policy could affect the affordability of the home but still reduces the number of empty properties and provides additional homes.	↕	This policy may not meet the demand for more houses as it prioritises other forms of uses over residential. It may have a range of effects, depending on the locality.	↓↓	This policy does not include residential conversions	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↕	Whilst promoting residential dwelling some	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant effect on this objective
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Living in rural areas has the potential to satisfy this objective	↑	Living in traditional style houses has the potential to satisfy this objective	↑	Having local services and facilities within the community encourages people to walk rather use private transport to nearby towns and feel more part of the local community, thus supporting this objective..	↑	Having local services and facilities in within the community encourages people to walk rather use private transport to nearby towns and feel more part of the local community.	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	This can lead to unsustainable development	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑↑	By encouraging the conversion of empty buildings in settlements or clusters help create a sense of community and by ensuring development is proportionate, there is more likely to be an inclusive sense of community.	↑↑↑	The retention of traditional construction/materials supports links to the local history of the built environment	↑↑↑	Having a mixture of commercial and residential properties in settlements, encourages people to interact more locally, creating a sense of community rather than commuter villages.	↑	This policy should increase the number of commercial properties in settlements, encouraging people to interact more locally, creating a sense of community rather than commuter villages.	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	This policy does not provide sufficient controls to protect locally important buildings	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	→	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	→	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenbelt sites.	→	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites. But restriction may prevent any reuse when residential is required rather than community and economic	←←	This option is contrary to this objective.	←←	This can lead to unsustainable development	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	→	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites and the wider landscape, ensuring development is proportionate with its location will reduce the potential for adverse impacts on the visual and landscape impacts arising from the development	→→	The use of traditional construction/materials enhances the local built environment and so adds to the landscape character of the area.	→	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenbelt sites and the wider landscape.	→	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites. But restriction may prevent any reuse when residential is required rather than community and economic	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	This policy does not provide sufficient controls to protect locally important buildings	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the number of new developments, reducing pressure for building in open spaces.	↑	Reuse of existing buildings helps to improve and enhance the quality of the built environment .	↑	The sequential approach should reduce the amount of traffic congestion in the community	↕	This option may have both adverse and positive effects in relation to this objective, depending on the location	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↑	This policy would protect all rural buildings from potential deterioration	The preferred options best satisfy this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites and allows for retro-fitting more energy efficient heat and power systems.	↑	If local materials are sourced and used this reduces the carbon footprint of the build	↑	Mixed use properties should reduce commuting travel to and from work, services and facilities.	↕	Mixed use properties should reduce commuting travel to and from work, services and facilities. But restriction may prevent any reuse when residential is required rather than community and economic	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	These restrictions may lead to developments becoming unviable, and unsustainable development.	The preferred options are the most supportive of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑	Reuse of existing buildings enables water conservation measures to be introduced/retro-fitted.	↑	Reuse of existing buildings enables water conservation measures to be introduced/retro-fitted.	↑	Reuse of existing buildings enables water conservation measures to be introduced/retro-fitted.	↕	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites and the wider countryside. Lack of a policy will have a range of impacts, positive in some areas and negative in others	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	These restrictions may lead to developments becoming unviable, and unsustainable development.	The preferred options are the most supportive of this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑↑↑	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites and the wider countryside.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↑↑↑	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenbelt sites and the wider countryside.	↕	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites and the wider countryside. Lack of a policy will have a range of impacts, positive in some areas and negative in others	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	These restrictions may lead to developments becoming unviable, and unsustainable development.	The preferred options are the most supportive of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑↑↑	Reuse of buildings produces less waste than new development and comes high up the waste hierarchy.	↑↑↑	Reuse of buildings produces less waste than new development and comes high up the waste hierarchy.	↑↑↑	Reuse of buildings produces less waste than new development and comes high up the waste hierarchy.	↕	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites and the wider countryside. Lack of a policy will have a range of impacts, positive in some areas and negative in others	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	These restrictions may lead to developments becoming unviable, and unsustainable development.	The preferred options are the most supportive of this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↑↑↑	The sequential approach creates new job opportunities and live/work units should retain existing jobs providing people options	↕	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites and the wider countryside. Lack of a policy will have a range of impacts, positive in some areas and negative in others	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	These restrictions may lead to developments becoming unviable, and unsustainable development.	The preferred options are the most supportive of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	→	The use of traditional construction/materials promotes local craft workers	↑	The sequential approach promotes employment opportunities within the community	↕	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites and the wider countryside. Lack of a policy will have a range of impacts, positive in some areas and negative in others	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	These restrictions may lead to developments becoming unviable, and unsustainable development.	The preferred options are the most supportive of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→	This policy could minimise the need to travel, helping to support the rural economy	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↑↑↑	The sequential approach fully supports this objective	↕	Reuse of existing buildings reduces the development on greenfield sites and the wider countryside. Lack of a policy will have a range of impacts, positive in some areas and negative in others	↓↓	This option is contrary to this objective.	↓↓	These restrictions may lead to developments becoming unviable, and unsustainable development.	The preferred options are the most supportive of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		BE4 Flood risk and Surface water drainage	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
	Major beneficial		Major beneficial
	Minor beneficial		Minor beneficial
	Potentially beneficial		Potentially beneficial
	Potentially adverse		Potentially adverse
	Minor adverse		Minor adverse
	Major adverse		Major adverse
	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	BE4: Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage								
	Preferred options				Alternative Options				
	(1): Adopt a policy that seeks to prevent development in flood risk areas or where it would increase the risk of flooding elsewhere by adopting a sequential approach and requiring FRAs commensurate to the risk	(2): Expect all new development to defer to the drainage hierarchy and seek to incorporate SuDS in preference to discharge to local watercourses or the main sewer	BE4a: No policy in relation to flooding/flood risk	BE4b: Encourage the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems where possible	Comments				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes		This policy supports the views of the community about taking a sequential approach		This policy supports the views of the community who agree that all new developments should include SuDS where possible.		This policy does not support the local community views and issues but rather relies on national policy solely.		This policy may not be robust enough to support this objective	The preferred options , in combination, have the most positive effect on this objective
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces		The sequential approach indirectly impacts access to infrastructure,		This policy would ensure that effect drainage systems are in place for new developments		This policy does not support the regional infrastructure issues, such as overloading of surface water drains and sewer systems.		This policy promotes good practice but does not put developers under any obligations.	The preferred options , in combination, have the most positive effect on this objective
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home		This policy steers development away from high risk areas and encourages the use of lower risk areas.		This policy incorporates a degree of flexibility to ensure that measures do not make the development economically unviable and so prevent new homes from being built. The disadvantage is that measures are not taken by developers by justifying viability and result in a negative impact on the home owner		This policy may lead to unsustainable building and new developments being built in high flood risk areas without sufficient control measures implemented.		This policy promotes good practice but does not put developers under any obligations.	The preferred options , in combination, have the most positive effect on this objective
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people		This policy will prioritise development in lower rather higher risk areas reducing the impact of flooding on residents or users of the development and improving their sense of well-being.		Where SuDS are implemented there will reduce the risk of flooding to new developments and potentially improve their sense of well-being		This policy may lead to unsustainable building and new developments being built in high flood risk areas without sufficient control measures implemented which would impact adversely on the residents and users health and well being.		This policy promotes good practice but does not put developers under any obligations.	The preferred options have the most positive effect on this objective
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations		By not building in high flood risk areas this option reduces the risk of damage to landscapes from flood events		This option, by implementing these measures, reduces the risk of damage on the landscape from flood events		Without regional considerations there is a great risk of increased flooding and therefore indirect impact on the landscape.		This policy promotes good practice but does not put developers under any obligations.	The preferred options , in combination, have the most positive effect on this objective
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment		This policy supports this objective by steering developments to lower flood risk areas.		By implementing these measures there is less risk of damage from flooding to the built environment		Without regional planning considerations this options presents a greater risk of increased flooding and therefore indirect impact on the built environment		This policy promotes good practice but does not put developers under any obligations.	The preferred options , in combination, have the most positive effect on this objective
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources		This policy fully supports this objective, reducing increased pressure on the regional water environment.		This policy fully supports this objective, reducing increased pressure on the regional water environment.		This policy does not support this objective whatsoever.		This policy promotes good practice but does not put developers under any obligations.	The preferred options , in combination, have the most positive effect on this objective
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil		By not developing areas of high flood risk there is less impact on the land from the effects of flooding, i.e. landslides and soil contamination.		These measures have an indirect impact on this objective.		This policy does not support this objective whatsoever.		This policy promotes good practice but does not put developers under any obligations.	The preferred options have the most positive effect on this objective
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.		This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy		By reducing the impact of flood risk in the area, businesses should be encouraged to site locate in the borough and prosper.		By reducing the impact of flood risk in the area, businesses should be encouraged to site locate in the borough and prosper.		This policy could lead to unsustainable building and put existing and new businesses at increased risk of flooding rather than reducing the risk and encouraging the economy to thrive.		This policy may not be robust enough to prevent flooding events and so not support this objective.	The preferred options have the most positive effect on this objective

Key: Significance of Effects		BES Pollution Management	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects		
Major beneficial	Major beneficial		
Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial		
Potentially beneficial	Potentially beneficial		
Potentially adverse	Potentially adverse		
Minor adverse	Minor adverse		
Major adverse	Major adverse		
Potentially beneficial or adverse			
No significant effect			

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	BES5: Pollution Management										
	Preferred options					Alternative Options					Comments
	(1): Policy to ensure that all development proposals seek to minimise and where possible reduce emissions and other forms of pollution, including light and noise pollution and odour	(2): Resist development of new housing or other environmentally sensitive development where there is potential to incur statutory nuisance or a poor standard of residential amenity	(3): Include criteria to regulate proposals for pollution generating development	BES5a: No pollution management policy in the core strategy	BES5b: Include a pollution management policy in the core strategy that prohibits the siting of pollution sensitive development in locations where pollution generating development is present						
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that new developments and existing populations are protected from environmental pollution	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that new developments and existing populations are protected from environmental pollution	→→	This policy indirectly supports this objective by ensuring that the required measures are in place	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective	→	This policy indirectly supports this objective by ensuring that the required measures are in place	The preferred options in combination effectively meet this objective
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	→	Potentially beneficial as if the development is aiming to reduce emissions then it will be considering sustainable locations where access to facilities will be better	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective	↓	This policy may restrict development of sites considered to be 'marginal'.	The preferred options in combination effectively meet this objective
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible	→	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible reducing the potential for adverse impacts on residential amenity	→	This policy provides guidance for developers to ensure that sufficient measures are included in new developments	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective	↓	This policy may restrict development of sites considered to be 'marginal'.	The preferred options in combination effectively meet this objective
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that new developments and existing populations are protected from environmental pollution	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that new developments and existing populations are protected from environmental pollution	→	This policy provides guidance for developers to ensure that sufficient measures are included in new developments	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective	↔	There are no mitigation measures included in this policy and so there is the potential for adverse effects with regard to this objective	The preferred options in combination effectively meet this objective
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	→	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible reducing the potential for adverse impacts on residential amenity	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective	↓	This policy may restrict development of sites considered to be 'marginal'.	The preferred options in combination effectively meet this objective
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible and therefore potentially benefitting biodiversity that could be adversely impacted through pollution	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	→	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that new developments and existing populations are protected from environmental pollution	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible and therefore reducing the potential for air pollution and benefitting local air quality	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible and therefore reducing the potential for air pollution and benefitting local air quality	→	This policy has the potential for supporting this objective by minimising any adverse effects	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective	↔	There are no mitigation measures included in this policy and so there is the potential for adverse effects with regard to this objective	The preferred options in combination effectively meet this objective
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible and therefore reducing the potential for water pollution and benefitting local water quality	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible and therefore reducing the potential for water pollution and benefitting local water quality	→	This policy has the potential for supporting this objective by minimising any adverse effects	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective	↔	There are no mitigation measures included in this policy and so there is the potential for adverse effects with regard to this objective	The preferred options in combination effectively meet this objective
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible and therefore reducing the potential for land/soil pollution and benefitting land/soil quality	↑↑	This policy supports this objective ensuring that the environmental impact of new development is reduced as far as possible and therefore reducing the potential for land/soil pollution and benefitting land/soil quality	→	This policy provides guidance for developers to ensure that sufficient measures are included in new developments	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective	↔	There are no mitigation measures included in this policy and so there is the potential for adverse effects with regard to this objective	The preferred options in combination effectively meet this objective
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		BE6 Historic Environment	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects		
Major beneficial	Major beneficial		
Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial		
Potentially beneficial	Potentially beneficial		
Potentially adverse	Potentially adverse		
Minor adverse	Minor adverse		
Major adverse	Major adverse		
Potentially beneficial or adverse			
No significant effect			

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	BE6: Historic Environment						
	Preferred option	Alternative Options			Comments		
	(1): Include a policy adopting a balanced approach to protection and enhancement of the historic, archaeological and cultural heritage	BE6a: No historic environment policy in the core strategy	BE6b: Include a policy adopting a strict approach to protection and enhancement of the historic built environment				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⚡	On the whole this policy would support community views however it may allow some forms of development considered inappropriate by some groups.	⚡	This policy does not consider or protect the local historic environment at all.	⚡	Whilst this policy would protect the historical environment it may be too financially restrictive and create confrontation between property owners.	The preferred policy does not provide a greater positive impact on this objective compared to the rejected policy, BE6b
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	⬆️	This policy includes the protection of hard and soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees, hedges, fences and surfacing which could support this objective.	⚡	This policy does not consider or protect the local historic environment at all.	⚡	Whilst his policy would protect the historical environment it may be too restrictive and costly.	The preferred option has the most positive effect on this objective
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred option does not have any significant bearing on this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred option does not have any significant bearing on this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	⬆️	This policy has the potential to have an indirect effect on this objective, by enhancing the local historic environment	⚡	This policy does not consider or protect the local historic environment at all.	⚡	This policy whilst supporting the historic environment may make result in some properties too expensive to renovate and so left to deteriorate.	The preferred option has the most positive effect on this objective
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	⬆️	By protecting and preserving the local historic environment, this option helps to support this objective .	⚡	This policy does not consider or protect the local historical environment at all.	⚡	This policy whilst supporting the historic environment may make result in some properties too expensive to renovate and so left to deteriorate.	The preferred option has the most positive effect on this objective
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	⬆️	This policy includes the protection of soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees and hedges, which could support this objective.	⚡	This policy does not consider or protect the local historic environment at all.	⚡	This policy whilst supporting the historic environment may make result in some properties too expensive to renovate and so left to deteriorate.	The preferred option has the most positive effect on this objective
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	⬆️	This policy includes the protection of hard and soft landscaping, such as open spaces, trees, hedges, fences and surfacing and so supports this objective.	⚡	This policy does not consider or protect the local historic environment at all.	⚡	This policy whilst supporting the historic environment may make result in some properties too expensive to renovate and so left to deteriorate.	The preferred option has the most positive effect on this objective
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⬆️	This policy supports the sympathetic development in conservation areas and alteration/extensions to listed buildings and so supports this objective	⚡	This policy does not consider or protect the local historic environment at all.	⚡	This policy whilst supporting the historic environment may make result in some properties too expensive to renovate and so left to deteriorate.	The preferred option has the most positive effect on this objective
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred option does not have any significant bearing on this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred option does not have any significant bearing on this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	↔️	This policy should not have any bearing on satisfying this objective.	The preferred options do not have any significant bearing on this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	⬆️	This policy aims to enhance social and economic regeneration by promoting the role of heritage: historic properties can provide an income, source of employment and supplement the regional tourism industry.	⚡	This policy does not support this objective as there is no stipulation to protect or preserve the local historic environment, so potential tourist interests could be lost.	⚡	This policy whilst supporting the historic environment may make result in some properties too expensive to renovate and so left to deteriorate.	The preferred option has the most positive effect on this objective
EC2: To improve access to jobs	⬆️	This policy will provide additional jobs in tourism and other associated industries by promoting the role of heritage in the District.	⚡	This policy does not support this objective as there is no stipulation to protect or preserve the local historic environment, so not provide any new jobs in tourism or association industries	⚡	This policy whilst supporting the historic environment may make result in some properties too expensive to renovate and so left to deteriorate.	The preferred option has the most positive effect on this objective
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	⬆️	This policy promotes the role of heritage within the local economy and supplements the facilities available to visitors to the District	⚡	This policy does not support this objective as there is no stipulation to protect or preserve the local historic environment which is important to the local economy	⚡	This policy whilst supporting the historic environment may result in some properties becoming too expensive to renovate and so left to deteriorate.	The preferred option has the most positive effect on this objective

Key: Significance of Effects	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects
Major beneficial	Major beneficial
Minor beneficial	Minor beneficial
Potentially beneficial	Potentially beneficial
Potentially adverse	Potentially adverse
Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Major adverse	Major adverse
Potentially beneficial or adverse	
No significant effect	

EC1 Location of Employment Land

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	EC1: Location of Employment Land								Comments				
	Preferred Options			Alternative Options									
	(1): Employment sites considered and provide a focus for investment as strategic, business park and local needs.	(2): Direct office development to town centres	(3): Include allocation and specific promotion of strategic sites in the core strategy.	EC1a: Maintain the level of employment land required but do not specify the type of use in order to maximise the flexibility (market to decide).	EC1b: Allocate main employment sites as strategic allocations	EC1c: Unrestricted approach to employment land	EC1d: Unrestricted approach to office development						
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant impacts	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	This option goes against the views of stakeholders to some extent	↔	This option goes against the views of stakeholders to some extent	The preferred options, in combination, are the most sustainable.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	→→	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and other policies to complement strategic to local service delivery to meet local needs for accessing services	→→	This option strongly supports this objective	→→	This option works well with Option (1) to indirectly meet/support this objective	↔↔	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↔↔	This option fails to address needs for better access to services, the countryside and open spaces as focuses economic development in main allocations rather than ensuring a spread across the Borough.	↔↔	This option fails to address needs for better access to services, the countryside and open spaces.	This combination of preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant impacts	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant impacts	↔	No significant impacts	None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→→	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and other policies to complement strategic to local service delivery to meet local needs for education and training	→	This option indirectly helps to support this objective in relation to accessing these services.	→→	This option works well with Option (1) to indirectly meet/support this objective	↔↔	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↔	This option fails to address locational needs for access to these services, so some areas may benefit whilst others will be disadvantaged.	↔	This option fails to address locational needs for access to these services, so some areas may benefit whilst others will be disadvantaged.	The combination of preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	→→	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and other policies to complement strategic to local service delivery, helping to support this objective	→	This option indirectly helps to support this objective	→→	This option works well with Option (1) to indirectly meet/support this objective	↔↔	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↔	This option fails to address locational needs for access to these services, so some areas may benefit whilst others will be disadvantaged.	↔	This option fails to address locational needs for access to these services, so some areas may benefit whilst others will be disadvantaged.	The combination of preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	→→	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and other policies to help foster community vibrancy, cultural heritage and social inclusion.	↔	No significant impacts	→→	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↔↔	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↔	This option fails to address locational needs for access to these services, so some areas may benefit whilst others will be disadvantaged.	↔	This option fails to address locational aspects of this objective, so some areas may benefit whilst others will be disadvantaged.	The combination of preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, natural environment and other policies to help direct the right types and scale of development to appropriate areas, potentially supporting this objective.	↔	No significant impacts	↑	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↓	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↑	This option focuses economic development into strategic allocations, which are likely to be within or near to the main centres in the Borough, this reduces the potential for economic development taking place in a piecemeal approach across the Borough on greenfield land in more rural areas, however, larger sites as part of strategic allocations will also have the potential to be using greenfield land and potentially impacting habitats and species.	↔	This option fails to address locational aspects of this objective, so some areas may benefit whilst others may be disadvantaged.	The combination of preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, natural environment and other policies to help direct the right types and scale of development to appropriate areas, potentially supporting this objective.	↔	No significant impacts	↑	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↓	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↑	This option focuses economic development into strategic allocations, which are likely to be within or near to the main centres in the Borough, this reduces the potential for economic development taking place in a piecemeal approach across the Borough on greenfield land in more rural areas, however, larger sites as part of strategic allocations will also have the potential to be using greenfield land and potentially impacting landscape character and quality.	↔	This option fails to address locational aspects of this objective, so some areas may benefit whilst others may be disadvantaged.	No significant impacts, although the preferred option, in combination, would be best in relation to this option.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and other policies to help direct the right types and scale of development to appropriate areas, supporting this objective.	↔	No significant impacts	↑	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↓	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↑	This option will focus economic development together in main allocations, predominantly in existing urban areas and therefore through high quality design has the potential to benefit the quality of the built environment.	↔	No significant impacts	None
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and transport policies to help direct the right types and scale of development to appropriate areas, supporting this objective.	↑	Targeted location of new business developments will enable greater sharing of low carbon energy solutions and travel plans, helping to mitigate emissions and meet this objective	↑	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↓	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↔	This policy option will result in clusters of economic development, which will be likely to be within or near to the main urban centres, ensuring that they are in sustainable locations for the majority of the population. However, by restricting economic growth outside of these allocations, there will be an increased need to travel from more rural locations to access employment, resulting in an increase in emissions.	↔↔	This option fails to address or encourage opportunities for joint energy and travel solutions via targeted co-location.	This option fails to address or encourage opportunities for joint energy and travel solutions via targeted co-location.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, natural environment and other policies to help direct the right type and scale of development to appropriate areas, potentially supporting this objective.	↑	Targeted location of new business developments will enable greater sharing of low carbon water supply and treatment solutions towards meet this objective	↑	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↓	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↔	This option will ensure that development of an appropriate scale takes place in settlements not adversely affecting existing infrastructure and will also provide opportunities to share and develop technology based on economies of scale. However, development of these allocations in the main centres could result in development on land at risk from flooding.	↔↔	This option fails to address or encourage opportunities for water conservation and sustainable supply measures.	This option fails to address or encourage opportunities for water conservation and sustainable supply measures.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and other policies to help direct the right type and scale of development to appropriate areas, supporting this objective.	↑	Targeted location of new business developments will enable greater sharing of facilities through co-location towards meet this objective, enabling good use of brownfield sites via Built Environment policies	↑	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↓	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↑	Targeted location of new business developments will enable greater sharing of facilities through co-location towards meet this objective, enabling good use of brownfield sites via Built Environment policies	↔↔	This option fails to address or encourage opportunities co-location, for wiser use of land, especially brown field sites.	This option fails to address or encourage opportunities co-location, for wiser use of land, especially brown field sites.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and other policies to help direct the right type and scale of development to appropriate areas, potentially supporting this objective through collaborative waste management and resource efficiency initiatives.	↑	Targeted location of new business developments will enable greater sharing of sustainable waste management solutions towards meet this objective	↑	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↓	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↑	Targeted location of new business developments will enable greater sharing of sustainable waste management solutions towards meet this objective	↔↔	This option fails to address or encourage opportunities for sustainable waste management.	This option fails to address or encourage opportunities for sustainable waste management.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→→	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and other policies to help support job security and new employment opportunities to meet local needs.	→→	This option strongly meets this objective	→→	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↓	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	→→	This option strongly meets this objective	↔	This option fails to address locational aspects of this objective, so some areas may benefit whilst others may be disadvantaged.	This option fails to address locational aspects of this objective, so some areas may benefit whilst others may be disadvantaged.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	→→	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and other policies to help support access to jobs in ways that meet local needs.	→→	This option strongly meets this objective	→→	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↓	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↔	This policy option will result in clusters of economic development, which will be likely to be within or near to the main urban centres, ensuring that they are in sustainable locations for the majority of the population. However, by restricting economic growth outside of these allocations, there will be an increased need to travel from more rural locations to access employment.	↔	This option fails to address locational aspects of this objective, so some areas may benefit whilst others may be disadvantaged.	This option fails to address locational aspects of this objective, so some areas may benefit whilst others may be disadvantaged.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→→	This option's hierarchical approach works well with spatial, built environment and other policies to help support investment in ways that meet local needs for economic diversification.	→→	This option strongly meets this objective	→→	This option works well with Option (1) to support this objective	↓	Leaving type of use to market forces could lead to increasingly unbalanced development in relation to local socio-economic and environmental needs over time.	↑	Whilst this policy option provides opportunities to strengthen the economy, restricting development outside of these allocations potentially restricts the diversification of the economy, e.g. supporting rural business growth and farm diversification.	↔	This option fails to address locational aspects of this objective, so some areas may benefit whilst others may be disadvantaged.	This option fails to address locational aspects of this objective, so some areas may benefit whilst others may be disadvantaged.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↕	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

EC2 Employment Allocations

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	EC2: Employment Allocations										Comments				
	Preferred options			Alternative Options											
	(1): Maintain the existing allocations and protection of employment land until the sites can be reviewed as part of the Employment Land Allocation DPD.	(2): Support and encourage the extension or intensification of existing employment sites.	(3): Restrict employment related development outside employment allocations, and consider on their merits in light of local impact.	EC2a: Allow for the release of existing employment sites for other uses.	EC2b: Carry forward existing employment sites into the Employment Land Allocation DPD.	EC2c: Restrict the extension of existing employment sites and direct the development to allocations.	EC2d: Restrict employment related development outside employment allocations.								
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes.	→→	This is the best option for taking stakeholder views into account.	→	This option works well with expressed stakeholder views.	→	This option works well with expressed stakeholder views.	↔	This may work against the majority of views expressed by stakeholders.	↔	No significant impacts.	↔	This may work against the majority of views expressed by stakeholders.	↔	This may work against the majority of views expressed by stakeholders.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↑↑	This option is strongly supportive of this objective.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	←	This option could work against this objective.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↓↓	This could compromise the viability of existing and future services, access to services and the countryside/open spaces.	↓↓	This option is too inflexible and restrictive to support this objective. It could lead to marked adverse effects over time.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home.	↔	No significant impacts.	↔	No significant impacts.	↔	No significant impacts.	↔	No significant impacts.	↔	No significant impacts.	↔	No significant impacts.	↔	No significant impacts.	No significant impacts.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training.	→→	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	→→	This option is indirectly but strongly supportive of this objective.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	←	This option could work against this objective.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↓↓	This could compromise the viability of existing and future education and training opportunities, access to these services and facilities.	↓↓	This option is too inflexible and restrictive to support this objective. It could lead to marked adverse effects over time.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people.	→→	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	→→	This option is indirectly but strongly supportive of this objective.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	←	This option could work against this objective.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	←	This could compromise viability, leading to stress and reduced levels of well-being, especially longer term.	↓↓	This option is too inflexible and restrictive to support this objective. It could lead to marked adverse effects over time.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↑↑	This option is strongly supportive of this objective.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	←	This option could work against this objective.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↓↓	This could compromise the viability of existing communities, especially longer term.	↓↓	This option is too inflexible and restrictive to support this objective. It could lead to marked adverse effects over time.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective and EN policies.	↑	Intensification and selective extension of existing sites should help reduce pressure on greenfield sites in relation to biodiversity, but will need to be carefully delivered in combination with EN policies.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	↕	This option could have a range of effects, depending on location and nature of the alternative use.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↔	No significant impacts.	↑	This option could help to benefit biodiversity by restricting industrial and commercial development.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↑	Intensification and selective extension of existing sites should help reduce pressure on greenfield sites in relation to biodiversity, but will need to be carefully delivered in combination with EN policies.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	↕	This option could have a range of effects, depending on location and nature of the alternative use.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↔	No significant impacts.	↑	This option could help to benefit landscape character by restricting industrial and commercial development.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↔	No significant impacts.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	↔	No significant impacts.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↔	Some opportunities for improvement of existing areas/sites could be missed.	↕	This option could result in a range of beneficial and adverse impacts on the built environment: it is too restrictive.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↑	Intensification and selective extension of existing sites should help manage emissions reduction by enabling co-location and shared low carbon energy systems and travel arrangements.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	↕	This option could have a range of effects, depending on location and nature of the alternative use.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↓	Some opportunities for co-location and sharing of low carbon energy systems and transport could be missed.	↕	This option could have beneficial impacts in some areas, encouraging viable low carbon energy systems in some areas, but could possibly result in more intensive emissions in other parts of Allerdale, possibly conflicting with transport needs.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↑	Intensification and selective extension of existing sites could help to improve water supply and treatment systems by enabling co-location and shared low carbon supply systems.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	↕	This option could have a range of effects, depending on location and nature of the alternative use.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↓	Some opportunities for co-location and sharing of low carbon water supply systems and treatment could be missed.	↕	This option could result in a range of beneficial and adverse impacts on the built environment: it is too restrictive.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↑	Intensification and selective extension of existing sites should help reduce pressure on greenfield sites and make brownfield development more cost effective, but will need to be carefully delivered in combination with EN policies.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	↕	This option could have a range of effects, depending on location and nature of the alternative use.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↓	Failure to realise opportunities for co-location and intensification on brownfield sites could needlessly increase pressure on greenfield land.	↕	This option could result in a range of beneficial and adverse impacts on the built environment: it is too restrictive.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↑↑	Intensification and selective extension of existing sites should help to improve sustainable waste management solutions and cradle to cradle resource use opportunities.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	↕	This option could have a range of effects, depending on location and nature of the alternative use.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↓	Failure to realise opportunities for co-location and intensification on brownfield sites could compromise opportunities to implement/deliver improved waste management and cradle to cradle resource use opportunities.	↕	This option could result in a range of beneficial and adverse impacts on the built environment: it is too restrictive.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	↕	This option could have a range of effects, depending on location and nature of the alternative use.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↓↓	This option does not support this objective and could put existing jobs at risk.	↕	This option could result in a range of beneficial and adverse impacts on the built environment: it is too restrictive.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	↕	This option could have a range of effects, depending on location and nature of the alternative use.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↓↓	This option does not support this objective and could compromise access to jobs.	↕	This option could result in a range of beneficial and adverse impacts on the built environment: it is too restrictive.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and future targeting in relation to this objective.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective.	↑↑	This option allows for greatest flexibility and targeting in relation to this objective.	↕	This option could have a range of effects, depending on location and nature of the alternative use.	↓	Continuation of the existing/previous allocations is less flexible and could work against future needs in relation to this objective.	↓↓	This option does not support this objective and could put economic diversification opportunities at risk.	↕	This option could result in a range of beneficial and adverse impacts on the built environment: it is too restrictive.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		EC4 Education and Skills	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects	Direct Effects	Indirect Effects
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇦	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	EC4: Education and skills				Comments
	Preferred option		Alternative Option		
	(1): Promote development of education and skills through Core Strategy policy		Alternative Option 2: Do not include a policy on education and skills within the Core Strategy		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	No significant effects
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	Encouraging the provision of modern education and training centres and services to meet community needs will directly support this option.	↓	This option does not support this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation this objective
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	No significant effects
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑↑	This option very strongly supports this objective	↓↓	This option is directly opposed to this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation this objective
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	→→	Encouraging the provision of modern education and training centres and services to meet community needs will indirectly support this option.	←	This option does not support this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation this objective
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	Encouraging the provision of modern education/training centres and services to meet community needs will directly support this option.	↓	This option does not support this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation this objective
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	No significant effects
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	No significant effects
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	No significant effects
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	No significant effects
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	No significant effects
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	No significant effects
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	No significant effects
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This option very strongly supports this objective	↓↓	This option is directly opposed to this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation this objective
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This option very strongly supports this objective	↓↓	This option is directly opposed to this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation this objective
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	This option very strongly supports this objective	↓↓	This option is directly opposed to this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation this objective

Key: Significance of Effects		EC5 Town Centres and Retail	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↕	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	(1): Adopt an overarching town centre policy highlighting town centre and retail issues of local importance		EC5a: No policy relating to issues covered by National Policy (Planning Policy Statements and emerging National Planning Policy Framework)		Comments	(2): Policy to identify retail hierarchy of centres relating to size / function of town centres		EC5b: Policy identifying retail hierarchy in line with current Joint Structure Plan (Policy S15) approach		Comments	(3): Policy supporting retail and leisure development of appropriate scale and type within Core Strategy (not setting detailed floorspace or capacity figures)	
	Direct	Indirect	Direct	Indirect		Direct	Indirect	Direct	Indirect			
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	→	Options were developed after direct consultation, thus indirectly supporting this objective	←	This options goes against community views, thus it fails to meet this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	→	Options were developed after direct consultation, thus indirectly supporting this objective	←	This options goes against community views, thus it fails to meet this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	→	Options were developed after direct consultation, thus indirectly supporting this objective
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability	↓↓	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability	There is little to choose from between these options, much depends on how they are implemented to achieve optimal results without stifling change/being too rigid to work with the changing economy and market developments	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability, thus supporting health and well-being.	↓↓	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability, thus supporting health and well-being.	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability, thus supporting health and well-being.	There is little to choose from between these options, much depends on how they are implemented to achieve optimal results without stifling change/being too rigid to work with the changing economy and market developments	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability, thus supporting health and well-being.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages community vibrancy, viability and cultural heritage	↓↓	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages community vibrancy, viability and cultural heritage	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages community vibrancy, viability and cultural heritage	There is little to choose from between these options, much depends on how they are implemented to achieve optimal results without stifling change/being too rigid to work with the changing economy and market developments	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages community vibrancy, viability and cultural heritage
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity, to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to local centre needs	↓	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity, to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to local centre needs	↑	This option supports this objective because it encourages targeted investment and economic activity, to encourage a high quality built environment appropriate to local centre needs	There is nothing to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective	↔	No significant effects
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	This option, working in conjunction with transport policies, has the potential to help encourage effective public transport to reduce reliance on the car, leading to reductions in transport emissions. It may also allow for collaborative location and energy efficiency measures to reduce emissions.	←	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	↔	This option, working in conjunction with transport policies, has the potential to help encourage effective public transport to reduce reliance on the car, leading to reductions in transport emissions. It may also allow for collaborative location and energy efficiency measures to reduce emissions.	↔	This option, working in conjunction with transport policies, has the potential to help encourage effective public transport to reduce reliance on the car, leading to reductions in transport emissions. It may also allow for collaborative location and energy efficiency measures to reduce emissions.	There is nothing to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective	↔	No significant effects
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it supports job security and new employment opportunities.	↓↓	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it supports job security and new employment opportunities.	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it supports job security and new employment opportunities.	There is nothing to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective	↑	This option supports this objective because it supports job security and new employment opportunities.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it supports improving access to employment.	↓↓	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it supports improving access to employment.	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it supports improving access to employment.	There is nothing to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because it supports improving access to employment.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it directly supports and encourages investment and diversification.	↓↓	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it directly supports and encourages investment and diversification.	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it directly supports and encourages investment and diversification.	There is nothing to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective	↑↑	This option supports this objective because it directly supports and encourages investment and diversification.

EM6 Town Centres												
EC5c: Policy to set detailed requirements for floorspace and capacity (scale and type) for each centre		Comments	(4): Policy setting support statement for sequential and impact assessment in Core Strategy - not setting details		EC5d: Policy which addresses key implications and sets out the thresholds and requirements for impact and sequential tests		Comments	(5): Policy to support development of town centre action plans for each of the centres within the hierarchy		EC5e: No policy to develop town centre action plans		Comments
➔	Options were developed after direct consultation, thus indirectly supporting this objective	None	➔	Options were developed after direct consultation, thus indirectly supporting this objective	➔	Options were developed after direct consultation, thus indirectly supporting this objective	None	➔	Options were developed after direct consultation, thus indirectly supporting this objective	⬅	This option goes against community views, thus it fails to meet this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
⚡	This policy is not wholly supportive of this objective because it is far less flexible and may check service centre vitality in some locations	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability, using set criteria allowing flexibility in results.	⚡	This policy is not wholly supportive of this objective because it is less flexible and may check service centre vitality in some locations	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability	⬇️	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
⚡	This policy is not wholly supportive of this objective because it is far less flexible and may check service centre vitality in some locations	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability, using set criteria allowing flexibility in results.	⚡	This policy is not wholly supportive of this objective because it is less flexible and may check service centre vitality in some locations	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability, thus supporting health and well-being	⬇️	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
⚡	This policy is not wholly supportive of this objective because it is far less flexible and may check service centre vitality in some locations	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability, using set criteria allowing flexibility in results.	⚡	This policy is not wholly supportive of this objective because it is less flexible and may check community vibrancy in some locations	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it encourages community vibrancy, viability and cultural heritage	⬇️	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it encourages service centre viability in ways that should also benefit the built environment	⬇️	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
↔	No significant effects	None	⬆️	This option, working in conjunction with transport policies, has the potential to help encourage effective public transport to reduce reliance on the car, leading to reductions in transport emissions. It may also allow for collaborative location and energy efficiency measures to reduce emissions.	⬆️	This option, working in conjunction with transport policies, has the potential to help encourage effective public transport to reduce reliance on the car, leading to reductions in transport emissions. It may also allow for collaborative location and energy efficiency measures to reduce emissions.	There does not appear to be much to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective.	⬆️	This option, working in conjunction with transport policies, has the potential to help encourage effective public transport to reduce reliance on the car, leading to reductions in transport emissions. It may also allow for collaborative location and energy efficiency measures to reduce emissions.	⬇️	This option works directly against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
⬆️	This option supports this objective because it supports job security and new employment opportunities.	There is nothing much to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it supports job security and new employment opportunities.	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it supports job security and new employment opportunities.	There does not appear to be much to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective.	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it supports job security and new employment opportunities.	⬇️	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
➔	This option indirectly supports this objective because it supports improving access to employment.	There is nothing much to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it supports improving access to employment.	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it supports improving access to employment.	There does not appear to be much to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective.	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it supports improving access to employment.	⬇️	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
⬆️	This option supports this objective because it directly supports and encourages investment and diversification.	There is nothing much to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it directly supports and encourages investment and diversification.	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it directly supports and encourages investment and diversification.	There does not appear to be much to choose between the sustainability of these options in relation to this objective.	⬆️	This option supports this objective because it directly supports and encourages investment and diversification.	⬇️	This option works against this objective	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective

Key: Significance of Effects		EC6 Tourism and leisure	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↕	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	EC6: Tourism and Leisure											
	Preferred Options						Alternative Op					
	(1): Overarching policy to support sustainable tourism and community leisure development	(2): Policy to direct development for tourism and leisure attractions to Principal, Key and Local Service Centres, but allow appropriate proposals elsewhere, subject to their environmental impact and sustainability	(3): Policy to provide support for identified key tourism and leisure projects, i.e., Derwent Forest, Maryport Harbour/Roman Maryport, AONB etc.	Preferred Option 4c: Policy to support new and improved tourist accommodation in Principal, Key and Local Service Centres, and: - in sites allocated for key tourist development in Policy 3; - in the open countryside by way of conversion of existing buildings or extension to existing accommodation; or - in the open countryside as new build where existing buildings cannot be re-used, the accommodation is directly associated with a strategic tourist attraction (listed in Policy 3) and a local deficiency in accommodation has been identified in the evidence base	EC6a: No overarching policy to support sustainable tourism and leisure development	EC6b: Policy to direct development for tourism and leisure development to existing centres only - in order to protect town centre vitality and viability and prevent inappropriate development within the countryside						
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	→	This option supports the recorded views of local communities, thus indirectly supporting this initiative.	→	This option supports the recorded views of local communities, thus indirectly supporting this initiative.	→	This option supports the recorded views of local communities, thus indirectly supporting this initiative.	→	This option supports the recorded views of local communities, thus indirectly supporting this initiative.	←	This option goes against community wishes, thus it does not support this option.	←	This option goes against community wishes, thus it does not support this option.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective.	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective.	↑	This option helps to focus support for those areas with highest potential as key tourism and leisure service areas.	↑↑	This option is strongly supportive of this objective, being both targeted but responsive to local circumstances. It works well with other policies for spatial development, the natural environment, transport and others.	↓	This option goes against this objective.	↕	This option would benefit some areas and not others, so it would have mixed effects, both positive and adverse.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC4 & transport policies.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC4 and transport policies.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC4 policies.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC4 and transport policies.	←←	This option goes against this objective.	↕	This option would benefit some areas and not others, so it would have mixed effects, both positive and adverse.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3 and NE policies.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC4, transport and NE policies.	←←	This option goes against this objective.	↕	This option would benefit some areas and not others, so it would have mixed effects, both positive and adverse.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3 and NE policies.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC4, transport and NE policies.	←←	This option goes against this objective.	↕	This option would benefit some areas and not others, so it would have mixed effects, both positive and adverse.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	→	This option helps to indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies, to reduce pressures on sensitive areas.	↔	This option could indirectly help to support measures to enhance biodiversity interest	↔	In combination with preferred options (1) and (3), this option has no significant effects on this objective	↓↓	This option goes against this objective.	↕	Whilst mainly supportive of this objective, this option could also adversely impact biodiversity in some locations.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option should help to support measures to enhance valued landscape character	↔	In combination with preferred options (1) and (3), this option has no significant effects on this objective	←←	This option goes against this objective.	↕	Whilst mainly supportive of this objective, this option could also adversely impact landscape character in some locations.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	←←	This option goes against this objective.	↔	No significant effect
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↔	No significant effect	↓	New development, especially in more rural areas would almost certainly result in increased GHG emissions, even with traffic demand management and the application of new transport policies.	↓↓	This option goes against this objective.	↕	This option would benefit some areas and not others, so it would have mixed effects, both positive and adverse.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↓↓	This option goes against this objective.	↕	This option would benefit some areas and not others, so it would have mixed effects, both positive and adverse.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	←←	This option goes against this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with other policies to guide development away from greenfield sites and open countryside.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↓↓	This option goes against this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective, to guide development away from greenfield sites and open countryside and to help encourage sustainable waste treatment.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↓↓	This option goes against this objective.	↓	This option is too restrictive and could hinder the development of this sector of the economy, threatening employment prospects.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↓↓	This option goes against this objective.	↓	This option is too restrictive and could result problems accessing jobs, especially in rural areas.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, working well with EC3, transport and NE policies.	↓↓	This option goes against this objective.	↓	This option is more restrictive and could stifle investment and diversification.

Key: Significance of Effects		EC7 Derwent Forest	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
	Major beneficial		Major beneficial
	Minor beneficial		Minor beneficial
	Potentially beneficial		Potentially beneficial
	Potentially adverse		Potentially adverse
	Minor adverse		Minor adverse
	Major adverse		Major adverse
	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	EC7: Derwent Forest						
	Preferred Option		Alternative Options			Comments	
	(1): Criteria-based policy for assessing proposal for the use and/or redevelopment of the former Royal Navy Armaments Depot at Broughton Moor		EC7a: No policy in Core Strategy		EC7b: Allocate Derwent Forest as a strategic site		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes		This option addresses stakeholder views and aspirations for the site		This option does not address consultee views		This option goes towards meeting stakeholder views	The preferred policy option best meets this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces		This option fully meets this objective		This option does not meet this objective		This option would meet this objective, but it may not be as tailored an approach as the preferred option.	The preferred policy option best meets this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home		No significant effects		No significant effects		No significant effects	No significant effects
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training		No significant effects		No significant effects		No significant effects	No significant effects, although it could be worth adding a criterion relating to this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people		This option provides for a cycle route and open space for local community use, supporting this objective.		This option does not address this objective		This option should help to support this objective, but is not as explicit compared to the preferred option.	The preferred policy option best meets this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history		No significant effects		No significant effects		No significant effects	No significant effects
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity		This option provides for habitat enhancement and protection, strongly supporting this objective.		This option does not address this objective		This option should help to support this objective, but is not as explicit compared to the preferred option.	The preferred policy option best meets this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations		This option provides for increased tree cover and open space, strongly supporting this objective.		This option does not address this objective		This option should help to support this objective, but is not as explicit compared to the preferred option.	The preferred policy option best meets this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment		No significant effects		No significant effects		No significant effects	No significant effects
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions		This option supports this objective, although not explicitly.		This option does not address this objective		This option should support this objective.	The preferred option would be the most sustainable if a criterion relating to climate change mitigation (and adaptation) was added.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources		No significant effects		No significant effects		No significant effects	No significant effects
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil		This option strongly meets this objective.		This option does not address this objective		This option should help to support this objective, but is not as explicit compared to the preferred option.	The preferred policy option best meets this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste		This option supports this objective, although not explicitly.		This option does not address this objective		This option should support this objective.	The preferred option would be the most sustainable if a criterion relating to sustainable waste management was added.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities		This option supports this objective, although not explicitly.		This option does not address this objective		This option should support this objective.	The preferred option would be the most sustainable if a criterion relating to sustainable waste management was added.
EC2: To improve access to jobs		This option supports this objective, although not explicitly.		This option does not address this objective		This option should support this objective.	The preferred option would be the most sustainable if a criterion relating to sustainable waste management was added.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy		This option supports this objective, although not explicitly.		This option does not address this objective		This option should support this objective.	The preferred option would be the most sustainable if a criterion relating to sustainable waste management was added.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	⇒⇒	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	⇒	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	⇐	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	⇐⇐	Major adverse
⇔	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
⇔	No significant effect		

EC8 Stand Alone Renewable or Low Carbon Technology

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	EC8: Stand Alone Renewable or Low Carbon Technology									
	Preferred Options					Alternative Policy Options				
	(1): Promote and encourage the development of renewable and low carbon energy generation		(2): Protect the AONB and Heritage Setting		EC8a: No renewable policy		EC8b: Adopt a negative policy towards large scale wind		EC8c: Establish 'areas of search' for wind development	
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⇒⇒	This option takes stakeholders aspirations into account, meeting this objective	⇒⇒	This option takes stakeholders aspirations into account, meeting this objective	⇐⇐	This option goes against the views of stakeholders, and does not support this objective	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⇒⇒	This option indirectly meets this objective by increasing the range of energy sources, helping towards reducing fuel poverty in the longer term.	⇔	No significant effect	⇐	This option works against this objective by not encouraging a range of fuels to help reduce fuel poverty.	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇒	This option ensures that there will be a minimum distance between large scale wind developments and residential properties, helping to reduce the potential disturbance from issues such as noise, visual impacts and shadow flicker, however the perceived views on turbines vary from person to person so it is difficult to quantify. The scale of this impact will depend on the specific location and therefore would be more appropriate to determine distances on a case-by-case basis.	⇔	No significant effect
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	⇔	No significant effect	⇒⇒	This option indirectly supports this objective because it helps to protect local heritage and 'sense of place'	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	⇔	No significant effect	↑	This option helps to support this objective, working well with NE policies	⇔	This option could lead to a less consistent development approach that may have a range of effects, including adverse impacts in some areas.	↑	This option is likely to help towards meeting this objective.	⇔	Some areas may benefit whilst other may not in relation to this objective
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	⇔	No significant effect	↑	This option helps to support this objective, working well with NE policies	⇔	This option could lead to a less consistent development approach that may have a range of effects, including adverse impacts in some areas.	↑	This option would help to meet this objective by restricting wind turbine development.	⇔	Some areas may benefit whilst other may not in relation to this objective
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇔	No significant effect	↑	This option helps to support this objective, working well with NE policies	⇔	This option could lead to a less consistent development approach that may have a range of effects, including adverse impacts in some areas.	↑	This option would help to meet this objective by restricting wind turbine development.	⇔	Some areas may benefit whilst other may not in relation to this objective
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This option strongly meets this objective; they are mutually supportive	↑	This option supports this objective, but qualifies how it should be met.	⇐⇐	This option works directly against this objective.	⇐⇐	This option works directly against this objective.	⇔	Some areas may benefit whilst other may not in relation to this objective
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇔	No significant effect, when NE, transport and built environment policies are taken into account.	↑↑	This option helps to support this objective, working well with NE policies	⇔	This option could lead to a less consistent development approach that may have a range of effects, including adverse impacts in some areas.	↑↑	This option would help to meet this objective by restricting wind turbine development.	⇔	Some areas may benefit whilst other may not in relation to this objective
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑↑	This option strongly meets this objective; they are mutually supportive because many types of waste can be re-used as a low carbon fuel stock.	↑↑	This option strongly meets this objective; they are mutually supportive	⇐⇐	This option works directly against this objective and could result in lost RHI and similar opportunities.	⇔	No significant effect	⇔	No significant effect
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This option strongly meets this objective; they are mutually supportive	↑↑	This option helps to protect the tourism and leisure sector important to Allerdale's economy.	⇐	This option works directly against this objective and could result in lost opportunities and a decline in job security in the energy and related sectors.	⇐	This option works directly against this objective and could result in lost opportunities and a decline in job security in the energy and related sectors.	⇔	No significant effect
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This option strongly meets this objective; they are mutually supportive	↑↑	This option helps to protect the tourism and leisure sector important to Allerdale's economy.	⇐	This option works directly against this objective and could result in lost opportunities and reduced access to jobs.	⇐	This option works directly against this objective and could result in lost opportunities and reduced access to jobs.	⇔	No significant effect
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	This option strongly meets this objective; they are mutually supportive	↑↑	This option helps to protect the tourism and leisure sector, securing potential for diversification.	⇐	This option works directly against this objective and could result in lost opportunities reduced economic diversification.	⇐	This option works directly against this objective and could result in lost opportunities reduced economic diversification.	⇔	No significant effect

					Comments	
EC8d: Set a renewable energy threshold		EC8e: Include specific criteria including 'setback' distances from residential developments		EC8f: Apply policy uniformly across all Allerdale		
↔	No significant effect	→→	This option takes stakeholders aspirations into account, meeting this objective	←	This option is not supported by stakeholders, thus it does not meet this objective	Overall, the preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective, EC8e also performs strongly, however, a uniform approach to setback distances would vary in its success as each location would be different, therefore a more pragmatic approach through national policy and the preferred options is considered the most sustainable.
↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
↔	This option will restrict the total amount of energy that can be generated from renewable sources within the Borough, therefore potentially not helping to address issues of fuel poverty across the Borough	→→	This option ensures that there will be a minimum distance between large scale wind developments and residential properties, helping to reduce the potential disturbance from issues such as noise, visual impacts and shadow flicker, therefore contributing to a pleasant environment which forms part of a decent home. The scale of this impact will depend on the specific location and therefore would be more appropriate to determine distances on a case-by-case basis.	↔	No significant effect	Overall, the preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective, again EC8e also scores well, but the most pragmatic approach would be to consider this on a case-by-case basis.
↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
↔	No significant effect	→	This option ensures that there will be a minimum distance between large scale wind developments and residential properties, helping to reduce the potential disturbance from issues such as noise, visual impacts and shadow flicker, however the perceived views on turbines vary from person to person so it is difficult to quantify. The scale of this impact will depend on the specific location and therefore would be more appropriate to determine distances on a case-by-case basis.	↔	No significant effect	Generally no significant effects, however, there are some potential indirect benefits associated with EC8b and EC8e. The perceived impacts vary from person to person in terms of large scale wind and other renewable installations therefore the most sustainable approach is still to consider the issues on a case by case basis as there is always the back up of national policy to protect the interests of residents.
↔	No significant effect	→	A policy to ensure certain distances between communities and large scale wind are maintained will help to retain local communities.	↔	No significant effect	Few effects in relation to this objective except that (2) is indirectly strongly supportive.
→	Restricting the total amount of renewable energy development in the Borough through the use of a threshold will potentially protect areas of biodiversity which may have been suitable for renewable energy development.	↓	There is the potential that by 'pushing' the development further away from settlements there will be a higher risk of impacts upon biodiversity and fragmentation on habitats, this will be dependent on the specific location of the development.	↔	Some areas may benefit whilst other may not in relation to this objective	There are positive impacts identified in both the preferred and alternative options. No negative effects are identified in the preferred options. The impacts will depend on implementation.
→	Restricting the total amount of renewable energy development in the Borough through the use of a threshold will potentially protect areas of landscape which may have been suitable for renewable energy development.	↓	There is the potential that by 'pushing' the development further away from settlements there will be a higher risk of impacts upon landscape character and fragmentation of landscapes this will be dependent on the specific location of the development.	↔	Some areas may benefit whilst other may not in relation to this objective	There are positive impacts identified in both the preferred and alternative options. No negative effects are identified in the preferred options. The impacts will depend on implementation.
→	Restricting the total amount of renewable energy development in the Borough through the use of a threshold will potentially protect the quality of the built environment which may have been suitable for renewable energy development.	↑	There is the potential that by 'pushing' the development further away from settlements, the character and quality of the built environment within the settlement will be protected.	↔	Some areas may benefit whilst other may not in relation to this objective	There are positive impacts identified in both the preferred and alternative options. No negative effects are identified in the preferred options. The impacts will depend on implementation.
↔	Whilst this option supports this objective through the development of renewable energy, restricting the total amount to be generated from the Borough, means that the Borough may not be reaching its full potential and could contribute further without a threshold in place.	↔	Some areas may benefit whilst other may not in relation to this objective	↓	This option is a less flexible approach that may not result in optimal results for this objective as the ideal will be the right mix of technologies in any given area.	Overall, the preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
↑	Through a restriction on the amount of energy generation that can be developed in the Borough, there will also be a limit on the amount of land that is used as part of the developments.	↔	Some areas may benefit whilst other may not in relation to this objective	↓	This option is a less flexible approach that may not result in optimal results for this objective as the ideal will be the right mix of technologies in any given area.	Overall, the preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↓	This option is a less flexible approach that may not result in optimal results for this objective as the ideal will be the right mix of technologies in any given area.	Overall, the preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
↓	This option works directly against this objective and could result in lost opportunities and a decline in job security in the energy and related sectors.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	Overall, the preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
↓	This option works directly against this objective and could result in lost opportunities and reduced access to jobs.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	Overall, the preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
↓	This option works directly against this objective and could result in lost opportunities reduced economic diversification.	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	Overall, the preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↕	Potentially beneficial	↕	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

EC9 Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	EC9: Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects				
	Preferred option	Alternative Option	Comments		
	(1): Policy to ensure a proactive and transparent process for the development of NSIPs	EC9a: Do not include a policy on NSIPs			
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑↑	This option supports active engagement in the NSIP process involving community and stakeholders.	↓↓	Without a policy on NSIPs there is the risk that the process does not include community consultation and is less transparent.	Overall, the preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	The policy option will seek to locate temporary workers in PSC and KSCs to ensure they are able to access services and facilities.	↓	There will be no strategic approach to consideration of the location of temporary workers therefore they will be potentially located away from services and facilities.	Overall, the preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑↑	The policy seeks to increase training and employment opportunities through the development of NSIPs	↔	No significant effect, there will be no adverse effects to the baseline, but there will not be the benefits arising from the promotion of training and education that will result from (1).	Overall, the preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↕	The policy seeks to ensure that the development of NSIPs includes mitigation to reduce the impact on local communities.	↓	Without consideration of the potential impacts on the local community development could be planned that will result in adverse impacts on their day-to-day activities.	Overall, the preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↔	No significant effect, the policy is not concerned with whether or not development takes place, but rather how it is approached should it be taking place within the Borough.	↔	No significant effect	None
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↔	No significant effect, the policy is not concerned with whether or not development takes place, but rather how it is approached should it be taking place within the Borough.	↔	No significant effect	None
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↔	No significant effect, the policy is not concerned with whether or not development takes place, but rather how it is approached should it be taking place within the Borough.	↔	No significant effect	None
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑	The policy option will seek to locate temporary workers in PSC and KSCs to ensure they are able to access services and facilities, and to use sustainable forms of transport to move construction workers and materials which will reduce potential transport emissions and improve local air quality.	↓	There will be no strategic approach to consideration of the location and transportation of temporary workers and materials therefore they will be potentially located away from services and facilities and use unsustainable forms of transport.	Overall, the preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect, the policy is not concerned with whether or not development takes place, but rather how it is approached should it be taking place within the Borough.	↔	No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effect, the policy is not concerned with whether or not development takes place, but rather how it is approached should it be taking place within the Borough.	↔	No significant effect	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect, the policy is not concerned with whether or not development takes place, but rather how it is approached should it be taking place within the Borough.	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑	The policy option will seek to locate temporary workers in PSC and KSCs to ensure they are able to access services and facilities which could potentially create additional employment through the business that they bring to the area	↓	There will be no strategic approach to consideration of the location of temporary workers therefore they will be potentially located away from services and facilities, or use those outside of the Borough.	Overall, the preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑	The policy option will seek to locate temporary workers in PSC and KSCs to ensure they are able to access services and facilities via sustainable means.	↓	There will be no strategic approach to consideration of the location of temporary workers therefore they will be potentially located away from services and facilities.	Overall, the preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑	The policy option will seek to locate temporary workers in PSC and KSCs to ensure they are able to access services and facilities, this will help support the local economy for the duration of the construction phase.	↓	There will be no strategic approach to consideration of the location of temporary workers will potentially result in them being located away from services and facilities in the Borough, which may result in them using services and facilities from other parts of the region, meaning they are not benefitting the Allerdale local economy.	Overall, the preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects **EC10 New Nuclear Power Station at Sellafield**

Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇄	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇄	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇄	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	EC10: New Nuclear Power Station at Sellafield				
	Preferred option		Alternative Option		Comments
	(1): Policy to ensure a proactive and transparent process for future projects at Sellafield enabling the council to fully engage in the proposals		EC10a: Do not include a policy on New Nuclear Power Station at Sellafield		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑↑	This option supports active engagement in the NNB process involving community and stakeholders.	↓↓	This fails to address this objective as it results in a less transparent process and doesn't take account of the needs of the local communities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	The policy option will seek to locate temporary workers in PSC and KSCs to ensure they are able to access services and facilities.	⇄	As a result of NNB there will be a need for additional workers, who will require accommodation and access to services and facilities, with no guidance on the location of this accommodation, there is the potential that there will be a piecemeal approach to provision and that provision will be in unsustainable locations.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑	The policy seeks to ensure that additional facilities are provided to ensure that infrastructure is not compromised by the additional demand of workers.	↓	There is the potential that with an increase in population resulting from workers involved in NNB, there will be an increased pressure on educational facilities in the Borough.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	⇄	Proposals for NNB may result in increased stress and anxiety affecting health and well-being, however, this policy seeks to involve the community as far as possible and achieve community benefits to mitigate impacts.	↓	Proposals for NNB in the Borough may result in additional stress and anxiety resulting in adverse impacts on health and well-being.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	The policy seeks to ensure that the development of NNB includes mitigation to reduce the impact on local communities.	↓	Without this policy in place there is the risk that the developers will proceed without consideration to the impacts on local communities and identification of mitigation measures to offset the impact.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	The policy seeks to ensure that electricity transmission infrastructure concerned with the development minimises its impact on biodiversity as far as possible.	↓	Without this policy in place there is a risk that there will be adverse biodiversity impacts as a result of the routing of the electricity infrastructure.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑	The policy seeks to ensure that electricity transmission infrastructure concerned with the development minimises its impact on landscape as far as possible.	↓	Without this policy in place there is a risk that there will be adverse landscape impacts as a result of the routing of the electricity infrastructure.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↔	No significant effect, the policy is not concerned with whether or not development takes place, but rather how it is approached should it be taking place within the Borough.	↔	No significant effect, the policy is not concerned with whether or not development takes place, but rather how it is approached should it be taking place within the Borough.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑	The policy option will seek to locate temporary workers in PSC and KSCs to ensure they are able to access services and facilities, and to use sustainable forms of transport to move workers and materials, including promotion of the use of the port and existing rail infrastructure, which will reduce potential transport emissions and improve local air quality.	↓	There will be no strategic approach to consideration of the location and transportation of temporary workers and materials therefore they will be potentially located away from services and facilities and use unsustainable forms of transport.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect, the policy is not concerned with whether or not development takes place, but rather how it is approached should it be taking place within the Borough.	↔	No significant effect, the policy is not concerned with whether or not development takes place, but rather how it is approached should it be taking place within the Borough.	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇄	The policy seeks to ensure that adequate land and premises are available to meet the requirements for storage, assembly and manufacture of offsite components, depending on the location of this there could be impacts on land and soil.	↓	Without a strategic approach to ensuring that land is available for storage, assembly and manufacture, there could be potential issues of the most suitable land not being identified from the outset.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑	The policy seeks to ensure that the geological disposal facility site has a proven and robust safety case and the support of the host community, this should help to address issues related to the location of the waste facility.	↓	Without a strategic approach to determining the location of the disposal facility there is less likely to be acceptance of the location, and other potentially adverse effects.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑	The policy option will seek to locate temporary workers in PSC and KSCs to ensure they are able to access services and facilities which could potentially create additional employment through the business that they bring to the area. In addition, through use of the Port and rail infrastructure, new jobs will be created at these locations.	↓	There will be no strategic approach to consideration of the location of temporary workers therefore they will be potentially located away from services and facilities, or use those outside of the Borough.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑	The policy option will seek to locate temporary workers in PSC and KSCs to ensure they are able to access services and facilities via sustainable means, the policy also seeks to ensure good access to the site by sustainable means.	↓	There will be no strategic approach to consideration of the location of temporary workers therefore they will be potentially located away from services and facilities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑	The policy option will seek to locate temporary workers in PSC and KSCs to ensure they are able to access services and facilities, this will help support the local economy for the duration of the construction phase, use of the Port and existing rail infrastructure with strengthen these sections of the economy, and the development itself with further grow the local and regional economy.	↓	There will be no strategic approach to consideration of the location of temporary workers will potentially result in them being located away from services and facilities in the Borough, which may result in them using services and facilities from other parts of the region, meaning they are not benefitting the Allerdale local economy.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		HO1 Balanced Housing Market	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↕	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	HO1 Balanced Housing Market				
	Preferred Option		Alternative Option		Comments
	(1): Include a policy focused on achieving balanced housing markets across Allerdale		HO1a: Do not include a Strategic Housing Policy		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	→	This option could indirectly help to meet this objective through balanced development that also addresses the provision of, or access to facilities and services that people need for sustainable lifestyles.	←	Lack of a policy may fail to address the equal need to balance related provision of services, access to services and open space that people need for sustainable lifestyles.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This option directly supports the achievement of this objective.	↓↓	This option directly conflicts with the purpose of this objective	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because achieving balanced housing markets will help to sustain inclusive communities and contribute to general well-being.	←	Lack of a policy may fail to enable balanced housing markets, leading to greater inequalities in health and general well-being.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	This option directly supports the achievement of this objective because it will help to encourage mixed communities.	↓↓	This option directly conflicts with the purpose of this objective because it could encourage very polarised development.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	→	This option should indirectly benefit this objective as balanced markets will help to achieve the right balance between green field and brown field sites.	←	Lack of a policy may fail to enable balanced housing markets, leading to greater vulnerability of green field land and sites of biodiversity interest. It may also lead to greater fragmentation of specific habitats.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	→	This option should indirectly benefit this objective as balanced markets will help to achieve appropriate development in keeping with existing landscape character.	←	This option may lead to imbalances in development that adversely affect landscape character due to over-development.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	Balanced housing markets should help considerably towards achieving a high quality built environment in all areas, appropriate to local sense of place.	↓↓	Lack of a policy may lead to imbalances in development that detract from the quality of the built environment in areas where new development is concentrated.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	Balanced housing markets should help considerably towards achieving a new development appropriate to local sense of place, enabling easier emissions reduction and management.	↓↓	Lack of a policy may lead to imbalances in development that cause more intense levels of emissions in areas where new development is especially concentrated.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	→	This option should indirectly benefit this objective as balanced markets will help to achieve a more even and well-managed use of water resources and related water treatment measures.	←	This option may lead to imbalances in development that adversely affect water resources (quality and supplies).	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	This option should help towards avoiding excessive soil-sealing and impacts on drainage by helping to guide the location of new development, including the restoration of brownfield sites.	↓	This option may lead to imbalances in development that adversely affect vulnerable soils and lead to excessive 'soil-sealing' in some areas. It may also lead to greater pressure on most valued types of land around towns and settlements.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	This option may help to reduce potential conflicts over waste management measures in some areas by ensuring that new development is more equably located.	↔	This option may exacerbate potential issues over the type and location of waste management measures for municipal waste if new development is too concentrated in specific areas.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	This option could help to address some of the difficulties, especially in rural areas, where housing is currently less affordable, which in turn may help to secure existing employment and create new opportunities in such areas.	↔	By failing to address disparities in housing markets across Allerdale, this option could in greater polarity in job security between areas, leading to fewer employment opportunities in the most disadvantaged communities.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	More equable housing markets could help to improve access to jobs by also evening out disparities between areas.	↔	If this option leads to increasing polarity between areas in terms of new development and employment, some areas may become far less 'accessible' for certain types of employment.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	This option, by helping to create a more equable distribution of development, could also help to boost inward investment where it is most needed, helping economic diversification.	↔	This option may lead to imbalances in development that adversely affect economic opportunity, especially in some rural areas, creating even bigger disparities in investment and new economic opportunities.	The preferred option helps to meet this objective whilst the alternative option does not.

Key: Significance of Effects		HO2 Affordable Housing	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects	Direct Effects	Indirect Effects
↑↑ Major beneficial	→→ Major beneficial	↑↑ Major beneficial	→→ Major beneficial
↑ Minor beneficial	→ Minor beneficial	↑ Minor beneficial	→ Minor beneficial
⇅ Potentially beneficial	⇅ Potentially beneficial	⇅ Potentially beneficial	⇅ Potentially beneficial
↓ Potentially adverse	← Potentially adverse	↓ Potentially adverse	← Potentially adverse
↓↓ Minor adverse	←← Minor adverse	↓↓ Minor adverse	←← Minor adverse
↓↓↓ Major adverse	←←← Major adverse	↓↓↓ Major adverse	←←← Major adverse
⇅ Potentially beneficial or adverse			
↔ No significant effect			

Sustainability Objectives	HO2 Affordable Housing: Targets				Comments	HO2 Affordable Housing: Threshold						
	Preferred Option	Alternative Options		Preferred Option		Alternative Options						
	(1): Separate affordable housing target based on HMA reflecting the different levels of need across Allerdale	HO2a: No affordable housing target, proposals assessed on a case-by-case basis	HO2b: Single affordable housing target for the whole of Allerdale	(2): Threshold reflects local circumstances		HO2c: Policy applies to all development no matter the size	HO2d: Policy applies to over 15 dwellings following the national policy					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective		
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This option should help to develop good linkages between service provision and access to a wide range of services and new development with the aim of enabling equality of access between areas.	⇅	This option, whilst focusing on assessing site proposals in relation to the locality, could be far too reductionist and fail to take strategic access to service needs into account, with variable results.	↓↓	This option would fail to address this objective by being far too blunt an approach, unable to respond to different access requirements in different areas of Allerdale.	→→	This option indirectly but strongly supports this objective because it is about matching provision to need, taking local circumstances into account.	←←	This option does not support this objective because it fails to address the wide range of differences between urban and rural areas in relation to need, and does not take local circumstances into account.	⇅	This policy might possibly work well in supporting this objective in some areas but not in others because it has no real relationship to HMAs or key service centres, neither will it address different needs in rural and urban areas.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This option directly supports the achievement of this objective by matching provision to needs in the HMA/locality. This approach means that targets could be adjusted over time to continue to meet needs without changing the overriding principle.	↑↑	This option also directly meets this objective in that it would address needs in the immediate locality of the development site.	↓↓	This option would fail to address this objective by being far too blunt an approach, unable to respond to different levels of need in different areas of Allerdale.	↑↑	This option very strongly supports this objective because it is about matching provision to need, taking local circumstances into account.	↓↓	This option fails to address this objective because it will not enable targeted matching of provision to meet rural and urban needs.	⇅	This policy would possibly work well in supporting this objective in some areas but not in others because it has no real relationship to HMAs and identified needs which vary between rural and urban areas.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→→	because there is a strong relationship between new housing provision and schools/education facilities provision. Targets responsive to local housing need will also be responsive to local education and training	→	This option should support this objective to some extent, but it fails to take a strategic enough approach to fully link with education and training provision/targets.	←←	This option would fail to address this objective by being far too blunt an approach, unable to respond to different levels of need in different areas of Allerdale.	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	→→	This option directly supports the achievement of this objective by matching provision to needs in each HMA/locality. This should contribute towards maintaining a general sense of well being with related health benefits.	→	This option also supports this objective but not as strongly because it has a far less strategic view of need in relation to new housing provision.	←←	This option would fail to address this objective by being far too blunt an approach, unable to respond to different levels of need in different areas of Allerdale.	→→	This option indirectly but strongly supports this objective because it is about matching provision to need, taking local circumstances into account, so it should help to improve sense of well-being and levels of health.	←←	This option does not support this objective because it fails to address the big differences between urban and rural areas in relation to need, which in turn could affect sense of well being and levels of health.	⇅	This policy would possibly work well in supporting this objective in some areas but not in others because it has no real relationship to HMAs and identified needs which vary between rural and urban areas.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	This option directly supports the achievement of this objective by matching provision to needs in each HMA/locality. This approach should help considerably towards enabling inclusive, balanced communities to thrive.	↑	This option also supports this objective but not as strongly because it has a far less strategic approach towards enabling inclusive, balanced communities to thrive.	↓↓	This option is very likely to fail in assisting social equity and inclusive communities, especially in specific urban fringe and rural areas where affordable housing for young people and families is especially needed.	→→	This option indirectly but strongly supports this objective because it matches provision to need, taking local circumstances into account, so it should help to foster socially inclusive communities.	←←	This option does not support this objective because it fails to address the big differences between urban and rural areas in relation to need, which in turn could affect social inclusiveness and community vibrancy.	⇅	This policy would possibly work well in supporting this objective in some areas but not in others because it has no real relationship to HMAs and identified needs which vary between rural and urban areas.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	⇅	There is potential for this option, by addressing need at HMA level, to work well with NE policies to help support this objective.	⇅	There is potential for this option to work well with NE policies on a site by site basis to help support this objective.	←	It is highly likely that this option will work against this objective because housing need will not be appropriately addressed at the strategic level, leading to greater pressures on biodiversity in specific localities where new development is more concentrated than might otherwise be the case.	⇅	This option could indirectly benefit biodiversity interest because it could enable a more sensitive approach to the provision of affordable housing in rural areas.	←	Because this option fails to address differences between urban and rural areas, it may indirectly affect biodiversity interest due to lack of strategic approach.	⇅	This policy would possibly work well in supporting this objective in some areas but not in others because it has no real relationship to HMAs and identified needs which vary between rural and urban areas.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	⇅	There is potential for this option, by addressing need at HMA level, to work well with NE policies for landscape character to help support this objective.	⇅	There is potential for this option to work well with NE policies to conserve landscape character on a site by site basis to help support this objective.	←	It is highly likely that this option will work against this objective because housing need will not be appropriately addressed at the strategic level, leading to greater pressures on local landscape character in specific localities where new development is more concentrated than might otherwise be the case.	⇅	This option could indirectly benefit landscape character because it could enable a more sensitive approach to the provision of affordable housing in rural areas.	←	Because this option fails to address differences between urban and rural areas, it may indirectly affect landscape character due to lack of strategic approach.	⇅	This policy would possibly work well in supporting this objective in some areas but not in others because it has no real relationship to HMAs and identified needs which vary between rural and urban areas.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This option directly supports the achievement of this objective by matching provision to needs in each HMA/locality. This approach should help considerably towards achieving a high quality environment across each HMA.	⇅	This option, whilst focusing on assessing site proposals in relation to the locality, could be too reductionist and fail to take strategic design needs into account, with variable results.	↓	Because this option fails to address how to meet needs equably it may well result in less than optimal results for improving built environmental quality in areas where new development is more concentrated due to market forces.	↑	This option could benefit built environment quality because it could enable a more sensitive design approach to the provision of affordable housing to best meet need in different areas.	⇅	Because this option fails to address differences between urban and rural areas, it may indirectly affect built environment quality differently from place to place, with benefits in some areas and disbenefits in others.	↑	This option could benefit built environment quality because it should enable a more sensitive design approach to the provision of affordable housing to best meet need in different areas.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	⇅	There is potential for this option, by addressing need at HMA level, to work well with NE and Transport policies to help mitigate emissions and support this objective.	⇅	There is potential for this option to work well with NE and transport policies to mitigate emissions on a site by site basis to help support this objective.	←	It is highly likely that this option will work against this objective because housing need will not be appropriately addressed at the strategic level, leading to greater pressures on local air quality in specific localities where new development is more concentrated than might otherwise be the case.	→	This option should benefit air quality because it enables a more tailored approach to local urban/rural circumstances, working well with transport and built environment policies.	←	Because this option fails to address differences between urban and rural areas, it may indirectly affect local air quality and emissions due to lack of strategic approach.	⇅	This option could indirectly benefit water resources (supply and quality) because it could enable a more sensitive approach to the provision of affordable housing in different types of area.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⇅	There is potential for this option, by addressing need at HMA level, to work well with NE policies for water resources to help support this objective.	⇅	This option, whilst focusing on assessing site proposals in relation to the locality, could be too reductionist and fail to take strategic water management needs into account, with variable results.	←	It is highly likely that this option will work against this objective because housing need will not be appropriately addressed at the strategic level, leading to greater pressures on water resources in specific catchment areas where new development is more concentrated than might otherwise be the case.	→	This option could indirectly benefit water resources (supply and quality) because it could enable a more sensitive approach to the provision of affordable housing in rural areas.	←	Because this option fails to address differences between urban and rural areas, so it may indirectly affect water supply and quality due to lack of strategic approach.	⇅	This option could indirectly benefit water resources (supply and quality) because it could enable a more sensitive approach to the provision of affordable housing in different types of area.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇅	There is potential for this option, by addressing need at HMA level, to work well with NE policies for conserving soils and protecting BMV areas at a strategic level to help support this objective.	⇅	There is potential for this option to work well with NE and transport policies to mitigate emissions on a site by site basis to help support this objective.	←	It is highly likely that this option will work against this objective because housing need will not be appropriately addressed at the strategic level, leading to greater pressures on land and soils (soil sealing and drainage issues especially) in localities where new development is more concentrated than might otherwise be the case.	→→	This option strongly supports this objective because it matches provision to need whilst taking local circumstances into account, making it possible to take a sensitive approach to the protection of land and soils, especially in rural areas, in combination with EN policies.	←←	Because this option fails to address differences between urban and rural areas, it may indirectly affect land and soils, leading to greater development in rural areas than may otherwise take place.	→→	This option strongly supports this objective because it matches provision to need whilst taking local circumstances into account, making it possible to take a sensitive approach to the protection of land and soils, especially in rural areas, in combination with NE policies.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⇅	There is potential for this option, by addressing need at HMA level, to work well with strategic planning for minerals and waste management to help support this objective.	⇅	There is potential for this option to work well with strategic minerals and waste management planning to help support this objective.	←	It is highly likely that this option will work against this objective because housing need will not be appropriately addressed at the strategic level, leading to greater pressures on waste management especially in localities where new development is more concentrated than might otherwise be the case.	⇅	There is potential for this option, by addressing need in relation to each locality, to work well with strategic planning for minerals and waste management to help support this objective.	⇅	Because this option fails to address differences between urban and rural areas, it may indirectly affect waste management and minerals activities in different ways in different places.	⇅	There is potential for this option, by addressing need in relation to each locality, to work well with strategic planning for minerals and waste management to help support this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→→	This option could indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing provision could be planned to meet job security and employment opportunities within each HMA.	→	This option could also indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing provision could be matched to job security and employment opportunities within each HMA.	←	This option does not support this directive because it may skew the job market in some areas, creating benefits in some and disadvantaging others, putting existing jobs at risk.	→→	This option could indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing provision could be planned to meet the differing job security issues and employment opportunities within different types of area.	←←	Because this option fails to address differences between urban and rural areas, it may indirectly affect job security and employment prospects.	→→	This option could indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing provision could be planned to meet the differing job security issues and employment opportunities within different types of area.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	→→	This option could indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing provision could be planned to meet job security and employment opportunities within each HMA.	→	This option could also indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing sites could be matched to job security and employment opportunities within each HMA.	←	This option does not support this directive because it may skew the job market in some areas, creating benefits in some and disadvantaging others. This may also skew inward investment potential in some areas.	→→	This option could indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing provision planned to meet differing needs within rural and urban areas may also benefit access to jobs.	⇅	Because this option fails to address differences between urban and rural areas, it may indirectly affect access to jobs in some places.	→→	This option could indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing provision planned to meet differing needs within rural and urban areas may also benefit access to jobs.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→→	This option could indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing provision could be planned with inward investment and economic diversification initiatives within each HMA.	→	This option could indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing sites could be matched to job security and employment opportunities within each HMA.	⇅	This option does not support this directive because it may skew the economy in some areas and sectors, creating benefits in some and disadvantaging others. This may also skew inward investment potential in some areas.	→→	This option could indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing sites could be matched with inward investment and economic diversification initiatives in rural and urban areas.	⇅	This option does not support this objective because it may skew the economy in some areas and sectors, creating benefits in some and disadvantaging others. This may also skew inward investment potential in some areas.	→→	This option could indirectly help to support this objective because new affordable housing sites could be matched with inward investment and economic diversification initiatives in rural and urban areas.

Comments	HO2 Affordable Housing: On or off-site contributions				Comments
	(3): Strict on-site affordable provision		HO2e: Flexibility approach to on-site affordable provision		
None	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	None
The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.	→	This option indirectly supports this objective because it helps match provision to need, taking local circumstances inc. key service centres into account.	↕	This option may work well in some areas for some sites and not in others in support of this objective, i.e. affordable housing may not be provided close to service centres.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.	↗	This option strongly supports this objective; they are mutually supportive.	↓	This option is less supportive of this objective, and may lead to under-provision of decent, affordable homes in some areas	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
None	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	None
The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.	↗	This option indirectly and strongly supports this objective because it helps match provision to need, helping to improve well-being and levels of health.	↓	This option is less supportive of this objective, and may lead to under-provision of decent, affordable homes in some areas, leading to issues over well-being and health.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.	↗	This option indirectly and strongly supports this objective because it helps match provision to need, helping to improve community vibrancy and social inclusiveness.	↓	This option is less supportive of this objective, and may lead to under-provision of decent, affordable homes in some areas, leading to issues over vibrancy and social inclusiveness.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	None
The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	None
Option HO2c is the least sustainable in relation to this objective, the other options are very similar in the likely effects they would have in supporting this objective.	→	This objective may help to improve the quality of the built environment by helping to ensure that affordable housing is of a similar design, efficiency and quality.	↕	This option may indirectly lead to greater disparity between new development sites.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
Option HO2c is the least sustainable in relation to this objective, the other options are very similar in the likely effects they would have in supporting this objective, but the preferred option is less complex to implement than others.	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	None
Option HO2c is the least sustainable in relation to this objective, the other options are very similar in the likely effects they would have in supporting this objective, but the preferred option is less complex to implement than others.	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	None
Option HO2c is the least sustainable in relation to this objective, the other options are very similar in the likely effects they would have in supporting this objective, but the preferred option is less complex to implement than others.	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	None
Option HO2c is the least sustainable in relation to this objective, the other options are very similar in the likely effects they would have in supporting this objective, but the preferred option is less complex to implement than others.	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	↔	No significant effects between this option and this objective	None
Option HO2c is the least sustainable in relation to this objective, the other options are very similar in the likely effects they would have in supporting this objective, but the preferred option is less complex to implement than others.	→	There is some potential for this option to help secure existing employment and create new opportunities because it encourages greater social inclusiveness.	←	This option may disadvantage some areas and sectors because it works against social inclusiveness	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
Option HO2c is the least sustainable in relation to this objective, the other options are very similar in the likely effects they would have in supporting this objective, but the preferred option is less complex to implement than others.	→	There is some potential for this option to help improve access to jobs because it encourages greater social inclusiveness.	←	This option may disadvantage some areas and sectors because it works against social inclusiveness	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
Option HO2c is the least sustainable in relation to this objective, the other options are very similar in the likely effects they would have in supporting this objective, but the preferred option is less complex to implement than others.	→	There is some potential for this option to help economic diversification because it encourages greater social inclusiveness which may lead to increased entrepreneurship.	←	This option may disadvantage some areas and sectors because it works against social inclusiveness	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective

Key: Significance of Effects		HO3 Housing Mix	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
	Major beneficial		Major beneficial
	Minor beneficial		Minor beneficial
	Potentially beneficial		Potentially beneficial
	Major adverse		Major adverse
	Minor adverse		Minor adverse
	Potentially adverse		Potentially adverse
	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	HO4 Housing Mix						Comments		
	Preferred Options			Alternative Option					
	(1): Expect new development to make a positive contribution to the overall mix of housing in the HMA in which it is located	(2): Require allocated sites to include a mix of housing that reflects the housing needs in the area	(3): Encourage new development to include units built to lifetime homes standards	HO3a: Include a policy that requires developments of a certain threshold to provide an appropriate mix of housing					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None		
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces		This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community would encourage a wider mix of accessible services and open spaces.		This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community would encourage a wider mix of accessible services and open spaces.		This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community would encourage a wider mix of accessible services and open spaces.		This policy might have an indirect, negative and cumulative impact over time in relation to achieving balanced communities, leading to related imbalances in service provision.	The preferred policies are the most sustainable and would potentially have a minor indirect positive effect.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home		This policy could support this objective because achieving a more mixed, balanced community should involve designing new units that meet fully meet the decent homes criteria for all types of households.		This policy directly and strongly supports this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.		This policy directly supports this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.		This policy might have an indirect, negative and cumulative impact over time in relation to achieving balanced communities, leading to related imbalances in service provision.	The preferred policies are the most sustainable and would have a positive effect in relation to this sustainability objective. (3) only encourages rather than requires, in sustainability terms a requirement would be better, but it is acknowledged that this may also deter developers.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people		This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to improve general sense of well-being.		This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to improve general sense of well-being by helping to directly meet local needs.		This policy directly supports this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.		This policy might have an indirect, negative and cumulative impact over time in relation to achieving balanced communities, leading to related imbalances in health and well being.	The preferred policies are the most sustainable and would have a positive effect in relation to this sustainability objective. (3) only encourages rather than requires, in sustainability terms a requirement would be better, but it is acknowledged that this may also deter developers.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history		This policy could indirectly support this objective because more mixed, balanced new housing development should lead to more vibrant and active communities.		This policy indirectly supports this objective because more mixed, balanced new housing development should lead to more vibrant and active communities.		This policy could indirectly support this objective because encouraging homes to be built to this standard will make units more versatile/useable, helping to encourage more mixed, vibrant and active communities.		This policy might have an indirect, negative and cumulative impact over time in relation to achieving balanced communities, potentially leading to related imbalances in social mix and vibrancy.	The preferred policies are the most sustainable and would have a positive effect in relation to this sustainability objective. (3) only encourages rather than requires, in sustainability terms a requirement would be better, but it is acknowledged that this may also deter developers.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment		No significant effect		This policy indirectly supports this objective because it should help to ensure that the right type of development is built in relation to local need.		This policy directly supports this objective; they are mutually reinforcing, especially in relation to internal built quality.		No significant effect	The preferred policies are the most sustainable and would have a positive effect in relation to this sustainability objective. (3) only encourages rather than requires, in sustainability terms a requirement would be better, but it is acknowledged that this may also deter developers.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities		This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities.		This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to secure job security and create new employment opportunities.		No significant effect		This policy might have an indirect, negative and cumulative impact over time in relation to achieving balanced communities, leading to related imbalances in job security and opportunities.	The preferred policies are the most sustainable and would potentially have a minor indirect positive effect.
EC2: To improve access to jobs		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy		This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.		This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community should help to encourage economic diversity and a stronger local economy.		No significant effect		This policy might have an indirect, negative and cumulative impact over time in relation to achieving balanced communities, leading to related imbalances in economic diversity and development.	The preferred policies are the most sustainable and would potentially have a minor indirect positive effect.

Key: Significance of Effects		HO4 Housing Renewal	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑↑	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	HO4 Housing Renewal						
	Preferred Options			Alternative Option		Comments	
	(1): Policy that supports and facilitates housing renewal initiatives throughout the borough	(2): The use of developer contributions to enable/facilitate housing renewal	HO4a: Include a policy that supports and facilitates housing renewal initiatives into existing priority areas				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community through housing renewal would help support and encourage a wider mix of accessible services and open spaces.	↑	This policy directly supports this objective by making explicit requirements for key services and open spaces as appropriate to meet current and identified future local needs.	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable because they will help to identify and target appropriate new development for those places and communities most in need of housing renewal.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	→→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community through housing renewal would help support and encourage the provision of decent homes in areas of greatest need.	↑↑	This policy directly supports this objective by enabling explicit requirements for new development as appropriate to meet current and identified future local needs.	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable because they will help to identify and target appropriate new development for those places and communities most in need of housing renewal.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community through housing renewal should help improve sense of well-being and levels of general health.	↑	This policy directly supports this objective by enabling explicit requirements for new development as appropriate to meet current and identified future local needs.	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable because they will help to identify and target appropriate new development for those places and communities most in need of housing renewal.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	→→	This policy could indirectly support this objective because a more mixed, balanced community through housing renewal should help foster community vibrancy and inclusiveness.	→→	This policy directly supports this objective by enabling explicit measures for new development as appropriate to meet current and identified future local needs, e.g., refurbishment of existing or the provision of new community facilities.	←	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable because they will help to identify and target appropriate new development for those places and communities most in need of housing renewal.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	→	This option works well with NE policies to improve GI provision through appropriate housing development, i.e. housing renewal programmes and natural environment improvements can be compatible.	↑↑	This policy directly supports this objective by enabling explicit biodiversity improvement measures, working well with NE and Developer Contribution policies	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities and areas outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable because they will help to identify and target appropriate improvement measures possible via housing renewal.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	→	This option works well with NE policies to improve GI provision and landscape character through appropriate housing development, i.e. housing renewal programmes and natural environment improvements can be compatible.	↑↑	This policy directly supports this objective by enabling explicit landscape character improvement measures, working well with NE and Developer Contribution policies	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities and areas outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable because they will help to identify and target appropriate improvement measures possible via housing renewal.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This policy option directly supports this sustainability objective, by helping to regenerate areas and improve built environment quality.	↑↑	This policy directly supports this objective by enabling explicit measures for new development as appropriate to raise the quality of the built environment.	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities and areas outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable because they will help to identify and target appropriate improvement measures possible via housing renewal.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	→→	This policy option indirectly supports this sustainability objective, as housing renewal should help to reduce carbon emissions and work with NE and transport policies to reduce traffic emissions.	↑↑	This policy directly supports this objective by enabling explicit measures for new development as appropriate to meet current and identified future carbon mitigation needs.	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities and areas outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable because they will help to identify and target appropriate improvement measures possible via housing renewal.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	This policy option could indirectly support this sustainability objective, by helping to regenerate areas in ways that could also improve water quality and the more sustainable use of water resources.	↑↑	This policy directly supports this objective by enabling explicit measures for new development as appropriate to meet current and identified future water quality and resource use targets.	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities and areas outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable because they will help to identify and target appropriate improvement measures possible via housing renewal.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	This option should support this objective by encouraging new development that restores land and soils in affected areas.	↑↑	This policy directly supports this objective by enabling explicit measures linked to housing renewal that could help resolve brownfield site issues.	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities and areas outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable because they will help to identify and target appropriate improvement measures for land and soils restoration possible via housing renewal.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing renewal will help to support existing job security and create new opportunities.	↑	This option could support this objective by enabling explicit measures linked to housing renewal that could help resolve local employment and economic issues.	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities and areas outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing renewal should help to improve access to employment by supporting existing job security and create new opportunities.	↑	This option could support this objective by enabling explicit measures linked to housing renewal that could help resolve local employment and economic issues.	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities and areas outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→→	This option indirectly supports this objective because housing renewal will help to encourage inward investment, economic diversification and a stronger local economy.	↑	This option could support this objective by enabling explicit measures linked to housing renewal that could help resolve local employment and economic issues.	↓	This policy would unfairly penalise those communities and areas outside of priority areas.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		HO5 Rural Exceptions Sites	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	HO5: Rural Exceptions Sites				
	Preferred Option	Alternative Options		Comments	
	(1): Include a criteria-based policy in the core strategy enabling sites to be released in rural areas, as an exception to the normal policy	HO5a: A small element of open market housing may be permissible where it would enable the delivery of an exception site			
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	→	This option recognises that rural communities have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it indirectly supports this objective	↔	No significant effect	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	The preferred option makes clear that development will only be permitted where good access to community facilities and services are possible. However, it may also help to secure the viability of existing services and facilities for the wider community.	↕	This could have a beneficial for longer term service provision and accessibility in some rural communities, but it may lead to adverse impacts in others.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This option recognises that rural communities have specific housing needs that require tailored policy measures.	↔	No significant effect	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑↑	This option has the potential to support this objective by relieving disadvantage and reducing levels of stress to help improve health and well-being in rural communities via the provision of affordable local housing.	↔	No significant effect	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	By enabling young people and families to stay in their community, this option directly supports this objective, helping to rural communities to stay strong and vibrant.	↔	No significant effect	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→	By helping people/families to stay in their community, this option indirectly supports this objective.	↔	No significant effect	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
EC2: To improve access to jobs	→	By helping people/families to stay in their community, this option indirectly supports this objective.	↔	No significant effect	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	→	By helping people/families to stay in their community, this option indirectly supports this objective.	↔	No significant effect	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective

Key: Significance of Effects **HO6 Dwellings in the Open Countryside**

Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
	Major beneficial		Major beneficial
	Minor beneficial		Minor beneficial
	Potentially beneficial		Potentially beneficial
	Potentially adverse		Potentially adverse
	Minor adverse		Minor adverse
	Major adverse		Major adverse

	Potentially beneficial or adverse
	No significant effect

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	HO6: Dwellings in the open countryside								
	Preferred Options			Alternative Option			Comments		
	(1): Include a rural workers dwellings policy in the core strategy	(2): Include policy guidance on circumstances in which temporary dwellings may be acceptable	(3): Include policy guidance on the removal of rural workers occupancy conditions	HO6a: No rural workers dwellings policy in the core strategy					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes		This option recognises that rural communities and rural workers in particular have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it indirectly supports this objective		This option recognises that rural communities, and rural workers in particular, have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it indirectly supports this objective		This option recognises that rural communities and rural workers in particular have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it indirectly supports this objective		This option takes no account of the different needs of rural workers in the planning for housing process.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home		This option recognises that rural workers have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it strongly supports this objective		This option recognises that rural workers have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it strongly supports this objective		This option recognises that rural workers have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it strongly supports this objective		This option takes no account of the different needs of rural workers in relation to this objective.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training		This option indirectly but very strongly supports this objective by making it possible for rural trainee workers to live close to their employment/training.		This option indirectly but very strongly supports this objective by making it possible for rural trainee workers to live close to their employment and training.		This option indirectly but very strongly supports this objective by making it possible for rural trainee workers to live close to their employment and training.		This option takes no account of the different needs of rural workers in relation to this objective.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people		This option indirectly but very strongly supports this objective by making it possible for rural workers to live close to their employment, thus leading to improved sense of well being and health.		This option indirectly but very strongly supports this objective by making it possible for rural workers to live close to their employment, thus leading to improved sense of well being and health.		This option indirectly but very strongly supports this objective by making it possible for rural workers to live close to their employment, thus leading to improved sense of well being and health.		This option takes no account of the different needs of rural workers in relation to this objective.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history		This option indirectly but very strongly supports this objective by enabling rural workers to live within their local community, aiding social inclusiveness and vibrancy		This option indirectly but very strongly supports this objective by enabling rural workers to live within their local community, aiding social inclusiveness and vibrancy		This option indirectly but very strongly supports this objective by enabling rural workers to live within their local community, aiding social inclusiveness and vibrancy		This option takes no account of the different needs of rural workers in relation to this objective.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect		No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities		This option will help to keep skilled rural workers employed, and it will enable new employment opportunities to be developed and exploited, thus it strongly supports this objective		This option recognises that rural workers have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it strongly supports this objective		This option recognises that rural workers have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it strongly supports this objective		This option takes no account of the different needs of rural workers in relation to this objective.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
EC2: To improve access to jobs		This option recognises that rural workers have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it strongly supports this objective		This option recognises that rural workers have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it strongly supports this objective		This option recognises that rural workers have specific needs that require tailored policy measures, thus it strongly supports this objective		This option takes no account of the different needs of rural workers in relation to this objective.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy		This option will help to keep skilled workers employed, which in turn will help to enable economic diversification in rural areas		This option will help to keep skilled workers employed, which in turn will help to enable economic diversification in rural areas		This option will help to keep skilled workers employed, which in turn will help to enable economic diversification in rural areas		This option takes no account of the different needs of rural workers in relation to this objective.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in relation to this objective

Key: Significance of Effects		HO7 Elderly Needs Housing	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	→	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	←	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	HO7: Elderly Housing Needs								
	Preferred Options				Alternative Option		Comments		
	(1): Include a criteria based policy in the core strategy that supports the provision of elderly needs accommodation	(2): Support residential annexes where the need for ancillary accommodation be justified	(3): Encourage developers to include units within residential developments that are built to lifetime homes standards	HO7a: Allow an element of flexibility that allows sites/proposals in local centres to be considered if sites within key service centres cannot be identified					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	→	This option recognises that the elderly and those with special needs have specific needs that the planning process can meet, thus is indirectly helps to meet this objective.	→	This option recognises that the elderly and those with special needs have specific needs that the planning process can meet, thus is indirectly helps to meet this objective.	→	This option recognises that the elderly and those with special needs have specific needs that the planning process can meet, thus is indirectly helps to meet this objective.	→	This option recognises that the elderly and those with special needs have specific needs that the planning process can meet, thus is indirectly helps to meet this objective.	From a sustainability perspective all of the options meet this objective, but the preferred options are possibly the most flexible, enabling a tailored approach to meet local needs.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This option is flexible enough to meet local needs whilst enabling a consistent approach across the borough. By focusing on service centres, new development will meet this objective for this sector of the community.	↑↑	This option is flexible enough to meet local needs whilst enabling a consistent approach across the borough. By focusing on service centres, new development will meet this objective for this sector of the community.	↑↑	This option is flexible enough to meet local needs whilst enabling a consistent approach across the borough. By focusing on service centres, new development will meet this objective for this sector of the community.	↕	This option may have beneficial impacts in some areas, but could result in less optimal sites being developed where access to services are not as good as they need to be for the elderly and those with special needs.	The combination of preferred options are the most sustainable.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This option is flexible enough to meet local needs whilst enabling a consistent approach across the borough.	↑↑	This option is flexible enough to meet local needs whilst enabling a consistent approach across the borough.	↑↑	This option is flexible enough to meet local needs whilst enabling a consistent approach across the borough.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective, they are mutually reinforcing.	From a sustainability perspective all of the options meet this objective, but the preferred options are possibly the most flexible, enabling a tailored approach to meet local needs.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→	By focusing on core service centres this option indirectly helps to meet this objective by enabling this section of the population to access further education and training, not only to use facilities but also to contribute to their delivery.	→	By focusing on core service centres this option indirectly helps to meet this objective by enabling this section of the population to access further education and training, not only to use facilities but also to contribute to their delivery.	→	By focusing on core service centres this option indirectly helps to meet this objective by enabling this section of the population to access further education and training, not only to use facilities but also to contribute to their delivery.	↕	This option may have beneficial impacts in some areas, but could result in less optimal sites being developed where access to these services are not as good as they need to be for the elderly and those with special needs.	The combination of preferred options are the most sustainable.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑↑	This option enables this section of the population to remain fully active within their communities, this enabling a strong sense of well-being and general health.	↑↑	This option enables this section of the population to remain fully active within their communities, this enabling a strong sense of well-being and general health.	↑↑	This option enables this section of the population to remain fully active within their communities, this enabling a strong sense of well-being and general health.	↕	This option may have beneficial impacts in some areas, but could result in less optimal sites being developed where access to activities and services are not as good as they need to be for the elderly and those with special needs.	The combination of preferred options are the most sustainable.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	This option enables this section of the population to remain fully active within their communities, this enabling socially inclusive and vibrant communities.	↑↑	This option enables this section of the population to remain fully active within their communities, this enabling socially inclusive and vibrant communities.	↑↑	This option enables this section of the population to remain fully active within their communities, this enabling a strong sense of well-being and general health.	↕	This option may have beneficial impacts in some areas, but could result in less optimal sites being developed where the elderly and those with special needs are not fully enabled to take part in the local community.	The combination of preferred options are the most sustainable.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	From a sustainability perspective all of the options meet this objective, but the preferred options are possibly the most flexible, enabling a tailored approach to meet local needs.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	From a sustainability perspective all of the options meet this objective, but the preferred options are possibly the most flexible, enabling a tailored approach to meet local needs.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	↑	This option provides the potential for elderly and those with special needs to more easily take part in both paid and voluntary work-related activities if they so wish.	From a sustainability perspective all of the options meet this objective, but the preferred options are possibly the most flexible, enabling a tailored approach to meet local needs.

Key: Significance of Effects		HO8 Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	→	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	←	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	HO8: Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites				
	Preferred Option		Alternative Option		Comments
	(1): Include a criteria-based policy in the core strategy		HO8a: No gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople sites policy in the core strategy		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	→	This option recognises that gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople have specific needs in the planning process, thus it indirectly helps to meet this objective.	←	This option fails to address the specific needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople in the planning process in respect to this objective, and could result in adverse impacts.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.	↓↓	This option fails to address the specific needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople in the planning process in respect to this objective, and could result in adverse impacts.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	Whilst not providing 'homes' this option directly supports this objective because it provides the necessary infrastructure for a good quality of life, e.g. water and power supplies and the like.	↓↓	This option completely fails to meet this objective.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→→	This option seeks to provide suitable sites convenient to education facilities so it indirectly supports this objective.	←←	This option fails to address the specific needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople in the planning process in respect to this objective, and could result in adverse impacts.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑↑	This option seeks to provide suitable sites that will enable gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople to live in reasonable comfort with clean water and good sanitation, close to health facilities, so it meets this objective to improve health and well-being.	↓↓	This option fails to address the specific needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople in the planning process in respect to this objective, and could result in adverse impacts.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	This option actively seeks to find appropriate sites that cause least tension with local communities, with the aim of enabling gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople to contribute to sustainable rural communities	↓↓	This option fails to address the specific needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople in the planning process in respect to this objective, and could result in adverse impacts.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑	This option seeks to provide suitable sites that avoid damage or loss of biodiversity so it directly supports this objective, working well with NE and related policies.	↓↓	This option fails to address the specific needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople in the planning process in respect to this objective, and could result in adverse impacts.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	This option seeks to provide suitable sites that avoid damage to, or loss of landscape character so it directly supports this objective, working well with NE and related policies.	↓↓	This option fails to address the specific needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople in the planning process in respect to this objective, and could result in adverse impacts.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	→	By providing appropriate sites in rural areas, this option seeks to minimise adverse impact on the edge of urban areas or urban open space, so it indirectly supports this objective.	←	This option fails to address the specific needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople in the planning process in respect to this objective, and could result in adverse impacts.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→	By providing appropriate sites close to facilities and rural communities, this enables gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople to take part more easily in the local economy.	←	This option fails to address the specific needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople in the planning process in respect to this objective, and could result in adverse impacts.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	→	By providing appropriate sites close to facilities and rural communities, this enables gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople to take part more easily in the local economy.	←	This option fails to address the specific needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople in the planning process in respect to this objective, and could result in adverse impacts.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None

Key: Significance of Effects		NE1 Green Infrastructure	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	⇒⇒	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	⇒	Minor beneficial
⇧	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
⇩	Potentially adverse	⇨	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	⇦	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	⇦⇦	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	NE1: Green Infrastructure				Comments		
	Preferred Option		Alternative Option				
	(1): Provide an overarching Green Infrastructure policy	NE1a: No overarching Green Infrastructure policy	NE1b: Policy to sets targets for GI provision in line with the deficiencies identified in the GI Plan (if adopted)				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⇨	An overarching policy has the potential to link with/into other people-focussed policies and community processes	⇨	This option could fail to take strategic account of local community views and concerns	⇒⇒	The provision of targets to support the Plan means that this option could be really effective in meeting clearly expressed community expectations and identified needs.	There are clearly opportunities to link GI policies with those for developer contributions, both S106 and CIL
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	Having this policy would enable direct links to be made to the provision of GI services from a strategic perspective, optimising access in ways that are not detrimental to GI integrity	↓	This option would fail to provide a strategic overview of GI potentials and need so access to key GI benefits would be affected.	↑↑	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis.	As above, plus there is potential to directly link these options to the Community Sustainability Strategy and related transport, health and well-being service measures.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⇕	This policy would enable new development to be planned sympathetically with GI provision, especially on the basis that 'decent home' includes appropriate GI setting and service provision. There may be some conflicts between GI needs and housing need in specific areas	⇨	This option would indirectly fail to address the opportunities that immediate GI access would provide for decent homes/their setting.	⇒⇒	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis.	There is potential for considerable synergies and benefits from taking a strategic approach to GI provision in relation to where people live, especially those in more disadvantaged areas with poorer quality natural environmental assets
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑↑	This option gives the opportunity to make direct links between quality of life and quality of the natural environment when delivering high quality development	↓↓	This policy does not support this objective so important health benefits and sense of well-being would suffer	↑↑	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis.	Policies that in combination take a structured approach to the identification, quality/state and help to plan for enhancements in GI assets and services will benefit community health and well-being.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	⇨	Most of our valued GI assets have a strong, direct link with local cultural heritage, so this policy could help to reinforce a sense of place, especially in rural areas.	⇨	This policy approach would fail to make the potential links and synergies with this objective.	↑↑	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis. This policy could help to reinforce a sense of place, especially in rural areas.	The preferred option is potentially indirectly supportive of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑	This policy would directly and very strongly benefit biodiversity	↓↓	This policy directly fails this objective	↑↑	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis. This policy could help to reinforce a sense of place, especially in rural areas.	Overall, this suite of policies will help to meet objective EN1 whilst also providing potential links into other sectors and their objectives.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	As above, this policy will help to underpin the importance of Allerdale's internationally and locally important landscapes and their key characteristics	↓↓	This policy directly fails this objective	↑↑	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis. This policy could help to reinforce a sense of place, especially in rural areas.	Overall, this suite of policies will help to meet objective EN2 whilst also providing potential links into other sectors and their objectives.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇒	This policy should encourage bringing GI into urban areas helps to soften and create more liveable, higher quality environments, especially in regard to likely climate change impacts.	⇨	This policy approach would fail to make the potential links and synergies with this objective.	⇒⇒	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis. This policy could help new development to reinforce sense of place in urban areas whilst improving microclimate benefits.	Overall, this suite of policies will help to meet objective EN3 whilst also providing potential links into other sectors and their objectives.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	⇒	GI has an important role to play in helping to regulate air quality and climate and in providing biomass fuels to help mitigate climate change.	⇨	This policy approach would fail to make the potential links and synergies with this objective.	⇒⇒	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis.	Overall, this suite of policies will help to meet objective NR1 whilst also supporting policies for low carbon construction and energy systems.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⇒⇒	This general/overall policy will help to conserve and enhance 'blue infrastructure' features important for GI services and benefits	⇨⇨	This policy approach would fail to make the potential links and synergies with this objective.	⇒⇒	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis. This policy could help to reinforce good GI planning with water management.	There is a strong, indirect link between this objective and the preferred GI policy that needs to be explicitly made.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑↑	There is a strong, direct link between this objective and this policy option, each reinforce the other	↓↓	This policy option fails to support this objective and could potentially have very damaging impacts.	↑↑	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis.	This preferred policy option directly supports this sustainability objective
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⇒	This policy helps to provide an overarching, strategic approach to GI that reinforces sustainable minerals planning to have least adverse impact on GI services and benefits.	⇨	This policy approach would fail to make the potential links and synergies with this objective.	⇒⇒	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis, in ways that work well with minerals and waste planning.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	⇒	Setting meaningful targets directly linked to the plan should enable a strategic approach to resolving deficiencies at a local level within agreed timeframes to make good inadequacies on a prioritised basis. This policy could help to guide regeneration initiatives that may result in new employment opportunities and green technology-related jobs	No identified impacts in terms of the preferred option
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant direct or indirect effects	No identified impacts in terms of the preferred option
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	⇨	This policy could help to secure existing employment levels in agriculture, tourism and the 'green economy' in rural areas that depend on maintaining and enhancing GI assets and services	⇨	This policy approach would fail to make the potential links and synergies with this objective.	⇒	This policy could indirectly help to secure existing employment levels in agriculture, tourism and the 'green economy' in rural areas that depend on maintaining and enhancing GI assets and services	There is potential for the preferred policy to help shape and guide the development of new employment opportunities and local economic diversification initiatives that will support both natural and economic assets.

Key: Significance of Effects		NE3 Biodiversity and Geodiversity	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects	Direct Effects	Indirect Effects
	Major beneficial		Major beneficial
	Minor beneficial		Minor beneficial
	Potentially beneficial		Potentially beneficial
	Potentially adverse		Potentially adverse
	Minor adverse		Minor adverse
	Major adverse		Major adverse
	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	NE3: Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity					Comments			
	Preferred Options		Alternative Options						
	(1): Policy to protect and enhance (where possible) biodiversity and geodiversity assets	(2): Allow proposals affecting site biodiversity / geodiversity to be considered on their own merits	NE3a: Do not include biodiversity/geodiversity policy in the core strategy	NE3b: Include a policy that seeks to resist development posing harm to sites of biological or geological interest					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes		Possibly has some potential to enable community views and aspirations to be taken into account.		This option potentially provides an opportunity for greater community participation in decisions about whether to allow specific proposals to go ahead		No significant impact either way.		No significant impact either way.	Linkage between these options and this sustainability objective are not especially strong
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces		Policy will work towards improving Allerdale's GI network which will aid increased access to the countryside and open spaces.		This option potentially provides an opportunity for improved access to the countryside and open spaces, but there may be issues over impacts on biodiversity especially, and on geologically important sites/assets		This option may result in adverse impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity that may arise from the provision of new development aimed at meeting this objective.		This option might also help to meet this objective, conversely it may also hinder much needed access to services and the countryside.	Together the preferred options have the potential to meet this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home		This option could help to meet this objective through the enhancement of GI assets important for biodiversity.		This option may result in beneficial or slight adverse impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity that may arise from the provision of new homes aimed at meeting this objective, depending on location and/or design.		This option may result in adverse impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity that may arise from the provision of new development aimed at meeting this objective.		This option might also help to meet this objective, depending on where and how development is planned, conversely it may also hinder the provision of much high quality housing in some areas.	Together the preferred options have the potential to meet this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training		No significant impact either way.		This option may result in adverse impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity that may arise from the provision of educational or training facilities aimed at meeting this objective, depending on location and /or design.		No significant impact either way.		No significant impact either way.	A mixture of impacts and negative impacts could probably be avoided or reduced through mitigation, but the preferred options would work well together.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people		This option should result in benefits to health and well-being via the provision of further GI assets/services and benefits, or the enhancement of existing GI assets		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, depending on whether the type of development is aimed at meeting this sustainability objective.		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, depending on how the type of development is aimed at meeting this sustainability objective.		This option may also help to meet this objective, depending on where and how development is planned.	A mixture of impacts and negative impacts could probably be avoided or reduced through mitigation, but the preferred options would work well together.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history		This option should result in benefits to community vibrancy and sense of place via the provision of further GI assets/services and benefits, or the enhancement of existing GI assets in-keeping with local cultural heritage		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, depending on whether the type of development is aimed at meeting this sustainability objective.		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, depending on how the type of development is aimed at meeting this sustainability objective.		This option might also help to meet this objective, conversely it may also hinder the provision of much high quality housing in some areas.	A mixture of impacts and negative impacts could probably be avoided or reduced through mitigation, but the preferred options would work well together.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity		This policy option directly supports the aims of this objective: they are mutually reinforcing		This option needs to be guided by this objective so that the development is actively designed to achieve protection and enhancement, but there is potential for adverse impacts. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This policy option directly supports the aims of this objective: they are mutually reinforcing		This policy option directly supports the aims of this objective: they are mutually reinforcing	Mostly positive impacts and negative impacts could probably be avoided or reduced through mitigation. The preferred options would work well together in relation to this objective
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations		There will be considerable synergy and overlap between biodiversity and landscape criteria, with high potential for enhancement of both.		This option needs to be guided by this objective so that the development is actively designed to achieve this sustainability objective, but there is potential for adverse impacts. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This policy option directly supports the aims of this objective: they are mutually reinforcing		This policy option directly supports the aims of this objective: they are mutually reinforcing	Mostly positive impacts and negative impacts could probably be avoided or reduced through mitigation. The preferred options would work well together in relation to this objective
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment		It should be possible to meet this objective using measures that will also enhance biodiversity assets		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, whilst still meeting this sustainability objective. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option may result in adverse effects on biodiversity or geodiversity potential, or failure to address opportunities to enhance these assets through location and design of new development in urban and peri-urban areas.		No significant impact either way.	Overall, the preferred options are the most beneficial in relation to this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions		There is good linkage between this option and this objective: GI features/assets such as enhanced or new greenspace including trees and woodland will help to improve local air quality and reduce emissions.		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, whilst still meeting this sustainability objective through good design. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option may result in adverse effects on biodiversity potential by failure to address opportunities to enhance these assets through location and design of new development in urban and peri-urban areas in ways that could meet this objective.		This option should also help to meet this objective.	Mostly positive impacts except for NE3a which is negative/adverse. The preferred options would work well together.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources		There is good linkage between this option and this objective: GI features/assets such as new water bodies and SuDS features will help to meet both this objective and the requirements of this policy.		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, whilst still meeting this sustainability objective through good design. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, whilst still meeting this sustainability objective. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option should also help to meet this objective.	A mixture of impacts and negative impacts could probably be avoided or reduced through mitigation, but the preferred options would work well together.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil		There is good linkage between this option and this objective: land and soil type directly influence biodiversity potential. This option and this objective are mutually reinforcing.		This option needs to be guided by this objective so that the development is actively designed to achieve protection and enhancement, but there is potential for adverse impacts such as soil-sealing and loss of greenfield land. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, whilst still meeting this sustainability objective. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option should also help to meet this objective.	A mixture of impacts and negative impacts could probably be avoided or reduced through mitigation, but the preferred options would work well together.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste		Overall, it should be possible to meet this objective whilst also fulfilling the requirements of this policy option, but there is potential for localised adverse impacts on biodiversity. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option needs to be guided by this objective so that the development is actively designed to achieve protection and enhancement of biodiversity and geological/mineral assets, but there is potential for adverse impacts such as loss of access to mineral deposits. Or, on the other hand, loss of biodiversity due to new minerals development. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option may result in adverse effects on these assets whilst still meeting this objective, i.e. mineral extraction and waste facilities could reduce their quality and/or extent cumulatively over the plan period. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial effects on this objective, in terms of what type of minerals extraction of waste management development may or may not be allowed in specific areas.	Nothing much to choose between these options, except for NE3a which is negative/adverse.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities		No significant impacts or effects		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, whilst still meeting this sustainability objective to improve job security and increased employment through new development. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		No significant impacts or effects		This option might also help to meet this objective, depending on where and how development is planned, conversely it may also hinder opportunities to retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities.	Nothing much to choose between these options. Negative impacts could probably be avoided or reduced through mitigation
EC2: To improve access to jobs		There should be scope meet this objective whilst also meeting the requirements of this policy		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, whilst still meeting this sustainability objective to improve access to jobs through new development and infrastructure. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option may result in adverse impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity that may arise from the provision of new development aimed at meeting this objective.		This option might also help to meet this objective, depending on where and how development is planned, conversely it may also hinder opportunities to improve access to jobs.	Overall, the preferred options are the most beneficial in relation to this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy		There should be scope meet this objective whilst also meeting the requirements of this policy, especially through new development involving tourism and leisure, possibly also green technology development.		This option might result in either adverse or beneficial impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity, whilst still meeting this sustainability objective to improve job security and increased employment through new development. The decision-making process in each case will need to be transparent and accurately recorded.		This option may result in adverse impacts on biodiversity or geodiversity that may arise from the provision of new development aimed at meeting this objective.		This option might help to meet this objective, depending on where and how development is planned, conversely it may also hinder opportunities to diversify and strengthen the economy in specific areas of Allerdale.	Overall, the preferred options are the most beneficial in relation to this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects		NE4 Air, soil and water quality	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	→	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	←	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	NE4: Air, Soil and Water Quality										
	Preferred Options				Alternative Options				Comments		
	(1): Allow development proposals that include mitigation measures, to be considered on their own merits	(2): Resist development proposals that pose a threat to biodiversity and geodiversity assets	(3): Safeguard the best and most versatile agricultural land from development	NE4a: Do not include an air, soil and water quality policy in the Core Strategy	NE4b: A strict policy that advocates the refusal of development that would have an adverse impact on air, soil and water quality						
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	Some small potential for increasing the levels of public engagement in the decision-making process if proposals are considered on this basis.	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	Very little direct relationship between this suite of policies and this objective, although there is scope in the planning process itself for increasing levels of participation.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↔	No significant effects	↔	Indirect potential to meet this objective by retaining GI assets that could also provide for improved community access	↔	Indirect potential to meet this objective by retaining high quality farmland that could also provide for improved public access	↔	Some potential for indirect disbenefits in relation to this objective if this option fails to address the importance of these assets for the supply of 'natural services and benefits' for people, although the GI policies should help to reduce negative impacts of this policy.	↕	This option could result in benefits for access to services by protecting natural assets, it may also however prevent development that is needed to improve service provision in areas that are currently disadvantaged.	Slight relationship between this suite of policies and this objective, but the preferred options are the most sustainable as they help enable the potential for increasing levels of access to the countryside and open spaces.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑	Provides for measures that could reduce the cost of living, make homes more affordable, especially with increasing climate change impacts	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	Some potential for indirect disbenefits in relation to this objective if this option fails to address the importance of these assets for the supply of 'natural services and benefits' for people where they live.	↕	This option could result in benefits for existing residents by protecting natural assets where people live, it may also however prevent development that is needed to improve the supply of decent homes in areas that are currently disadvantaged.	Slight relationship between this suite of policies and this objective, but the preferred options are the most sustainable as they help enable the potential for increasing levels of access to the countryside and open spaces.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Provides for measures that could help towards improving local environmental quality and the benefits this would have on health and well-being, especially with increasing climate change impacts, adaptive resilience	↑	Provides for measures that could help towards improving local environmental quality and the benefits this would have on health and well-being, especially with increasing climate change impacts, adaptive resilience	↑	Helps to secure local crops and produce of importance to healthy lifestyles, as well as securing landscape benefits important for health and sense of well-being	↓	This option is in direct contrast to the purpose of this objective. It could allow development to proceed that may compromise these natural assets and impact on levels of health and well-being over time.	↕	This option could result in health and well-being benefits, but it may also prevent some developments that would help to meet needs in areas that are currently disadvantaged, with related lower levels of health and well-being.	Reasonably strong, positive relationship between the preferred policies and this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	Provides for measures that could help towards protecting and improving local biodiversity, especially in view of increasing climate change impacts through enabling adaptive resilience	↑↑	This policy directly and very strongly supports this sustainability objective: they are mutually reinforcing. It also help to reduce the negative aspects of (3).	↓	This option would protect high quality farmland but possibly at the expense of lower grade land important for biodiversity and semi-natural habitats, helping to further fragment buffer areas around protected sites and areas.	↓↓	This option is in direct contrast to the purpose of this objective. It could allow development to proceed that may compromise these natural assets and impact on biodiversity interest over time.	↕	This option could result in community benefits by preventing potentially harmful development, but it may also prevent some development that would help to enable community vibrancy and social inclusion in areas currently disadvantaged.	The preferred options work well together to support this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑	Provides for measures that could potentially help towards protecting and improving local landscape character by securing effective mitigation measures to protect soils, air quality and water resources	↑	Provides for measures that could potentially help towards protecting and improving local landscape character by securing effective mitigation measures to protect soils, air quality and water resources	↑	Provides for measures that should help towards protecting and improving local farmland landscapes by safeguarding it from development.	↔	This option is in direct contrast to the purpose of this objective. It could allow development to proceed that may compromise these natural assets and impact on landscape character and quality over time.	↑	Works well with this objective to help towards protecting and improving local farmland landscapes by safeguarding them from potentially harmful development.	The preferred options work well together to support this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	Provides for measures that could help towards improving local environmental quality through good design, bringing benefits for health and well-being, especially with increasing climate change impacts, adaptive resilience	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	This option is in direct contrast to the purpose of this objective. It could allow development to proceed that may compromise the quality and 'comfort levels' in the built environment over time.	↓	This option would probably act as a too strong a brake on almost all development, especially in peri-urban areas and on greenfield land, because mitigation and design measures to reduce impacts would be too costly and beyond current building regs.	Reasonably strong, positive relationship between the preferred policies and this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This policy directly and very strongly supports this sustainability objective: they are mutually reinforcing, to protect environmental quality and the provision of important natural environment regulating services	↑↑	This policy directly and very strongly supports this sustainability objective: they are mutually reinforcing, to protect environmental quality and the provision of important natural environment regulating services	↕	This policy supports this sustainability objective: they are mutually reinforcing to an extent, but high grade farmland is more likely to be intensively farmed, creating diffuse pollutions and GHG emissions. The type of production systems themselves will be the cause of this sort of conflict, but are largely outside of the planning process except for PPS25.	↓↓	This option is in direct contrast to the purpose of this objective. It could allow development to proceed that may compromise air quality over time. The effects are likely to be cumulative and synergistic with objectives NR2, NR3 and SP5.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective	Overall a positive and mutually reinforcing relationship although (3) may result in some conflicts.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑↑	This policy directly and very strongly supports this sustainability objective: they are mutually reinforcing, to protect environmental quality and the provision of important natural environment regulating services	↑↑	This policy directly and very strongly supports this sustainability objective: they are mutually reinforcing, to protect environmental quality and the provision of important natural environment regulating services	↕	This policy supports this sustainability objective: they are mutually reinforcing to an extent, but high grade farmland is more likely to be intensively farmed, causing diffuse pollution and GHG emissions. The type of production systems themselves will be the cause of this sort of conflict, but are largely outside of the planning process except for PPS25.	↓↓	This option is in direct contrast to the purpose of this objective. It could allow development to proceed that may compromise water supply and quality over time. The effects are likely to be cumulative and synergistic with objectives NR3, NR1 and SP5.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective	Intensive modern farming systems cause a potential issue with this objective, which policy (3) could inadvertently exacerbate, otherwise the preferred options support this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑↑	This policy directly and very strongly supports this sustainability objective: they are mutually reinforcing, to protect environmental quality and the provision of important natural environment regulating services	↑↑	This policy directly and very strongly supports this sustainability objective: they are mutually reinforcing, to protect environmental quality and the provision of important natural environment regulating services	↕	This policy supports this sustainability objective: they are mutually reinforcing to an extent, but high grade farmland is more likely to be intensively farmed, affecting soil structure, causing erosion and can result in 'degraded countryside'. The type of production systems themselves will be the cause of this sort of conflict, but are largely outside of the planning process except for PPS25.	↓↓	This option is in direct contrast to the purpose of this objective. It could allow development to proceed that may compromise land and soils quality over time, through soil sealing and reducing the ability of the land to help regulate drainage and to act as a natural carbon sink, especially peatier soils. The effects are likely to be cumulative and synergistic with objectives NR2, NR1 and SP5.	↑↑	This option strongly supports this objective	Intensive modern farming systems cause a potential issue with this objective, which policy (3) could inadvertently exacerbate, otherwise the preferred options support this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects	↔	Protecting these assets from development could also help to indirectly safeguard mineral resources	↔	No obvious significant effects	↔	Whilst this option will not hinder this objective, it may result in minerals and waste-related development that could compromise aspects of air, land and water quality - these impacts could be cumulative over the plan period.	↔	This option may hinder this objective, because it may compromise aspects of minerals and waste-related development. It will require effective mitigation measures to avoid long term adverse impacts.	Slight positive relationship between the preferred options and this objective. The rejected options are too polarised and have a slight negative impact overall.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effects	↔	This policy could indirectly help to support land-based sector jobs	↔	This policy could indirectly help to support land-based sector jobs	↔	This policy could have a dampening effect on land-based job security and new employment opportunities, especially in relation to tourism and farming.	↔	This policy could have a dampening effect on other sectors and new employment opportunities, especially in rural areas.	Slight positive relationship between the preferred options and this objective. The rejected options are too polarised and have a slight negative impact overall.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	This policy could indirectly help to support land-based sector jobs	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	This policy could indirectly help to support the agriculture, fisheries and timber sectors	↔	This option may have a cumulative, adverse impact on the potential for attracting inward investment if environmental quality suffers, especially in relation to tourism and farming.	↔	This policy could have a dampening effect on other sectors and diversification opportunities, especially in rural areas.	Slight positive relationship between the preferred options and this objective. The rejected options are too polarised and have a slight negative impact overall.

Key: Significance of Effects		NES Open space, sports and recreational facilities	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects	Direct Effects	Indirect Effects

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	NES: Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities										
	Preferred Options					Alternative Options					Comments
	(1): Safeguard and encourage the provision of new space, sports and recreational facilities	(2): Include criteria that must be met in order for proposals that would result in the loss of open space or facilities to be allowed	(3): Protect the structure, character, principal components and setting of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest	(4): Resist development on land adjoining areas of open space and sports and recreational facilities where it would erode the quality and/or jeopardise its use and enjoyment	(5): Seek the provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities through new housing development and/or developer contributions for the enhancement of space, sports and recreational facilities on or off-site	NESa: Do not include an open space, sports and recreational facilities policy in the core strategy	NESb: Include a policy that safeguards existing open space, sports and recreational facilities from development				
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes											There is no evident or obvious relationship between these policies and this objective
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces											The preferred policies meet this objective. It may be appropriate to develop criteria including on a spatial basis - to guide the identification of appropriate levels of provision to meet differing levels of current and anticipated future need. There is obvious synergy with NE1 policies, so GI provision of services and benefits fits well with NES policies and this objective. It will be important to factor in climate change adaptation measures/features, i.e. provision of shade, drought tolerant species and so on.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home											The preferred policy options are complementary to this sustainability objective and there are strong synergies with NE1 for the provision of GI.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training											There is no evident or obvious relationship between these policies and this objective
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people											The preferred policy options are complementary to this sustainability objective and there are strong synergies with NE1 for the provision of GI.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history											The preferred policy options are complementary to this sustainability objective and there are strong synergies with NE1 for the provision of GI.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity											These policies have a range of relationships with this objective, from supportive to creating tensions and even some conflict. For these reasons it will be important to set clear guidelines and standards to reduce conflicts and optimise positive opportunities for securing biodiversity and leisure provision.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations											These policies have a range of relationships with this objective, from supportive to creating tensions and even some conflict. For these reasons it will be important to set clear guidelines and standards to reduce conflicts and optimise positive opportunities for securing both landscape enhancements and leisure provision.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment											Overall the preferred policy options are the most complementary to this objective, but will require careful application, in tandem with other environmental and social policies to get the best results.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions											Overall the preferred policy options are complementary to this objective, but will require careful application, in tandem with other environmental and social policies to get the best results.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources											None
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil											Overall these policies are complementary to this objective, but there is scope for impacts to go either way. The preferred policies will require careful application, in tandem with other environmental and social policies to get the best results.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste											There is a very slight relationship between these policies and this objective - mainly in relation to setting guidelines and standards.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities											Overall the preferred policies are indirectly complementary to this objective, but the relationship is slight.
EC2: To improve access to jobs											There is no evident or obvious relationship between these policies and this objective
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy											Overall the preferred policies are indirectly complementary to this objective, but the relationship is slight.

Key: Significance of Effects **NE6 Countryside and Coastal Access and Recreation**

Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↕	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	NE6: Countryside and Coastal Access and Recreation								
	Preferred Options			Alternative Option			Comments		
	(1): Criteria based policy to encourage proposals that improve access to countryside and coastal areas and increase opportunities for recreation within it	(2): Ensure that new development in the vicinity of PROW are connected in order to improve accessibility and integrate with GI network	(3): Resist developments that would obstruct a PROW or adversely affect it	NE6a: Do not include a countryside and coastal access and recreation policy in the core strategy					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	No real relationship
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This policy directly supports and will strongly help to meet this objective.	↑↑	This policy directly supports and will strongly help to meet this objective.	↑↑	This policy directly supports and will strongly help to meet this objective.	↓↓	This option would not support this objective. They are directly opposing.	A strong and very positive relationship between these policies and this objective. The preferred options are directly supportive.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↔	This policy indirectly helps to support this objective in that decent homes need to be provided with good access to the countryside with opportunities for informal recreation	↔	This policy indirectly helps to support this objective in that decent homes need to be provided with good access to the countryside and increase opportunities for recreation	↔	This policy indirectly helps to support this objective in that decent homes need to be provided with good access to the countryside and increase opportunities for informal recreation	↔	This policy option is potentially adverse in relation to this objective because it fails to provide for good informal recreation opportunities.	A fairly strong indirect positive linkage between the preferred policies and this objective
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	None
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	Enabling access to the countryside and coastal areas helps to improve opportunities for people to maintain/improve their well-being.	↑	Enabling access to the countryside and coastal areas helps to improve opportunities for people to maintain/improve their well-being.	↑	Securing access to the countryside and coastal areas helps to improve opportunities for people to maintain/improve their well-being.	↓	This option would not support this objective and could result in development that adversely affects health and well-being.	These policies link well to NE1 for the provision of GI
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	This policy directly supports and will strongly help to meet this objective, by enabling social interaction via long established access routes.	↑	This policy directly supports and will help to meet this objective, by enabling social interaction between new and existing residents via long established access routes.	↔	This option could potentially benefit this objective by keeping existing PROW open, retaining good to help towards social interaction/movement within existing communities. Most PROW have historic connections with the local area.	↓↓	This option would not support this objective. They are directly opposing.	A strong and very positive relationship between the preferred policies and this objective. The preferred options are directly supportive.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↕	Potential to have a negative impact on biodiversity through trampling and disturbance, unless carefully planned and managed. However, by improving existing green networks intact this option could benefit most species and habitats.	↕	This option has the potential to help facilitate the spread of valued species and to help create a network of greenways that help species to move/migrate across the area. Conversely this policy option may have some adverse effects on more vulnerable species through disturbance.	↔	This option could benefit biodiversity interest keeping green networks open.	↕	This option could benefit biodiversity impacts by restricting trampling and disturbance. However, by improving existing green networks intact this option could also benefit most species and habitats.	Overall, an ambiguous relationship between all options and this objective, so negative impacts would need to be designed out or mitigated.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑	This option would encourage development that designs in greenways for access that could help to improve landscape quality and add to local sense of place.	↑	This option would encourage development that designs in greenways for access that could help to improve landscape quality and add to local sense of place.	↑	This option would encourage development that keeps greenways open for access so that landscape quality/character and local sense of place are conserved and enhanced.	↓	This option would not support this objective and could cause conflicts arising from new development that fails address this issue and this objective in an integrated way.	A fairly strong indirect positive linkage between the preferred policies and this objective
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↕	This policy potentially helps to meet this objective because good access from town to country should help to improve the quality of the built environment.	↑	A quality built environment should have/facilitate good access networks into the countryside.	↑	A quality built environment should have/facilitate good access networks into the countryside.	↓	This options could reduce access between town and country, to the detriment of the quality of townscape/urban areas.	A fairly strong indirect positive linkage between the preferred policies and this objective
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	No real relationship or significant effects
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	No real relationship or significant effects
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	This policy supports and will strongly help to meet this objective by keeping greenways open, preventing soil-sealing.	↑	This policy indirectly supports and will strongly help to meet this objective by keeping greenways open, preventing soil-sealing.	↑	This policy directly supports and will strongly help to meet this objective by keeping greenways open, preventing soil-sealing.	↓	This option could have an indirect adverse effect through land-take and soil sealing by new development that affects existing green ways and PROW.	A strong and very positive relationship between these policies and this objective. The preferred options are directly supportive.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	No significant relationship
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	This option could potentially help to secure and improve opportunities for tourism related employment.	↔	This option could potentially help to secure and improve opportunities for tourism related employment.	↔	This option could potentially help to secure and improve opportunities for tourism related employment.	↔	This policy option is potentially adverse in relation to this objective because it may damage the integrity of established walking routes important for tourism.	Overall, an indirect positive linkage between the preferred policies and this objective
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	No significant relationship
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↔	This option could potentially help with tourism diversification and help to attract inward investment opportunities for tourism related employment.	↔	This option could potentially help with tourism diversification and help to attract inward investment opportunities for tourism related employment.	↔	This option could potentially help with tourism diversification and help to attract inward investment opportunities for tourism related employment.	↔	This option is potentially adverse for tourism diversification and may limit inward investment opportunities for tourism related employment.	Overall, an indirect positive linkage between the preferred policies and this objective

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
⇧	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
⇩	Potentially adverse	⇦	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objective	NE7: Shoreline Management and Coastal Development								
	Preferred Options			Alternative Option		Comments			
	(1): Include a designation-based policy to regulate coastal development	(2): Only permit coastal defence schemes where they are consistent with the management approach in the SMP and no adverse impact on the environment	(3): Criteria based policy for the relocation of facilities affected by coastal erosion	NE7a: Do not include a shoreline management and coastal development policy in the core strategy					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	No significant relationship		
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑	Regulating coastal development via designation could benefit the improvement of access to coastal areas, with direct benefits to locals and visitors.	⇨	There is potential for this policy to provide/enable benefits that could help to meet this objective by providing safer, assured access to parts of the local coastal area.	⇨	There is potential for this policy to provide/enable benefits that could help to meet this objective by providing safer, assured access to parts of the local coastal area.	↓	Not having a policy could adversely affect provision for good access to the countryside and coastal areas.	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑	This policy would make clear how new development should be sited/designed to result in safe homes at low risk of flooding.	⇨	This policy would help to meet this objective by including criteria for providing better protection to new homes in relation to vulnerable coastal areas and river catchments.	⇨	This policy would help to meet this objective by including criteria for providing better protection to essential facilities in relation to vulnerable coastal areas and river catchments.	↓	Not having a policy may adversely affect provision for homes safe from flood risk and similar threats in coastal areas.	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	No significant relationship
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑↑	This option gives a very strong, clear signal to communities as to what is included in the coastal zone and how existing and new development will be protected through explicit management measures. This should engender a strong sense of well-being, that new development will be safe from coastal erosion and extreme weather events, including vulnerable river catchments.	↑↑	This option should help to protect vulnerable coastal communities and enable a stronger sense of well-being, that both existing and new development will be protected from coastal erosion and extreme weather events, including vulnerable river catchments.	↑↑	This option should help to reassure vulnerable coastal communities and the wider public that existing and new facilities and infrastructure will be protected from coastal erosion, helping to maintain and enhance health and sense of well-being.	↓↓	This option sends all the wrong signals to communities and could put people's health and sense of well-being at risk. It could make the development planning process in coastal areas more difficult and protracted.	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	⇨	This option could help to design coastal defence measures that are able to accommodate important local community activities and heritage.	⇨	This option could help to design coastal defence measures that are able to accommodate important local community activities and heritage.	⇨	This policy could have potential to take into account the protection of local history and community activities dependent on specific facilities.	⇦	This option would fail to enable full account of community activities and heritage aspects into account, and could result in reduced social inclusion.	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑	This policy should help to directly meet this sustainability objective to a large extent. It is complimentary to NE1, NE3 covering GI and biodiversity geological protection.	↑↑	There is potential for this policy to provide/enable biodiversity benefits that could help to meet this objective, especially if 'soft' coastal defences comprising specific coastal habitats are likely to comprise part of the criteria and guidance.	↑↑	There is potential for this policy to provide/enable biodiversity benefits as the result of substitution following relocation of affected facilities, especially if 'soft' coastal defences comprising specific coastal habitats are likely to comprise part of the criteria and guidance for replacement.	↓↓	This policy could act against achieving this objective, causing vulnerable species and habitats to be at greater risk from new development.	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	This policy should help to directly meet this sustainability objective to a large extent. It is complimentary to NE1, NE3 covering GI and biodiversity geological protection.	↑↑	There is potential for this policy to provide/enable landscape benefits that could help to meet this objective, especially if 'soft' coastal defences comprising specific coastal habitats are likely to comprise part of the criteria and guidance.	→	There is potential for this policy to provide/enable landscape benefits as the result of substitution following relocation of affected facilities, especially if 'soft' coastal defences comprising specific coastal habitats are likely to comprise part of the criteria and guidance for replacement.	↓↓	This policy would fail to fully address the importance of coastal landscape character and sense of place in relation to new development.	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.

EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑	This policy would make clear how new development should be sited/designed to result in a high quality built environment appropriate to coastal and countryside character.	→→	There is potential for this policy to provide for higher quality in the coastal built environment in relation to increasing/ensuring the resilience of new development to coastal flooding, i.e. adaptive response to climate change impacts.	→→	There is potential for this policy to provide for higher quality in the coastal built environment in relation to increasing/ensuring the resilience of new re-located development to coastal flooding, i.e. adaptive response to climate change impacts.	←←	This policy would fail to fully address the importance of coastal landscape character and sense of place in relation to new development.	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑	This policy would make clear how new development should be sited/designed to result in least emissions.	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↓	Not having a policy may mean that emissions reduction has less emphasis, especially in relation to traffic demand management.	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑	This policy would make clear how new development should be sited/designed to help ensure water quality (through appropriate treatment in coastal areas) and supply into the future.	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↓	Not having a policy may result in reduced emphasis on provision for water supply, treatment and conservation in coastal areas.	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	This policy should help to directly meet this sustainability objective to a large extent. It is complimentary to NE1, NE3 covering G1 and biodiversity geological protection.	↑	This policy should help to directly meet this sustainability objective to a large extent by reducing loss of land and soil-sealing by new development. It is complimentary to NE1, NE3 covering G1 and biodiversity geological protection.	↑	This policy should help to directly meet this sustainability objective to a large extent as the result of re-location of existing development, reversing soil sealing. It is complimentary to NE1, NE3 covering G1 and biodiversity geological protection.	↓	This option fails to address the importance of adequately protecting valuable areas of land and soils that play an important role in coastal defence, and need to be protected from development.	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	↔	No significant effects either way	None
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This policy could address the importance of specific sectors, e.g. coastal fishing and tourism to help regulate new development in ways to benefit employment security and new opportunities.	→	This option could support this objective by helping to protect from coastal erosion and secure existing employment and growth.	→	This option could support this objective by helping to protect from coastal erosion and secure existing employment and growth.	←	Not having a policy could adversely affect achieving this objective by failing to address the unique economic character and role of Allerdale's coastal areas for tourism and local products	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↔	No significant effects either way	→	This option could help to protect key access networks and sectors, to support access to jobs.	→	This option could help to protect key access networks and sectors, to support access to jobs.	↔	No significant effects either way	There is a slight, indirect benefit from the preferred options
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑	This option could help to meet this objective by addressing how new development could help specific sectors by attracting inward investment.	→	This option could help to meet this objective by protecting key areas from flood risk and related events, thus helping to attract inward investment and appropriate economic growth	→	This option could help to meet this objective by ensuring the protection of key facilities, thus helping to attract inward investment and appropriate economic growth	←	Not having a policy could adversely affect achieving this objective by failing to address the unique economic character and role of Allerdale's coastal areas for tourism and local products	The preferred options help to meet this objective. Policy NE7a does not.

Key: Significance of Effects		S1 Sustainable Development Principles	
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	⇨	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇦	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	S1: Sustainable Development Principles			
	Preferred Option	Alternative Option	Comments	
	(1): Overarching policy to promote sustainable development as a core principle, all new development within the Borough will be of a high standard, sustainable and sympathetic to the needs of both local communities and the environment	S1a: Do not include an overarching sustainable development policy		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↑↑ The scope of this option will fully meet this objective in relation to active participation in the planning process	↓ The statutory planning process requires SA and progressive consultation but this option could reduce explicit emphasis on the need to achieve 'joined-up' sustainable outcomes.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching aim for participation within the Core Strategy.	
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑ This option emphasises the importance of self-contained communities, adequate services and good physical infrastructure.	↓ This option could result in less emphasis and 'joined-up' policy implementation in regards to this objective.	The preferred option is the most sustainable because it provides an overarching policy for sustainability as a common theme within the Core Strategy.	
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑ This objective is implicit in this option rather than being explicitly stated.	↓ This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option could be strengthened by a more explicit reference to decent homes to meet household needs over time.	
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑↑ This option emphasises the importance of skills and lifelong learning opportunities, linked to employment.	↓ This option fails to emphasise the importance of skills and lifelong learning as an overarching sustainability principle.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching aim for life-long learning provision within the Core Strategy.	
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑↑ This option emphasises the importance of enabling healthy lifestyles and well-being through the planning process.	↓ This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching aim for enabling health and well-being via the Core Strategy.	
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑ This option fully meets this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.	↓ This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching aim for enabling vibrant, inclusive health and sustainable communities via the Core Strategy.	
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑ This option fully meets this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.	↓ This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching aim for protecting and enhancing biodiversity via the Core Strategy.	
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑ This option fully meets this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.	↓ This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching aim for protecting and enhancing landscapes via the Core Strategy.	
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑ This option fully meets this objective, emphasising the importance of good design and retaining local distinctiveness.	↓ This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching aim for a high quality built environment delivered via the Core Strategy.	
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑ This option fully meets this objective, setting out principles for energy efficient design/construction and energy systems.	↓ This option may have little adverse impact because other policies, including the climate change policy, help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching aim for a high quality built environment delivered via the Core Strategy.	
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑↑ This option fully meets this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.	↓ This option could result in less emphasis and 'joined-up' policy implementation in regards to this objective.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching approach to water resources and usage via the Core Strategy.	
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑↑ This option fully meets this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.	↓ This option could result in less emphasis and 'joined-up' policy implementation in regards to this objective.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching approach to land and soil protection via the Core Strategy.	
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑↑ This option fully meets this objective, setting out principles for energy efficient design/construction and energy systems.	↓ This option may have little adverse impact because other policies, including strategic minerals and waste planning, help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching aim for natural resource protection and sustainable waste management via the Core Strategy.	
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑ This option addresses skills development and local business diversity without explicitly emphasising job security and new employment opportunities	↓ This option could result in less emphasis and 'joined-up' policy implementation in regards to this objective.	The preferred option could be strengthened by a more explicit reference to new development that helps retain existing jobs and the creation of new job opportunities.	
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑ This option fully meets this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.	↓ This option may have little adverse impact because other policies, including those for transport, housing and economy, help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides the Core Strategy with an overarching statement for good access to employment.	
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑ This option fully meets this objective; they are mutually reinforcing.	↓ This option may have little adverse impact because other policies, including strategic minerals and waste planning, help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in relation to this objective because it provides an overarching aim for economic diversification within a sustainability context for the Core Strategy.	

NB: The SA framework itself is meant to be used as a means of achieving sustainable planning solutions and new development, so adopting the local SA framework as a SPD would enable its use in support of the preferred sustainability policy.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S2 Adapting and mitigating the effects of climate change

Sustainability Objectives	S2: Adapting and mitigating the effects of climate change				Comments
	Preferred Option		Alternative Option		
	(1): Include an overarching policy on climate change to ensure that the impact of new development on climate change is mitigated and that a comfortable, liveable environment can be ensured across the Borough by adapting to the effects of climate change		S2a: Do not include an overarching policy on the adaptation to or mitigation against climate change		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effects; this objective is not addressed by this policy option	↔	No significant effects; this objective is not addressed by this policy option	This objective is fully covered in the accompanying preferred option for an overarching sustainability policy.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This option makes clear that new development must be resilient to impacts into the future in terms of location, design/construction and layout	↓↓	No other policies in the core strategy cover this issue, so this option would leave the Core Strategy vulnerable.	The preferred option is by far the most sustainable option; it is essential for a robust Core Strategy.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑↑	This option makes clear that new development must be resilient to impacts into the future in terms of location, design/construction and layout	↓↓	No other policies in the core strategy cover this issue, so this option would leave the Core Strategy vulnerable.	The preferred option is by far the most sustainable option; it is essential for a robust Core Strategy.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↔	No significant effects; this objective is not addressed by this policy option	↔	No significant effects; this objective is not addressed by this policy option	Other policies meet this objective, and it is well-covered in the accompanying preferred sustainability policy option.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	This option identifies essential adaptation measures critical in the planning process without making explicit reference to health and 'liveability' of new development into the future, e.g. to reduce 'heat island' effects.	↓	This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	Although implicit in the current version, the preferred option could be re-worded to emphasise the importance of ensuring a comfortable, liveable environment through the adaptation measures listed.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↔	No significant effects; this objective is not addressed by this policy option	↔	No significant effects; this objective is not addressed by this policy option	Other policies meet this objective, and it is well-covered in the accompanying preferred sustainability policy option.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑	This option fully addresses enabling resilient future habitats, the importance of GI and enabling species resilience.	↓	This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑	Climate change impacts on landscape character could be considerable over time but this is not really addressed in this policy option, with the emphasis being more on biodiversity (species and habitats)	↓↓	Whilst landscape character is fully addressed in the NE policies, change in landscapes over time due to climate change is not. This option would leave the Core Strategy vulnerable	The preferred option is by far the most sustainable option but needs more explicit wording about facilitating resilience in landscape character over time as an essential aspect of the Core Strategy.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This option fully addresses enabling resilient future habitats, the importance of GI and enabling species resilience.	↓	This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This option fully addresses enabling this objective.	↓	This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑	Climate change impacts on water resources could be considerable over time but this is not addressed in this policy option.	↓	This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable but needs to be explicit about protecting water resources and water quality from climate impacts to more fully compliment the related, preferred sustainability policy option.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑↑	This option fully addresses enabling this objective, by explicitly stating the importance of protecting soils in order to ensure they are resilient to climate change	↓↓	Other policies help towards meeting this objective, but without an explicit, overarching commitment the Core Strategy will be less robust.	The preferred option is the most sustainable and it is complimented in the accompanying preferred sustainability policy option.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↔	No significant effects; this objective is not addressed by this policy option	↔	No significant effects; this objective is not addressed by this policy option	Other policies meet this objective, and it is well-covered in the accompanying preferred sustainability policy option.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↔	No significant effects; this objective is not addressed by this policy option	↔	No significant effects; this objective is not addressed by this policy option	Other policies meet this objective, and it is well-covered in the accompanying preferred sustainability policy option.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This option fully addresses enabling this objective, by explicitly addressing the location, layout and design of new development and infrastructure	↓	This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑	This option fully addresses enabling this objective, by explicitly addressing the location, layout and design of new development and infrastructure, local food production and farming.	↓	This option may have little adverse impact because other policies help to fully meet this objective, although an overarching commitment would be useful.	The preferred option is the most sustainable, but it could be strengthened by stating the importance of using the planning process to facilitate new economic opportunities presented by climate change for farming, tourism and other sectors.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	⇒⇒	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	⇒	Minor beneficial
⇅	Potentially beneficial	⇅	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇅	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	⇅	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	⇅⇅	Major adverse
⇅	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S3 Delivering a Sustainable and Diverse Local Economy

Sustainability Objectives	S3: Delivering a Sustainable and Diverse Local Economy				Comments
	Preferred Option		Alternative Option		
	(1): Include an overarching strategic economic policy for the area		S3a: Do not include a strategic economic overview		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	⇅	This option supports stakeholders views, helping to indirectly meet this objective	↔	No significant effect	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This policy option is supportive of this objective as it seeks to expand the existing economy and develop new businesses and retail, cultural and leisure facilities within the main towns, therefore increasing access to services for residents. The option also seeks to improve communications in terms of transport infrastructure and broadband which will also help to improve access to services and facilities further.	↑	Whilst the individual economic policies will remain in the strategy, without this strategic overview there is a risk that planning for the development of existing and future services and facilities will not be undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner, therefore potentially failing in addressing this objective whilst meeting other areas.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⇅	This policy option promotes development of retail, cultural and leisure facilities and communications infrastructure, and also supports the rural economy through the support of options such as farm diversification and live/work units. These developments will indirectly support this objective as in the wider holistic sense a decent home is influenced by your surrounding environment, services and facilities. The policy option also seeks to promote high quality design.	⇅	Whilst the individual economic policies will remain in the strategy, without this strategic overview there is a risk that planning for future economic development will not be undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner, therefore potentially failing in addressing this objective whilst meeting other areas.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑↑	The policy option and objective are directly compatible as the option seeks to promote the delivery of training programmes and educational facilities. In addition through supporting growth in the economy there will be further opportunities for employment and training.	↑	Whilst the individual economic policies will remain in the strategy, without this strategic overview there is a risk that planning for the development of existing and future educational facilities and training will not be undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner, therefore potentially failing in addressing this objective whilst meeting other areas.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	⇅	This policy option promotes development of services and facilities (including healthcare facilities) and communications infrastructure, and also supports the rural economy through the support of options such as farm diversification and live/work units. These developments will indirectly support this objective as health and well-being is influenced by your surrounding environment, services and facilities.	⇅	Whilst the individual economic policies will remain in the strategy, without this strategic overview there is a risk that planning for the development of existing and future services and facilities will not be undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner, therefore potentially failing in addressing this objective whilst meeting other areas.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	The policy seeks to promote a strategic approach to economic growth across the Borough by ensuring that settlements are well served by employment, services and facilities, the vibrancy of the community will be maintained. Further, the policy seeks to promote the delivery of high quality tourist attractions, which include local historical sites.	⇅	Whilst the individual economic policies will remain in the strategy, without this strategic overview there is a risk that planning for future economic development and thus support for local communities will not be undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner, therefore potentially failing in addressing this objective whilst meeting other areas.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	⇅	The policy is promoting a strategic approach to economic development across the Borough and seeks to promote most growth in existing centres, this will be a potentially positive benefit for biodiversity as there will be less focus on rural potentially greenfield development and more likelihood of use of PDL etc. However, as available land becomes more restricted in the main centres there may be a push to identify greenfield sites on the outskirts which will potentially adversely impact biodiversity.	⇅	Whilst the individual economic policies will remain in the strategy, without this strategic overview there is a risk that planning for future economic development will not be undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner, therefore potentially failing in addressing this objective in terms of allowing piecemeal economic development to take place in locations that might not be considered the most appropriate for ecological terms, whilst meeting other objective areas.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	⇅	The policy is promoting a strategic approach to economic development across the Borough and seeks to promote most growth in existing centres, this will be a potentially positive benefit for landscape character as there will be less focus on rural potentially greenfield development. However, as available land becomes more restricted in the main centres there may be a push to identify greenfield sites on the outskirts which will potentially adversely impact landscape character and result in fragmentation.	⇅	Whilst the individual economic policies will remain in the strategy, without this strategic overview there is a risk that planning for future economic development will not be undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner, therefore potentially failing in addressing this objective in terms of allowing piecemeal economic development to take place in locations that might not be considered the most appropriate in landscape terms, whilst meeting other objective areas.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇅	The policy seeks to ensure that new development is of the right quality, scale and location, the actual impacts will not be able to be determined until implementation, however, there are clearly some potential positive benefits.	⇅	Without the presence of a strategic policy there is the risk that economic development will take place in a piecemeal basis without appropriately considering all important elements of the development, therefore there is a risk that the development will not be of a high quality or commensurate with the scale of its location.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑	The policy option seeks to promote economic development in sustainable locations and focussing on existing centres, having a strategic approach to location of development that links into the approach for housing development will reduce the need to travel therefore potentially reducing the amount of greenhouse gas emissions arising as a result of commuting and using the new economic development.	⇅	Without a strategic approach to economic development that links into other development there is the risk that economic development is not in the most sustainable locations potentially increasing the need to travel by private car and therefore resulting in a potential increase in emissions.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⇅	Potential indirect link, through taking a more strategic approach to consideration of new location for development will ensure that issues such as flood risk and drainage are fully considered at the plan stage.	⇅	Without a strategic approach there is the risk that encouraging economic development across the Borough will result in development taking place in areas at risk from flooding or with concerns over drainage and water resources which will potentially result in an exacerbation of existing issues in the Borough.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇅	Whilst this policy option promotes development which has the potential to impact on land and soil resources, taking a strategic approach to allocating employment land should help to ensure that the development takes place in the most appropriate and sustainable locations, which will generally be in the main centres where there is greater potential to reuse PDL.	⇅	Without a strategic approach to future economic development, there is a risk that development will take place in a piecemeal fashion across the district which could potentially result in greater impacts on land and soil than the strategic approach proposed in (1).	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⇅	Potential indirect link, through taking a more strategic approach to consideration of new location for development will ensure that issues such as waste management and minerals are fully considered at the plan stage.	⇅	Without a strategic approach there is the risk that encouraging economic development across the Borough.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This policy option directly supports the objective	↑	Whilst the individual economic policies will remain in the strategy, without this strategic overview there is a risk that planning for the development of existing and future employment opportunities will not be undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This policy option directly supports the objective	↑	Whilst the individual economic policies will remain in the strategy, without this strategic overview there is a risk that planning for the development of existing and future employment opportunities will not be undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	This policy option directly supports the objective	↑	Whilst the individual economic policies will remain in the strategy, without this strategic overview there is a risk that planning for the development of the Borough's economy will not be undertaken in the most effective and efficient manner	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	→	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	←	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S4 Developer Contributions

Sustainability Objectives	S4: Developer Contributions				Comments
	Preferred Option		Alternative Option		
	(1): Require new developments to secure infrastructure improvements which are necessary to make the development acceptable by planning condition or obligations in accordance with circular 05/2005, obligations may also be required for maintenance payments to meet running costs or compensate for damage caused		S4a: No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	→→	Whilst public participation is not necessarily directly involved in using the community infrastructure levy and planning obligations, this policy enables community aspirations and needs to be appropriately addressed with the aim of avoiding or reducing negative impacts and improving local quality of life.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This option presents a highly flexible and comprehensive solution for optimising access to services, facilities and open green space	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	→→	Directly beneficial to local community as a whole and indirectly supporting the provision of decent homes within a neighbour context	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	→→	This option fully enables the successful provision of skills, education and training opportunities, because this option considers both the infrastructure and site specific developments.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑↑	This option presents a highly flexible and comprehensive solution for ensuring an improvement on general health and well-being.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑↑	This option presents a highly flexible and comprehensive solution for ensuring an improvement of the community vibrancy and sense of place	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑↑	This option presents are far more flexible and comprehensive solution for ensuring the protection and enhancement of the communities biodiversity.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑↑	This option presents are far more holistic approach to enhancing landscape character and green infrastructure throughout the area.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↑↑	This combination ensures that the quality of the built environment is fully considered and appropriately addressed at every level.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This combination ensures that an greater, all encompassing approach can be taken for the community for improving air quality and implementing climate change mitigation measures.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↑↑	By using the community infrastructure levy in combination with s106 agreement, water efficiency, flood risk management, SuDS and similar measures for Allerdale can be more effectively planned for and implemented.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑↑	By using the community infrastructure levy in combination with s106 agreement, flood risk management, SuDS and similar measures for Allerdale can be more effectively planned for and implemented. The CIL can consider on the regions brownfield capacity and ensure that reuse of previously developed land and existing buildings are considered alongside or instead of the development of virgin land.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑↑	By using the community infrastructure levy in combination with s106 agreement, Site Waste Management Plans and a wider review of resources available in the region can be considered during the construction phase of the development. Also access to local waste recycling facilities can be considered during the design phase, encouraging high recycling rates of waste during operational phase.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	→→	This option provides a greater benefit, although indirect, to retaining existing and increasing new employment opportunities by providing business centres for small, new start-up business affordable office space and services, such as meeting rooms, and ensuring that affordable public transport options are available to encourage residents to work within the region and not be reliant on the use of private car travel.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	→→	By using the community infrastructure levy in combination with s106 agreements, provides a greater benefit, although indirect, to promoting equal employment opportunities to the whole community and improve the qualification and skills of the local population, e.g. stipulating a minimum percentage of affordable housing, training centres to be included in the plan.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	By using the community infrastructure levy in combination with s106 agreement, there is a far more holistic approach taken to ensuring a diverse, dynamic economy across the Borough, e.g. ensuring regional transport networks enable easy access within settlements for both local residents and visitors to the region.	↔	No alternative policy option as policy is required by circular 05/2005 'Planning Obligations'	The preferred option is required by circular 05/2005 and is also the most sustainable approach.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↕	Potentially beneficial	↔	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	↔	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S6 Settlement Hierarchy

Sustainability Objectives	S6: Settlement Hierarchy										Comments
	Preferred Option		Alternative Options								
	(1): Definition of Principal Service Centre, Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Rural Villages to underpin how future growth will be distributed across the settlement hierarchy to reflect the role of the settlement and ensure that development is appropriate to scale and environmental and infrastructure capacity		S6a: Concentrate growth on Principal and Key Service Centres	S6b: Urban Focus / Rural Concentration	S6c: Update of current Local Plan settlement hierarchy	S6d: Focussed distribution of rural villages					
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	↔	No significant effects	None
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This policy option is directly supportive of this objective. The option ensures that the majority of development will be located in the existing urban centres that provide the best range of services, employment opportunities and access to public transport. The option also provides facilities and services in the rural villages, which reduces rural deprivation and isolation.	↕	This option will ensure that most new development is in close proximity to services, thus improving access. With a bias against development in rural locations, there is the potential for services within these settings to suffer and affect their viability, this will in turn potentially adversely affect the ability for people in rural areas to access services.	↕	This option will ensure that new housing development is in close proximity to services, thus improving opportunities to enjoy these areas. This option may present a greater opportunity to provide comprehensive services / facilities in urban areas (as a result of economic investment in the area and economies of scale).	↑	This policy option is directly supportive of this objective. The option ensures that the majority of development will be located in the existing urban centres that provide the best range of services, employment opportunities and access to public transport. The option also provides facilities and services in many of the rural villages which are already supporting an existing service or facility, which reduces rural deprivation and isolation.	↑	This policy option is directly supportive of this objective. The option ensures that the majority of development will be located in the existing urban centres that provide the best range of services, employment opportunities and access to public transport. The option also provides facilities and services in some rural villages which are already supporting a range of existing services and facilities, this will help to address some rural accessibility issues but fails to properly tackle rural deprivation and isolation as it focuses on those settlements already well served by facilities and services.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑	This policy option recognises that smaller rural settlements would benefit from small scale infill development to remain sustainable. This will help to provide decent affordable housing across the Borough and help younger people to remain in rural settlements should they choose to.	↓	the quality and affordability of housing within Allerdale. However, the provision of rural affordable housing will not be addressed through this policy and may therefore disadvantage those people not living in the PSC and KSCs who require affordable housing.	↓	New residential development should help to improve the quality and affordability of housing within Allerdale. However the provision of rural affordable housing in LSCs only is likely to disadvantage those people within rural areas not designated as LSCs who require affordable housing.	↑	This policy option recognises that smaller rural settlements would benefit from small scale infill development to remain sustainable. This will help to provide decent affordable housing across the Borough and help younger people to remain in rural settlements should they choose to.	↑	This option does provide some more rural housing in addition to the housing provision in urban areas, however the definition of rural areas to be served by development is very limited and therefore this will not help those in rural areas access decent and affordable housing effectively.	The preferred option and S6c perform most strongly in terms of this objective, however, (1) is considered the preferred approach as it reaches the widest possible spread of areas.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑↑	This policy option continues to focus the majority of the development in the main urban centres ensuring good access to educational facilities for the majority of the population, however it will also benefit the smaller settlements, within 2.5km of a school, in providing additional development which should help to support the viability of schools in these areas.	↓	This option will ensure that development is in close proximity to educational facilities. However, there is the potential for capacity of schools to be exceeded as a result of population growth. There is also the potential that the viability of schools in smaller and more rural settlements may be affected as the result of the presumption against new residential development in those areas.	↕	This option will ensure that new housing development is in close proximity to educational facilities. However, there is the potential for capacity of schools to be exceeded as a result of population growth. In addition, not supporting all schools may place those schools in more rural areas at risk of closure due to lower numbers. This option may present a greater opportunity to provide comprehensive educational facilities in urban areas (as a result of economic investment in the area and economies of scale).	↑	This policy option continues to focus the majority of the development in the main urban centres ensuring good access to educational facilities for the majority of the population, and it will also benefit some of the smaller settlements, in providing additional development which should help to support the viability of schools in these areas. However, as it restricts the rural settlements identified as being suitable for development, there is the risk that the vitality of some of the more rural schools served by villages falling outside of the definitions will be adversely affected.	↑	This policy option continues to focus the majority of the development in the main urban centres ensuring good access to educational facilities for the majority of the population, and it will also benefit some of the smaller settlements, in providing additional development which should help to support the viability of schools in these areas. However, as it significantly restricts the rural settlements identified as being suitable for development, there is the risk that the vitality of some of the rural schools served by villages falling outside of the definitions will be adversely affected.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	The policy option will ensure that the majority of the population are in close proximity to healthcare facilities which are generally located in the main urban centres, however through enabling additional small scale development in rural areas that are within 2.5km of a school, the option will help to provide services and facilities which may help to address issues of rural isolation and benefit general well-being.	↕	This option will ensure that housing development is in close proximity to healthcare services and recreational opportunities. However, there is the potential for the capacity of these facilities to be exceeded as a result of population growth. Focusing growth in the PSC and KSCs may help to improve mental well-being in these areas as this may contribute to reducing economic deprivation and inequalities, however, restricting development from LSCs and other rural settlements may adversely affect the viability of facilities and services in the areas and could contribute to increasing rural isolation and deprivation.	↕	This option will ensure that new housing is in close proximity to healthcare facilities and recreational opportunities are easily available. However, there is the potential for the capacity of these facilities to be exceeded as a result of population growth. Mental well-being in those centres where development takes place may be improved as this may contribute to reducing economic deprivation and inequalities. However in other areas where no development is taking place inequalities may increase. This option may present a greater opportunity to provide comprehensive healthcare facilities in urban areas (as a result of economic investment in the area and economies of scale).	↑	The policy option will ensure that the majority of the population are in close proximity to healthcare facilities which are generally located in the main urban centres, however through enabling additional small scale development in some rural areas, the option will help to provide services and facilities which may help to address issues of rural isolation and benefit general well-being.	↕	This option will ensure that new housing is in close proximity to healthcare facilities and recreational opportunities are easily available. However, there is the potential for the capacity of these facilities to be exceeded as a result of population growth. However in other rural areas, outside of the descriptions for this option, where no development is taking place, inequalities and rural isolation may increase.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	Through enabling small scale development in rural areas, this should help to maintain the viability and vitality of small settlements benefitting the local communities.	↓	This option may limit accessibility to local housing for residents of LSCs and other rural settlements, which may in turn increase house prices. This may lead to a sense of community being lost as younger residents have to move away from the local area.	↓	This option may limit accessibility to local housing for residents of LSCs and other rural settlements, which may in turn increase house prices. This may lead to a sense of community being lost as younger residents have to move away from the local area.	↑	Through enabling small scale development in rural areas, this should help to maintain the viability and vitality of small settlements benefitting the local communities.	↕	This policy option does enable development in some of the larger rural villages which should help to maintain their vitality and viability, however, restricting development in other rural settlements, will potentially have an adverse effect on communities as younger people may have to move away from the area to afford housing etc.	The preferred option and S6c perform most strongly in terms of this objective, however, (1) is considered the preferred approach as it supports a larger range of communities.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↓	This option may have an effect upon biodiversity depending on the precise location of development. Large scale development in and surrounding Workington and Cockermouth could affect the River Derwent SAC. There are also various SSSIs and CWSS which could be affected by development in some of the identified Centres. In addition, the identification of small infill sites in rural areas is likely to be greenfield rather than brownfield land, which will potentially affect biodiversity.	↓	This option may have an effect upon biodiversity depending on the precise location of development. Large scale development in and surrounding Workington and Cockermouth could affect the River Derwent SAC. There are also various SSSIs and CWSS which could be affected by development in some of the identified Centres.	↓	This option may have an effect upon biodiversity depending on the precise location of development. Large scale development in and surrounding Workington and Cockermouth could affect the River Derwent SAC. There are also various SSSIs and CWSS which could be affected by development in some of the identified Centres.	↓	This option may have an effect upon biodiversity depending on the precise location of development. Large scale development in and surrounding Workington and Cockermouth could affect the River Derwent SAC. There are also various SSSIs and CWSS which could be affected by development in some of the identified Centres. In addition, the identification of small infill sites in rural areas is likely to be greenfield rather than brownfield land, which will potentially affect biodiversity.	↓	This option may have an effect upon biodiversity depending on the precise location of development. Large scale development in and surrounding Workington and Cockermouth could affect the River Derwent SAC. There are also various SSSIs and CWSS which could be affected by development in some of the identified Centres. In addition, the identification of small infill sites in some of the larger rural areas is likely to be greenfield rather than brownfield land, which will potentially affect biodiversity.	All options will have a potentially adverse impact on biodiversity. The potential issues will need to be considered as part of the HRA and on a more site specific basis.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↓	This option may have an effect upon landscape character and quality depending on the precise location of development. Large scale development in and surrounding the main urban areas could affect greenfield land on the edge of settlements as space becomes more limited in the centre. In addition, the identification of small infill sites in rural areas has the potential to have an urbanising effect on the rural location and will potentially affect landscape character.	↕	This option will minimise development in rural areas and may therefore limit the impact of the development on the rural landscape. However, this option may also increase the rate of development on the greenfield land on the edge of the centres because of the restriction on the overall area of development land available; this will have an impact upon landscape corridors between settlements in the south of the Borough.	↕	This option will minimise development in rural areas and may therefore limit the impact of the development on the rural landscape. However, this option may also increase the rate of development on the greenfield land on the edge of the centres because of the restriction on the overall area of development land available; this will have an impact upon landscape corridors between settlements in the south of the Borough.	↓	This option may have an effect upon landscape character and quality depending on the precise location of development. Large scale development in and surrounding the main urban areas could affect greenfield land on the edge of settlements as space becomes more limited in the centre. In addition, the identification of small infill sites in some rural areas has the potential to have an urbanising effect on the rural location and will potentially affect landscape character.	↕	This option will restrict development in rural areas to the larger settlements and may therefore limit the impact of the development on the rural landscape. However, this option may also increase the rate of development on the greenfield land on the edge of the centres because of the restriction on the overall area of development land available; this will have an impact upon landscape corridors between settlements in the south of the Borough.	All options will have a potentially adverse impact on landscape character and quality. There is the potential that by spreading development out into rural areas the preferred option will perform less well than some of the alternative options with a more urban focus. The impact on landscape and landscape character will depend on design and implementation and will need to be considered in more detail on a site specific basis.

EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇅	This option will focus the majority of development in urban areas, presenting a significant opportunity to improve the quality of the built environment. The nature of the effect will ultimately depend on the quality of the design. There are historical resources such as Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings within the centres which may be affected by development. Large scale development within Workington, Maryport and Cockermouth may result in the development of land at risk from flooding. The option will also provide new development in more rural villages, the potential effect of this development on the built environment here will also depend on the quality of the design and implementation.	⇅	This option will maximise development in urban areas, presenting a significant opportunity to improve the quality of the built environment. The nature of the effect will ultimately depend on the quality of the design. There are historical resources such as Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings within the centres which may be affected by development. Large scale development within Workington, Maryport and Cockermouth may result in the development of land at risk from flooding.	⇅	This option will maximise development in urban areas, presenting a significant opportunity to improve the quality of the built environment. The nature of the effect will ultimately depend on the quality of the design. There are historical resources such as Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings within the centres which may be affected by development. Large scale development within Workington, Maryport and Cockermouth may result in the development of land at risk from flooding.	⇅	This option will focus the majority of development in urban areas, presenting a significant opportunity to improve the quality of the built environment. The nature of the effect will ultimately depend on the quality of the design. There are historical resources such as Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings within the centres which may be affected by development. Large scale development within Workington, Maryport and Cockermouth may result in the development of land at risk from flooding. The option will also provide new development in some rural villages, the potential effect of this development on the built environment here will also depend on the quality of the design and implementation.	⇅	This option will focus the majority of development in urban areas, presenting a significant opportunity to improve the quality of the built environment. The nature of the effect will ultimately depend on the quality of the design. There are historical resources such as Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings within the centres which may be affected by development. Large scale development within Workington, Maryport and Cockermouth may result in the development of land at risk from flooding. The option will also provide new development in a limited number of rural villages, the potential effect of this development on the built environment here will also depend on the quality of the design and implementation.	All options will have potentially beneficial and adverse impact on the built environment. The potential issues will need to be considered on a more site specific basis and will depend on design and implementation.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑	This option will focus the majority of new development in urban areas which should help to minimise the need for private car travel and encourage people to walk, cycle and make use of public transport. This may help improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The option will also provide additional services and facilities in more rural areas, which should also help to make these settlements more sustainable, further reducing the need to travel.	↑	This option will maximise development in urban areas which should help to minimise the need for private car travel and encourage people to walk, cycle and make use of public transport. This may help improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	↑	This option will maximise development in urban areas which should help to minimise the need for private car travel and encourage people to walk, cycle and make use of public transport. This may help improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	↑	This option will focus the majority of new development in urban areas which should help to minimise the need for private car travel and encourage people to walk, cycle and make use of public transport. This may also provide additional services and facilities in some more rural areas, which should also help to make these settlements more sustainable, further reducing the need to travel.	↑	This option will maximise development in urban areas which should help to minimise the need for private car travel and encourage people to walk, cycle and make use of public transport. This may help improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	The preferred option and S6c perform most strongly in terms of this objective, however, (1) is considered the preferred approach as it supports a larger range of communities.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⇅	The option has the potential to affect water quality and resources depending on the location of new development and the implementation. There is a particular problem related to drainage capacity in Cockermouth that restricts the amount of development that can take place there, however, the option provides a balance between all settlements and therefore does not entirely focus on the urban centres where issues such as drainage and flooding currently exist. There is also the potential that new development could help to support the construction of new infrastructure to address current issues.	↓	This option may have an effect upon water quality depending on the precise location of development in relation to rivers and groundwater resources. There is a particular problem related to drainage capacity, particularly in Cockermouth that is restricting the amount of development that can take place there. Further development in this area may result in exceeding the existing capacity leading to water resource issues in the town.	↓	This option may have an effect upon water quality depending on the precise location of development in relation to rivers and groundwater resources. There is a particular problem related to drainage capacity, particularly in Cockermouth that is restricting the amount of development that can take place there. Further development in this area may result in exceeding the existing capacity leading to water resource issues in the town.	⇅	The option has the potential to affect water quality and resources depending on the location of new development and the implementation. There is a particular problem related to drainage capacity in Cockermouth that restricts the amount of development that can take place there, however, the option provides a balance between all settlements and therefore does not entirely focus on the urban centres where issues such as drainage and flooding currently exist. There is also the potential that new development could help to support the construction of new infrastructure to address current issues.	↓	This option may have an effect upon water quality depending on the precise location of development in relation to rivers and groundwater resources. There is a particular problem related to drainage capacity, particularly in Cockermouth that is restricting the amount of development that can take place there. Further development in this area may result in exceeding the existing capacity leading to water resource issues in the town.	The preferred option and S6c perform most strongly in terms of this objective, however, (1) is considered the preferred approach as it supports a larger range of communities and therefore creates more opportunities to avoid and manage risk and impacts.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	⇅	This policy option will focus the majority of development in urban areas which will provide more opportunities for the reuse of PDL and existing buildings. However the option does enable development in more rural areas which will be more likely to result in the use of greenfield land.	↑	This option will maximise development in urban areas, which will provide more opportunities for, and re-use of, PDL and existing buildings, which will contribute towards the restoration and protection of land and soils.	↑	This option will maximise development in urban areas, which will provide more opportunities for, and re-use of, PDL and existing buildings, which will contribute towards the restoration and protection of land and soils.	⇅	This policy option will focus the majority of development in urban areas which will provide more opportunities for the reuse of PDL and existing buildings. However the option does enable development in more rural areas which will be more likely to result in the use of greenfield land.	↑	This option will maximise development in urban areas, which will provide more opportunities for, and re-use of, PDL and existing buildings, which will contribute towards the restoration and protection of land and soils. There will be development in some of the larger rural villages but less rural development than (1) or S6c.	The preferred option performs less well than some of the alternative options identified as an urban focus would ensure that use of PDL is prioritised, spreading development out to the rural areas reduces the potential to reuse PDL and other buildings.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⇅	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on waste generation and mineral resources. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	↑	This option may present a greater opportunity to provide comprehensive recycling facilities in urban areas (as a result of economic investment in the area and economies of scale).	↑	This option may present a greater opportunity to provide comprehensive recycling facilities in urban areas (as a result of economic investment in the area and economies of scale).	⇅	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on waste generation and mineral resources. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇅	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on waste generation and mineral resources. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	The preferred option performs less well than some of the alternative options identified as an urban focus would provide greater opportunity in terms of waste management options. The issues of mineral resources and waste management need to be considered as part of site specific development plans.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑↑	This option will focus commercial development in urban areas and support the role of the PSC and KSCs and larger LSCs, helping to create new employment opportunities and maintain existing jobs in these areas. This option also supports development in rural areas which could potentially mean farm diversification and growth of rural businesses to create additional jobs in the rural areas in addition to the urban focus.	↑	This option will maximise commercial development in urban areas and support the role of the PSC and KSCs and larger LSCs, helping to create new employment opportunities and maintain existing jobs in these areas.	↑	This option will maximise commercial development in urban areas and support the role of the PSC and KSCs and larger LSCs, helping to create new employment opportunities and maintain existing jobs in these areas.	↑↑	This option will focus commercial development in urban areas and support the role of the PSC and KSCs and larger LSCs, helping to create new employment opportunities and maintain existing jobs in these areas. This option also supports development in some rural areas which could potentially mean farm diversification and growth of rural businesses to create additional jobs in the rural areas in addition to the urban focus.	↑	This option will focus the majority of commercial development in urban areas and support the role of the PSC and KSCs and larger LSCs, helping to create new employment opportunities and maintain existing jobs in these areas.	The preferred option and S6c perform most strongly in terms of this objective, however, (1) is considered the preferred approach as it supports a larger range of communities.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This option will focus commercial development in urban areas where the majority of the population reside, this will ensure that employment opportunities are easily accessible and by sustainable means. In addition supporting the development of commercial growth in rural areas will enable rural settlements to be better served by employment opportunities and increase accessibility to jobs for residents in these settlements.	⇅	This option will maximise commercial development in urban areas, meaning that jobs created will be in accessible locations and those areas which may be in most need of employment opportunities. However, this option limits commercial development in rural areas and may therefore have an effect upon people's access to jobs in these areas.	⇅	This option will maximise commercial development in urban areas, meaning that jobs created will be in accessible locations and those areas which may be in most need of employment opportunities. However, this option limits commercial development in rural areas and may therefore have an effect upon people's access to jobs in these areas.	↑↑	This option will focus commercial development in urban areas where the majority of the population reside, this will ensure that employment opportunities are easily accessible and by sustainable means. In addition supporting the development of commercial growth in some rural areas will enable these rural settlements to be better served by employment opportunities and increase accessibility to jobs for residents in these settlements.	↑	This option will focus the majority of commercial development in urban areas, meaning that jobs created will be in accessible locations and those areas which may be in most need of employment opportunities. However, this option limits commercial development in rural areas and may therefore have an effect upon people's access to jobs in these areas. There will be development in the larger rural villages which will increase accessibility for those residents.	The preferred option and S6c perform most strongly in terms of this objective, however, (1) is considered the preferred approach as it supports a larger range of communities.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑↑	This option will focus commercial development in urban areas and support the role of the PSC and KSCs and larger LSCs, helping to create new employment opportunities and maintain existing jobs in these areas. This option also supports development in rural areas which could potentially mean farm diversification and growth of rural businesses to create additional jobs in the rural areas in addition to the urban focus creating a diverse and sustainable local economy.	⇅	This option will maximise residential development in urban areas, potentially increasing the attractiveness of these areas to businesses. In addition, this option will maximise commercial development in urban areas which will present opportunities for diversification of the economy. Concentrating development in these areas provides an opportunity to stimulate critical mass and attract inward investment thus transforming the urban area. However, limiting development in rural areas may affect the viability of village economies.	⇅	This option will maximise residential development in urban areas, potentially increasing the attractiveness of these areas to businesses. In addition, this option will maximise commercial development in urban areas which will present opportunities for diversification of the economy. Concentrating development in these areas provides an opportunity to stimulate critical mass and attract inward investment thus transforming the urban area. However, limiting development in rural areas may affect the viability of village economies.	↑↑	This option will focus commercial development in urban areas and support the role of the PSC and KSCs and larger LSCs, helping to create new employment opportunities and maintain existing jobs in these areas. This option also supports some development in rural areas which could potentially mean farm diversification and growth of rural businesses to create additional jobs in the rural areas in addition to the urban focus creating a diverse and sustainable local economy.	↑	This option will focus the majority of residential development in urban areas, potentially increasing the attractiveness of these areas to businesses. In addition, this option will maximise commercial development in urban areas which will present opportunities for diversification of the economy. Concentrating development in these areas provides an opportunity to stimulate critical mass and attract inward investment thus transforming the urban area. The option will also allow for development in the larger rural villages, supporting some growth in the rural economy, though not as strongly as (1) and S6c.	The preferred option and S6c perform most strongly in terms of this objective, however, (1) is considered the preferred approach as it supports a larger range of communities.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑↑	Potentially beneficial	→→	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	←	Potentially adverse
↓↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S7 Role of Settlements

Sustainability Objectives	S7: Role of Settlements				Comments
	Preferred Option		Alternative Option		
	(1): Define the role of settlements		S7a: Do not define the role of settlements		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the main service centres where facilities and services exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access possible for the population.	←	The policy option fails to provide guidance on what development is appropriate in the different scales of settlements and therefore will potentially result in inappropriate development taking place in different levels of centres resulting in reduced accessibility for the population to key services and facilities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⇕	Accessibility to services and facilities helps to contribute to meeting the needs of the population for decent homes in the wider sense.	←	No guidance on the location of new development could result in less accessibility to services and facilities all of which contribute to the achievement of a decent home in the wider sense.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that access to educational facilities is optimised.	↓	There is the potential that new development will take place which will result in lower levels of accessibility to educational facilities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that access to healthcare facilities is optimised.	↓	There is the potential that new development will take place which will result in lower levels of accessibility to healthcare facilities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	This policy option provides for small levels of infill development in the smaller service centres and rural settlements where appropriate, this will help to support the vitality of these settlements.	↓	Without specific guidance in terms of the settlement hierarchy, there is the potential that there will be no new development or conversely too much development in the smaller settlements, which has the potential to impact upon vitality and vibrancy of the communities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	The policy aims to ensure that the majority of new development takes place in urban centres, where there is the greater potential that development will be on brownfield land and have a lower impact on biodiversity.	↓	Without specific guidance in terms of the settlement hierarchy, there is the potential that development will take place on greenfield land or areas of high biodiversity value, rather than prioritising the use of urban centre locations first.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑	The policy aims to ensure that the majority of new development takes place in urban centres, where there is the greater potential that development will be on brownfield land and have a lower impact on landscape character and quality, and result in less fragmentation.	↓	Without specific guidance in terms of the settlement hierarchy, there is the potential that development will take place on greenfield land or areas of high landscape value resulting in adverse impacts and / or fragmentation, rather than prioritising the use of urban centre locations first.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇕	This policy option prioritises that the majority of development takes place in existing urban centres and therefore has the potential to contribute to the existing built environment and enhance it, however, this will depend on design and implementation and will need to consider the impact of the small infill development in rural settlements also.	↓	This policy option does not provide guidance on the location of development and therefore whilst it has the potential to contribute to the existing built environment and enhance it, it also has the potential to result in development that is out of scale and character in smaller settlements, however, this will depend on design and implementation and will need to consider the impact of the small infill development in rural settlements also.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective, the issue of design and implementation will need to be considered further.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the main service centres where services, facilities and employment opportunities exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access possible for the population.	←	The policy option fails to provide guidance on what development is appropriate in the different scales of settlements and therefore will potentially result in inappropriate development taking place in different levels of centres resulting in reduced accessibility for the population to key services and facilities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⇕	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on water quality, water resources and flood risk. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, which may also lead to some improvements. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇕	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on water quality, water resources and flood risk. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, which may also lead to some improvements but may also put existing infrastructure under increased pressure. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	Both policy options have the potential to impact water quality and resources, the impact on these issues will need to be considered on a more site specific basis.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on land and soil. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, the policy option promotes development to be located in mainly urban areas which should promote the use of brownfield land over greenfield sites. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	↓	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on land and soil. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, the policy option does not provide any guidance on the location of future development therefore there is the potential that there will be no prioritisation of brownfield sites, which will predominantly be in urban areas. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective, however, the issue will need to be considered in more detail at the site specific stage of plan development.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⇕	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on waste generation and mineral resources. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇕	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on waste generation and mineral resources. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	Both policy options have the potential to impact waste and mineral resources, the impact on these issues will need to be considered on a more site specific basis.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that existing employment locations can be supported and enabled to grow and develop along with new businesses being supported to start up in appropriate locations..	↓	The policy option does not provide guidance in terms of new development and therefore there is the potential that new development will be out of scale and in inappropriate locations in terms of existing centres and therefore the potential for growth and creation of employment will not necessarily be supported through the policy.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the main service centres where most employment opportunities exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access to employment opportunities possible for the population.	←	The policy option fails to provide guidance on what development is appropriate in the different scales of settlements and therefore will potentially result in inappropriate development taking place in different levels of centres resulting in reduced accessibility for the population to employment opportunities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that existing employment locations can be supported and enabled to grow and develop along with new businesses being supported to start up in appropriate locations. This will help to develop sustainable economies in all of the centres across the Borough.	↓	The policy option does not provide guidance in terms of new development and therefore there is the potential that new development will be out of scale and in inappropriate locations in terms of existing centres and therefore the potential for growth and creation of employment will not necessarily be supported through the policy and some of the centres in the Borough may struggle in terms of their economy without the support provided through (1)..	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	⇒⇒	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	⇒	Minor beneficial
↑↑	Potentially beneficial	⇒	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	⇐	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	⇐	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	⇐⇐	Major adverse
⇕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S8 Development Limits

Sustainability Objectives	S8: Development Limits				Comments
	Preferred Option		Alternative Option		
	(1): Criteria based policy to control development within and out with the physical limits of the towns and villages identified in the settlement hierarchy, ensuring that the development proposed is commensurate with the size of the settlement and its position within the settlement hierarchy		S8a: Do not include a policy on development expected within and out with development limits		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the within the limits of the centres identified in the settlement hierarchy where facilities and services exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access possible for the population.	⇐	The policy option fails to provide guidance on what development is appropriate in the different scales of settlements and therefore will potentially result in inappropriate development taking place in different levels of centres resulting in reduced accessibility for the population to key services and facilities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	⇒	Accessibility to services and facilities helps to contribute to meeting the needs of the population for decent homes in the wider sense.	⇐	No guidance on the location of new development could result in less accessibility to services and facilities all of which contribute to the achievement of a decent home in the wider sense.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that access to educational facilities is optimised.	↓	There is the potential that new development will take place which will result in lower levels of accessibility to educational facilities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that access to healthcare facilities is optimised.	↓	There is the potential that new development will take place which will result in lower levels of accessibility to healthcare facilities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	This policy option provides for small levels of infill development in the smaller service centres and rural settlements where appropriate, this will help to support the vitality of these settlements.	↓	Without specific guidance in terms of the settlement hierarchy, there is the potential that there will be no new development or conversely too much development in the smaller settlements, which has the potential to impact upon vitality and vibrancy of the communities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	The policy aims to ensure that the majority of new development takes place in urban centres, where there is the greater potential that development will be on brownfield land and have a lower impact on biodiversity.	↓	Without specific guidance in terms of the settlement hierarchy, there is the potential that development will take place on greenfield land or areas of high biodiversity value, rather than prioritising the use of urban centre locations first.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑	The policy aims to ensure that the majority of new development takes place in urban centres, where there is the greater potential that development will be on brownfield land and have a lower impact on landscape character and quality, and result in less fragmentation.	↓	Without specific guidance in terms of the settlement hierarchy, there is the potential that development will take place on greenfield land or areas of high landscape value resulting in adverse impacts and / or fragmentation, rather than prioritising the use of urban centre locations first.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇕	This policy option prioritises that the majority of development takes place in existing urban centres and therefore has the potential to contribute to the existing built environment and enhance it, however, this will depend on design and implementation and will need to consider the impact of the small infill development in rural settlements also.	↓	This policy option does not provide guidance on the location of development and therefore whilst it has the potential to contribute to the existing built environment and enhance it, it also has the potential to result in development that is out of scale and character in smaller settlements, however, this will depend on design and implementation and will need to consider the impact of the small infill development in rural settlements also.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective, the issue of design and implementation will need to be considered further.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the main service centres where services, facilities and employment opportunities exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access possible for the population.	⇐	The policy option fails to provide guidance on what development is appropriate in the different scales of settlements and therefore will potentially result in inappropriate development taking place in different levels of centres resulting in reduced accessibility for the population to key services and facilities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⇕	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on water quality, water resources and flood risk. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, which may also lead to some improvements. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇕	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on water quality, water resources and flood risk. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, which may lead to some improvements but may also place existing infrastructure under increased pressure. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	Both policy options have the potential to impact water quality and resources, the impact on these issues will need to be considered on a more site specific basis.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on land and soil. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, the policy option promotes development to be located in mainly urban areas which should promote the use of brownfield land over greenfield sites. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	↓	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on land and soil. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, the policy option does not provide any guidance on the location of future development therefore there is the potential that there will be no prioritisation of brownfield sites, which will predominantly be in urban areas. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective, however, the issue will need to be considered in more detail at the site specific stage of plan development.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⇕	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on waste generation and mineral resources. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇕	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on waste generation and mineral resources. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	Both policy options have the potential to impact waste and mineral resources, the impact on these issues will need to be considered on a more site specific basis.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that existing employment locations can be supported and enabled to grow and develop along with new businesses being supported to start up in appropriate locations..	↓	The policy option does not provide guidance in terms of new development and therefore there is the potential that new development will be out of scale and in inappropriate locations in terms of existing centres and therefore the potential for growth and creation of employment will not necessarily be supported through the policy.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the main service centres where most employment opportunities exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access to employment opportunities possible for the population.	⇐	The policy option fails to provide guidance on what development is appropriate in the different scales of settlements and therefore will potentially result in inappropriate development taking place in different levels of centres resulting in reduced accessibility for the population to employment opportunities.	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that existing employment locations can be supported and enabled to grow and develop along with new businesses being supported to start up in appropriate locations. This will help to develop sustainable economies in all of the centres across the Borough.	↓	The policy option does not provide guidance in terms of new development and therefore there is the potential that new development will be out of scale and in inappropriate locations in terms of existing centres and therefore the potential for growth and creation of employment will not necessarily be supported through the policy and some of the centres in the Borough may struggle in terms of their economy without the support provided through (1)..	The preferred option is the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

Key: Significance of Effects			
Direct Effects		Indirect Effects	
↑↑	Major beneficial	→→	Major beneficial
↑	Minor beneficial	→	Minor beneficial
↑	Potentially beneficial	→	Potentially beneficial
↓	Potentially adverse	←	Potentially adverse
↓	Minor adverse	←	Minor adverse
↓↓	Major adverse	←←	Major adverse
↕	Potentially beneficial or adverse		
↔	No significant effect		

S9 Distribution of Growth

Sustainability Objectives	S9: Distribution of Growth								Comments
	Preferred Options				Alternative Options				
	(1): HOUSING - Policy to allocate the level of growth across each tier of the settlement hierarchy based on the role and size of the settlement and its environmental and infrastructure capacity		(2): EMPLOYMENT - Policy to allocate employment land broadly in line with growth for housing (1), taking into account the importance of the current strategic and successful sites to Allerdale's economy, the existing pattern of supply and need for flexibility, choice and churn in the market		S9a: HOUSING - Population driven distribution		S9b: EMPLOYMENT - Unrestricted approach to employment land growth		
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	↔	No significant effect	None
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the within the centres identified in the settlement hierarchy where facilities and services exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access possible for the population.	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the within the centres identified in the settlement hierarchy where the existing population, facilities and services exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access possible for the population.	←	The policy provides guidance on growth based on population, rather than existing scale of settlements including current services and facilities and therefore will potentially result in inappropriate development taking place in different levels of centres, growth in LSCs would be reduced overall resulting in lower levels of accessibility to residents in these settlements.	↓	With no specific policy approach to allocating a supply of employment land and the location policies to address where new development would take place there is a risk that land would not be appropriately distributed across the Borough resulting in unequal access to employment opportunities.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	→	Accessibility to services and facilities helps to contribute to meeting the needs of the population for decent homes in the wider sense.	→	Accessibility to employment, services and facilities helps to contribute to meeting the needs of the population for decent homes in the wider sense.	←	This policy option could result in less accessibility to services and facilities for residents in LSCs which contribute to the achievement of a decent home in the wider sense.	↔	No significant effect	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that access to educational facilities is optimised.	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that access to employment, educational and training facilities is optimised.	↓	There is the potential that new development will take place which will result in lower levels of accessibility to educational facilities for residents in LSCs.	↓	With no specific policy approach to allocating a supply of employment land and the location policies to address where new development would take place there is a risk that land would not be appropriately distributed across the Borough resulting in unequal access to employment, educational and training opportunities.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that access to healthcare facilities is optimised.	↔	No significant effect	↓	There is the potential that new development will take place which will result in lower levels of accessibility to healthcare facilities for residents in LSCs.	↔	No significant effect	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑	This policy option provides for small levels of infill development in the smaller service centres and rural settlements where appropriate, this will help to support the vitality of these settlements.	↑	This policy option provides for small levels of infill development in the smaller service centres and rural settlements where appropriate, this will help to support the vitality of these settlements.	↓	Without specific guidance in terms of the settlement hierarchy, there is the potential that there will be no new development or conversely too much development in the smaller settlements (LSCs and rural villages respectively), which has the potential to impact upon vitality and vibrancy of these communities.	↓	Allocation of new employment land across the Borough may provide opportunities to promote community identity and social cohesion, however, without a strategic approach to this there is the potential that a piecemeal approach will be undertaken not contributing to community vitality.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑	The policy aims to ensure that the majority of new development takes place in urban centres, where there is the greater potential that development will be on brownfield land and have a lower impact on biodiversity.	↑	The policy aims to ensure that the majority of new development takes place in urban centres, where there is the greater potential that development will be on brownfield land and have a lower impact on biodiversity.	↓	This policy option places a higher priority on rural growth than (1), which in turn has the potential to result in higher levels of greenfield development which could potentially affect landscape character and quality and result in fragmentation.	↓	At this stage it is not possible to effectively predict how the plan might impact biodiversity. However, the option does promote growth and development and does not specifically guide the development to follow the settlement strategy policies and therefore the option if implemented inappropriately has the potential to adversely affect biodiversity. This will be further assessed through the specific allocations and spatial options assessments.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑	The policy aims to ensure that the majority of new development takes place in urban centres, where there is the greater potential that development will be on brownfield land and have a lower impact on landscape character and quality, and result in less fragmentation.	↑	The policy aims to ensure that the majority of new development takes place in urban centres, where there is the greater potential that development will be on brownfield land and have a lower impact on landscape character and quality, and result in less fragmentation.	↓	This policy option places a higher priority on rural growth than (1), which in turn has the potential to result in higher levels of greenfield development which could potentially affect biodiversity and result in habitat fragmentation.	↓	At this stage it is not possible to effectively predict how the plan might impact landscape character/quality. However, the option does promote growth and development and does not specifically guide the development to follow the settlement strategy policies and therefore the option if implemented inappropriately has the potential to adversely affect landscape character/quality. This will be further assessed through the specific allocations and spatial options assessments.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	⇅	This policy option prioritises that the majority of development takes place in existing urban centres and therefore has the potential to contribute to the existing built environment and enhance it, however, this will depend on design and implementation and will need to consider the impact of the small infill development in rural settlements also.	⇅	This policy option prioritises that the majority of development takes place in existing urban centres and therefore has the potential to contribute to the existing built environment and enhance it, however, this will depend on design and implementation and will need to consider the impact of the small infill development in rural settlements also.	↓	This policy supports growth in the urban centres but also places a greater emphasis on rural growth than (1) and therefore whilst it has the potential to contribute to the existing built environment and enhance it, it also has the potential to result in development that is out of scale and character in smaller settlements, however, this will depend on design and implementation.	⇅	How the plan will impact upon the built environment will depend upon implementation. High quality planning and design of new development has the potential to enhance the quality of the existing built environment and conversely bad quality design will have a negative effect. This will be further assessed through the specific allocations and spatial options assessments.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective, the issue of design and implementation will need to be considered further.
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the main service centres where services, facilities and employment opportunities exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access possible for the population.	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the main service centres where services, facilities and employment opportunities exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access possible for the population.	←	The policy provides guidance on growth based on population, rather than existing scale of settlements including current services and facilities and therefore will potentially result in inappropriate development taking place in different levels of centres, growth in LSCs would be reduced overall resulting in lower levels of accessibility to residents in these settlements resulting in an increased need to travel and therefore increased emissions and a reduction in local air quality.	⇅	The option promotes development which may generate air pollution and greenhouse gases during construction (dust, chemicals etc.) and operation (energy, transport emissions etc.). However, depending upon the nature and location of development, the plan may work to reduce operational emissions. Without a specific approach to guide the level and location of development, there is the risk that unsustainable levels of development will take place and/or development will be located outside of the main settlements resulting in an increased need to travel for employees resulting in higher levels of emissions.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	⇅	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on water quality, water resources and flood risk. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, which may also lead to some improvements. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇅	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on water quality, water resources and flood risk. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, which may also lead to some improvements. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇅	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on water quality, water resources and flood risk. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, which may also lead to some improvements, there is the potential that more rural locations will have less protection and investment in terms of flood resilience, which will increase the risk to the new areas of growth. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇅	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on water quality, water resources and flood risk. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, which may also lead to some improvements. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	All policy options have the potential to impact water quality and resources, the impact on these issues will need to be considered on a more site specific basis.
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on land and soil. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, the policy option promotes development to be located in mainly urban areas which should promote the use of brownfield land over greenfield sites. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	↑	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on land and soil. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, the policy option promotes development to be located in mainly urban areas which should promote the use of brownfield land over greenfield sites. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	↓	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on land and soil. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation, the policy option does promote development in urban areas which will help to promote the use of PDL, however it also places a greater emphasis on rural growth than (1) and therefore there is the potential that there will be a greater use of greenfield sites. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇅	At this stage, the location and type of any development is unknown. There is potential that both brownfield and greenfield land will be required for this level of development which will result in land based impacts. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial options assessment stage.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective, however, the issue will need to be considered in more detail at the site specific stage of plan development.
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	⇅	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on waste generation and mineral resources. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇅	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on waste generation and mineral resources. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇅	The option promotes development which may have a negative effect on waste generation and mineral resources. However, this will depend on the location and nature of the development and implementation. This will need to be further assessed at the site allocation, and spatial option stage.	⇅	At this stage it is not possible to accurately predict how the plan might affect minerals / waste management. Higher levels of development will invariably result in a larger impact in terms of waste generation both at the construction and operational phases of the development.	All policy options have the potential to impact waste and mineral resources, the impact on these issues will need to be considered on a more site specific basis.
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that existing employment locations can be supported and enabled to grow and develop along with new businesses being supported to start up in appropriate locations.	↑↑	This policy option directly supports this objective, ensuring that new economic development takes place across the Borough supporting existing businesses and encouraging growth and new businesses whilst also supporting strategic sites which will provide key employment opportunities in the future.	↓	The policy option does not provide guidance in terms of new development and therefore there is the potential that new development will be out of scale and in inappropriate locations in terms of existing centres and therefore the potential for growth and creation of employment will not necessarily be supported through the policy.	↑	This option does support the objective, however, it cannot be rated more highly as without a specific allocation it is possible that some years below the required rate will be developed.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that the majority of development is located in the main service centres where most employment opportunities exist, but also recognises the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access to employment opportunities possible for the population.	↑↑	This option directly supports this objective in terms of ensuring that that economic development takes place across the centres in scale with other residential development therefore focussing on main centre where most of the population reside, but also recognising the role of the smaller centres and rural settlements and ensures that they have development to help support their services and facilities and ensure the widest range of access to employment opportunities possible for the population.	←	Whilst this option promotes growth in urban centres which will increase accessibility to employment opportunities for local residents, the option also promotes a relatively high level of growth in rural areas which may be out of scale with other development in the location and result in an increase of in commuting and a reduction in accessibility as rural locations are less sustainable in transport terms.	↑	This option does support this objective, however, without the implementation of a policy to consider the settlement strategy as part of the employment land development, there is the risk that development will take place in unsustainable locations resulting in lack of access for the local population and an increased need to travel.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that existing employment locations can be supported and enabled to grow and develop along with new businesses being supported to start up in appropriate locations. This will help to develop sustainable economies in all of the centres across the Borough.	↑↑	The policy option guides new development in terms of the settlement hierarchy, this will ensure that existing employment locations can be supported and enabled to grow and develop along with new businesses being supported to start up in appropriate locations. This will help to develop sustainable economies in all of the centres across the Borough.	↓	The policy option does not provide guidance in terms of new development and therefore there is the potential that new development will be out of scale and in inappropriate locations in terms of existing centres and therefore the potential for growth and creation of employment will not necessarily be supported through the policy.	↑	This option does support this objective to a certain extent, however, letting the market have control over the employment development poses a potential risk that there will be a lack of diversity and sustainability in the local economy.	The preferred options are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

Key Significance of Effects		TR1 Transport Principles	
Direct Effects	Indirect Effects	Direct Effects	Indirect Effects
↑ Major beneficial	↑ Major beneficial	↑ Major beneficial	↑ Major beneficial
↑ Minor beneficial	↑ Minor beneficial	↑ Minor beneficial	↑ Minor beneficial
↑ Potentially adverse	↑ Potentially adverse	↑ Potentially adverse	↑ Potentially adverse
↓ Potentially adverse	↓ Potentially adverse	↓ Potentially adverse	↓ Potentially adverse
↓ Major adverse	↓ Major adverse	↓ Major adverse	↓ Major adverse
↓ Minor adverse	↓ Minor adverse	↓ Minor adverse	↓ Minor adverse
↔ No significant effect	↔ No significant effect	↔ No significant effect	↔ No significant effect

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Preferred Options												Alternative Options			Comments	
	(1): Development to be located in sustainable locations with safe and convenient access to services, facilities and public transport routes	(2): Allow exceptions to core principles of policy locations in rural areas that meet other plan policies	(3): Prioritise pedestrians and cyclists in town centres and new developments	(4): Protect and, where appropriate, enhance all designated PROW	(5): Require Transport Assessments / Travel Plans on major developments in line with DM TR1	(6): Require new development to take the accessibility needs of vulnerable groups into account	(7): Require new development to protect, enhance and capitalise upon sustainable transport links offered by GI	(8): Require new development to provide adequate levels of car parking as outlined in DM TR3	TR1a: No requirement for development to be sustainably located	TR1b: No transport rural exceptions policy	TR1c: Do not ask for travel plans or Transport Assessments						
SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	This option may dampen the potential for officers to take local views on transport provision and traffic levels into account	The preferred options do not have any identified impact on this objective.
SP2: To improve access to services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces	↑ This policy is all about ensuring that services are accessible so it directly meets this sustainability objective	↑ This policy should help to improve access to services in remote areas so that local people have greater choice of mobility and service provision	↑ This option is very responsive to location and needs and should indirectly help to improve access to all services, including GI and the countryside, by encouraging modal interchange and optimal mobility to help meet this objective.	↑ This policy directly supports and will strongly help to meet this objective.	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ This policy option fully supports this objective, taking a socially inclusive approach to enabling easy access for vulnerable groups in ways that will not inconvenience others.	↑ This option directly and strongly supports this objective: they are mutually reinforcing	↑ This option enables parking provision to be tailored to a locality, recognising that rural needs will be different to those in larger settlements. Appropriate parking provision can help to improve access to facilities without compromising public transport provision	↑ This option is opposed to this objective as if development is not sustainably located then the ability for the population to access services and facilities will potentially be compromised	↓ This policy will help to ensure that services are accessible so it directly meets this sustainability objective; however, this will not help to address the issue of accessibility to services for those in remote areas.	↓ This option is opposed to this objective as part of having a decent home is related to its environment and accessibility to services and facilities, if there is no requirement for development to be sustainably located then these features could be compromised	↓ This option has the potential to increase rural isolation and access to services and facilities which impacts on the liveability of rural areas	↓ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↓ This option would work against this objective, because applicants would not be required to provide evidence to show how they could help to meet this objective, or at least not compromise this objective.	↓ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	The preferred options in combination strongly support the objective.	
SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	↑ This policy helps to indirectly support this objective because it helps to increase liveability in rural areas.	↑ This policy helps to indirectly support this objective because it helps to increase liveability in rural areas.	↑ Because this option is responsive to location and needs, it will help to maintain and possibly increase local 'liveability' to support the provision of decent homes.	↑ This policy indirectly helps to support this objective in that decent homes need to be provided with good access to the countryside and increase opportunities for informal recreation	↑ No significant effects	↑ Good transport services and design needs to include the immediate environment outside their front door, including kerbs, types of paving, parking facilities and ease of access to public transport	↑ This option indirectly supports this objective by helping to provide aesthetically pleasing off-road cycling, walking and jogging networks close to home.	↑ No significant effects	↑ This option is opposed to this objective as part of having a decent home is related to its environment and accessibility to services and facilities, if there is no requirement for development to be sustainably located then these features could be compromised	↑ This policy helps to indirectly support this objective because it helps to increase liveability in rural areas.	↑ This option has the potential to increase rural isolation and access to services and facilities which impacts on the liveability of rural areas	↑ No significant effects either way	↑ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	The preferred options in combination are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.		
SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	↑ This policy helps to indirectly support this objective because it enables greater levels of access and mobility in rural areas, providing greater choice in opportunities to access skills, education and training	↑ This policy helps to indirectly support this objective because it enables greater levels of access and mobility in rural areas, providing greater choice in opportunities to access skills, education and training	↑ Because this option is very responsive to location and needs it should indirectly help to improve access to education and skills/training by encouraging modal interchange and optimal mobility to help meet this objective.	↑ No significant effects either way	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ This policy option fully supports this objective, taking a socially inclusive approach to enabling easy access to education and skills training facilities for vulnerable groups in ways that will not inconvenience others.	↑ This option indirectly supports this objective by helping to integrate well with the on-road, wider transport network. Enabling wider choice of mobility/routes to access education and training centres	↑ No significant effects	↑ This option is opposed to this objective as the ability to improve education and skills could be compromised if the population are unable to access the facilities due to development being unsustainably located	↑ This policy helps to indirectly support this objective because it enables greater levels of access and mobility in rural areas, providing greater choice in opportunities to access skills, education and training	↑ This option has the potential to increase rural isolation and access to services and facilities factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	The preferred options in combination are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.		
SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	↑ This policy helps to indirectly support this objective because it enables greater levels of access and mobility in rural areas, providing greater choice in opportunities to access all kinds of facilities (natural, community etc.)	↑ This policy helps to indirectly support this objective because it enables greater levels of access and mobility in rural areas, providing greater choice in opportunities to access all kinds of facilities (natural, community etc.)	↑ This option is very responsive to location and needs and in this way should indirectly help to improve sense of well-being and health by providing easy access to all services, including GI and the countryside. Walking and cycling routes will encourage healthy lifestyles as well as providing greater choice of transport options and mobility	↑ Securing access to the PROW network helps to improve opportunities for people to maintain/improve their well-being	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ This policy option fully supports this objective, taking a socially inclusive approach to enabling easy access to all places and services, engendering sense of well-being and enabling the most vulnerable to lead active, healthy lifestyles.	↑ This option directly and strongly supports this objective: they are mutually reinforcing	↑ This option indirectly supports this objective by helping to provide aesthetically pleasing off-road cycling, walking and jogging networks close to home, all of which contribute to healthy lifestyles and sense of well-being	↑ No significant effects	↑ This policy helps to indirectly support this objective because it enables greater levels of access and mobility in rural areas, providing greater choice in opportunities to access all kinds of facilities (natural, community etc.)	↑ This option has the potential to increase rural isolation and access to services and facilities important to health and well-being	↑ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	The preferred options in combination strongly support the objective.		
SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open minded communities with a strong sense of local history	↑ This policy supports the development of inclusive, vibrant communities by encouraging new development that is close to/existing easy reach of existing centres with community facilities.	↓ This policy could have a positive effect if it brings new community members / community facilities into a rural area, helping to increase social connectivity, allowing new development in a remote area could simply add to isolation and the need to travel to facilities.	↑ This option should indirectly help to support this objective by providing easy access to all services, including GI and the countryside, encouraging social interaction and community vibrancy. It will enable new links to existing off-road networks with local heritage connectors.	↑ This option could potentially benefit this objective by providing easy access to all services, including GI and the countryside, encouraging social interaction and community vibrancy. Most PROW have historic connections with the local area.	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ This policy option fully supports this objective, taking a socially inclusive approach to enabling easy access to all places and services, engendering sense of well-being and enabling the most vulnerable to lead active, healthy lifestyles within their communities.	↑ This option directly and strongly supports this objective: they are mutually reinforcing	↑ This option indirectly supports this objective by helping to provide aesthetically pleasing off-road networks, enabling greater connectivity between settlements and settlements, which should help to foster community spirit and social cohesion	↑ No significant effects	↑ This policy supports the development of inclusive, vibrant communities by encouraging new development that is close to/existing easy reach of existing centres with community facilities.	↓ This option could result in piecemeal development across the borough in numerous locations potentially unrelated to existing settlements / rural locations where the potential that new development will not be part of an existing community.	↓ This policy option has the potential to ensure new development close to existing communities and will therefore help support the development of these further, however, factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↓ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	The preferred options in combination are the most sustainable in terms of this objective. However, there is a potential risk with (2), that rural isolation could be increased through allowing factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	
EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity	↑ This policy supports this objective by encouraging development close to existing centres and away from the wider countryside, i.e. helping to avoid fragmentation of habitats	↓ This policy will almost certainly have an adverse impact on biodiversity because it appears to allow greenfield development in very rural areas, even if in exceptional circumstances	↑ Because this option considers road and off-road networks and interchanges in an integrated way to optimise sustainability, it has the potential to help protect and enhance biodiversity, i.e. helping to route people away from vulnerable areas, and to design network links with biodiversity measures in mind	↑ This option would benefit biodiversity interest keeping green networks open	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ No significant effects	↑ This option strongly supports this objective because of the strong relationships between GI for access purposes for people and the role of GI as access corridors for species. GI habitat will help to boost species resilience to climate change impacts, enabling adaptive responses.	↑ No significant effects	↓ This policy will almost certainly have an adverse impact on biodiversity because it will potentially allow greenfield development and piecemeal development which will result in fragmented habitats	↑ This policy supports this objective by encouraging development close to existing centres and away from the wider countryside, i.e. helping to avoid fragmentation of habitats	↑ This option could result in piecemeal development across the borough in numerous locations potentially unrelated to existing settlements / rural locations where the potential that new development will not be part of an existing community.	↑ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	The preferred options in combination are the most sustainable in terms of this objective. However, there is a potential risk with (2), that development in rural areas could result in an adverse impact on biodiversity through development of greenfield land and fragmentation of habitats, this policy will need to be considered in the context of NLP policies to ensure that adverse impacts do not occur		
EN2: To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations	↑ This policy supports this objective by encouraging development close to existing centres and away from the wider countryside, i.e. helping to avoid fragmentation of habitats	↓ This policy may have an adverse impact on landscape character because it appears to allow greenfield development in very rural areas, even if in exceptional circumstances	↑ Because this option considers road and off-road networks and interchanges in an integrated way to optimise sustainability, it has the potential to help protect and enhance local landscape	↑ This option would encourage development that helps greenways open for access to rural landscape quality/character and local sense of place are conserved and enhanced	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ No significant effects	↑ GI contributes strongly to landscape character and sense of place, especially in peri-urban areas, so this option strongly supports this objective.	↑ This option enables parking provision to be tailored to each locality in keeping with local character and sense of place, recognising that rural needs will be different to those in larger settlements.	↓ This policy may have an adverse impact on landscape character because it will potentially allow greenfield development in rural areas, so this option strongly supports this objective.	↑ This policy supports this objective by encouraging development close to existing centres and away from the wider countryside, i.e. helping to avoid fragmentation of habitats	↓ This option could result in piecemeal development across the borough in numerous locations potentially unrelated to existing settlements / rural locations where the potential that new development will not be part of an existing community.	↓ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	The preferred options in combination are the most sustainable in terms of this objective. However, there is a potential risk with (2), that development in rural areas could result in an adverse impact on biodiversity through development of greenfield land and fragmentation of habitats, this policy will need to be considered in the context of NLP policies to ensure that adverse impacts do not occur		
EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	↔ Whilst not directly linked to this objective, this policy could help to encourage good landscape design, especially for transport networks and facilities in ways that help to meet this objective.	↔ No significant effects	↑ Because this option considers road and off-road networks and interchanges in an integrated way to optimise sustainability, it has the potential to help protect and enhance the quality of the built environment	↑ A quality built environment should have/facilitate good access networks into the countryside.	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option enables parking provision to be tailored to a locality, recognising that rural needs will be different to those in larger settlements. Appropriate, well-designed parking provision can help to improve the quality of the built environment	↑ There are conflicts between the option and objective as the option enables piecemeal development to take place which will potentially be out of character with the existing settlement / rural location where the development is to take place rather than enhancing the built environment	↔ Whilst not directly linked to this objective, this policy could help to encourage good landscape design, especially for transport networks and facilities in ways that help to meet this objective.	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	The preferred options in combination are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.	
NR1: To improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	↑ This policy is supportive of this objective because it should help to reduce the need to travel by private car if good public transport services are available and the majority of people can walk to services close to where they live	↓ New development in rural areas may involve increased traffic leading to higher traffic emissions. Much will depend on the type of development and its specific access needs.	↑ Because this option considers road and off-road networks and interchanges in an integrated way to optimise sustainability, it has the potential to help foster effective on/off road network use and modal interchange, facilitating mobility and thus accessibility to jobs.	↑ No significant effects	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ No significant effects	↑ This option will contribute to achieving this objective because it helps to reduce reliance on private cars in urban areas and reduce levels of particulates, as well as acting as a carbon sink, creating cooler micro-climates etc.	↑ This option has the potential to help towards reducing air quality in rural areas, however this is dependent on the type of new development, e.g. new business premises associated with farm diversification	↑ This option is supportive of this objective because it should help to reduce the need to travel by private car if good public transport services are available and the majority of people can walk to services close to where they live.	↑ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans and their impacts, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option is supportive of this objective because it should help to reduce the need to travel by private car if good public transport services are available and the majority of people can walk to services close to where they live.	↑ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans and their impacts, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	The preferred options in combination are generally the most sustainable in terms of this objective. However, there is a potential risk with (2), in terms of enabling development in less sustainable locations therefore encouraging reliance on non sustainable forms of transport resulting in higher levels of emissions		
NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	None	
NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	↑ Focusing development in/rural existing centres will help to protect land and soils so this policy directly supports this objective, this will reduce the need for new access roads or extension to the existing road network.	↓ Any new development in the countryside will require a degree of new access roads or extension to the existing road network	↑ Because this option considers road and off-road networks and interchanges in an integrated way to optimise sustainability, it has the potential to help protect and enhance local landscape	↑ This policy directly supports and will strongly help to meet this objective by helping to keep greenways open, preventing soil-sealing	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ No significant effects	↑ The protection and management of GI for off-road transport and access purposes will directly benefit land and soil quality by helping to protect greenfield assets and soils, especially in peri-urban and urban areas, thus helping to retain soil health for good drainage and GI health.	↑ No significant effects	↑ Any new development outside of, or on the edge of, existing settlements will require a degree of new access, involving land take and soil sealing	↑ Focusing development in/rural existing centres will help to protect land and soils so this policy directly supports this objective, this will reduce the need for new access roads or extension to the existing road network	↑ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans and their impacts, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	The preferred options in combination are the most sustainable in terms of this objective. However, there is a potential risk with (2), in terms of enabling development in rural areas means the sites are less likely to be FOL and therefore the will be impacted on this objective, will need to be considered in conjunction with other policies to still ensure the best use of land.	
NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably and minimise waste	↑ Potentially beneficial in that focusing development in/adjacent to existing settlements will help to protect areas of countryside important for minerals from new road development and make it easier to manage waste arisings.	↑ If the new development is concerned with minerals extraction or waste management, e.g. a waste transfer station, then this policy and this objective could be mutually reinforcing	↔ No significant effects either way	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↔ No significant effects	↑ If the new development is concerned with minerals extraction or waste management, e.g. a waste transfer station, then this policy and this objective could be mutually reinforcing	↑ This option may work against appropriate levels of easy access and mobility being factored into new development plans, thus hindering the ability to meet this objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	↑ This option is in combination strongly support the objective.	Generally the preferred options are the most sustainable, although the impacts are likely to be indirect and minor	
EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	↑ By focusing new development in and adjacent to existing settlements there is some potential for this policy to support this objective. Concentrating development should potentially help to create transport nodes and viable public transport routes	↔ Allowing exceptions to (1) could possibly help to create new jobs, depending on the type of new development, e.g. new business premises associated with farm diversification.	↑ Because this option considers road and off-road networks and interchanges in an integrated way to optimise sustainability, it has the potential to help foster effective on/off road network use and modal interchange, facilitating mobility and thus accessibility to jobs.	↑ This option could potentially help to secure and improve opportunities for tourism related employment.	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option enables parking provision to be tailored to a locality, recognising that rural needs will be different to those in larger settlements. Appropriate, well-designed parking provision can help to improve the quality of the built environment	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	The preferred options in combination are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC2: To improve access to jobs	↑ By focusing new development in and adjacent to existing settlements there is some potential for this policy to support this objective. Concentrating development should potentially help to create transport nodes and viable public transport routes	↔ Allowing exceptions to (1) could possibly help to create new jobs, depending on the type of new development, e.g. new business premises associated with farm diversification.	↑ Because this option considers road and off-road networks and interchanges in an integrated way to optimise sustainability, it has the potential to help foster effective on/off road network use and modal interchange, facilitating mobility and thus accessibility to jobs.	↑ This option could potentially help to secure and improve opportunities for tourism related employment.	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option enables parking provision to be tailored to a locality, recognising that rural needs will be different to those in larger settlements. Appropriate, well-designed parking provision can help to improve the quality of the built environment	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	The preferred options in combination are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.
EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	↑ By focusing new development in and adjacent to existing settlements there is some potential for this policy to support this objective. Concentrating development should potentially help to create transport nodes and viable public transport routes	↔ Allowing exceptions to (1) could possibly help to create new jobs, depending on the type of new development, e.g. new business premises associated with farm diversification.	↑ Because this option considers road and off-road networks and interchanges in an integrated way to optimise sustainability, it has the potential to help foster economic activity to help strengthen and diversify opportunities.	↑ This option could potentially help to secure and improve opportunities for tourism related employment.	↑ This option would enable officers to consider evidence about how major schemes would help to meet this objective.	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option enables parking provision to be tailored to a locality, recognising that rural needs will be different to those in larger settlements. Appropriate, well-designed parking provision can help to improve the quality of the built environment	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	↑ This option may help to guide high quality inclusive design to create high quality, socially inclusive built environments that all can use and benefit from	The preferred options in combination are the most sustainable in terms of this objective.

