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SEA REGULATIONS COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

The table below indicates where the specific requirements of the SEA Regulations are addressed within the SA report. The report itself fulfills the requirement of Regulation 12-(1), which states: “Where an environmental assessment is required by any provision of Part 2 of these Regulations, the responsible authority shall prepare, or secure the preparation of, an environmental report in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of this regulation.” Paragraphs (2) and (3) of Regulation 12 are in the table below.

Note that in this table, “X” refers to the variable chapter numbers to which each section belongs (thus Chapters 6 – 15, Sections X.3 refers to Sections 6.3, 7.3, 8.3, 9.3, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Report Requirements&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Section(s) of This Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-(2) The report shall identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) implementing the plan or programme; and</td>
<td>Chapters 6 – 15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and</td>
<td>Sections X.3 and X.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the geographical scope of the plan or programme.</td>
<td>Section 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-(3) The report shall include such of the information referred to in Schedule 2 to these Regulations as may reasonably be required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information referred to in Schedule 2, as required through Regulation 12-(3)

| 1. An outline of the contents and main objectives of the plan or programme… | Section 1.2               |
| …and of its relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.         | Section 1.1               |
| 2. The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme. | Chapters 6 – 15,  |
|       Sections X.2                                                       |                          |
| 3. The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected. | Chapters 6 – 15,  |
|       Sections X.2                                                       |                          |
| 4. Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds(a) and the Habitats Directive. | Chapters 6 – 15,  |
|       Sections X.2                                                       |                          |
| 5. The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme… | Chapters 6 – 15,  |
|       Sections X.2                                                       |                          |
| … and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation. | Section 2.2               |

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the SEA Regulations (HM Government, 2004 – see References in Appendix 1)
## Environmental Report Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.</th>
<th>The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) biodiversity; (b) population; (c) human health; (d) fauna; (e) flora; (f) soil; (g) water; (h) air; (i) climatic factors; (j) material assets; (k) cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage; (l) landscape; and (m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (l).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 6 – 15, Sections X.3 and X.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7. | The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme. |
| Chapters 6 – 15, Sections X.6 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th>An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 9. | A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with regulation 17[2]. |
| Chapters 6 – 15, Sections X.7 |

| 10. | A non-technical summary of the information provided under paragraphs 1 to 9. |
| Chapters I – V |

---

2 “The responsible authority shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of each plan or programme with the purpose of identifying unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage and being able to undertake appropriate remedial action” (HM Government, 2004, Regulation 17-(1)).
## GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Name/Phrase</th>
<th>Definition:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cSAC</td>
<td>candidate Special Area of Conservation</td>
<td>A site that is currently under review for inclusion as a Special Area of Conservation (see definition of SAC below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSPA</td>
<td>candidate Special Protection Area</td>
<td>A site that is currently under review for inclusion as a Special Protection Area (see definition of SPA below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>Department for Communities and Local Government</td>
<td>Government body responsible for building regulations and planning in England, with a goal to shape planning and regeneration such that the global, national and local environments are respected and sustained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>Development Plan Document</td>
<td>A type of local development document. DPDs include the Core Strategy, site-specific allocations of land and Area Action Plans (where needed). The Core Strategy DPD sets out the key elements of a local authority’s LDF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
<td>A generic term used to describe a process and technique of assessing the environmental effects of a project, and making recommendations to maximise beneficial effects and to eliminate or minimise the potential adverse effects. It is required for certain types of project under European Directive 85/337/EEC, amended by Directive 97/11/EC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDD</td>
<td>Local Development Document</td>
<td>Local development documents are the main components of an LDF. There are three types of LDD: development plan documents, supplementary planning documents and statements of community involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF</td>
<td>Local Development Framework</td>
<td>A local authority’s collection of planning documents, or local development documents, that forms the basis upon which all planning decisions are made. It also includes a local development scheme, proposals map, and annual monitoring reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Office of the Deputy Prime Minister</td>
<td>Replaced by the Department for Communities and Local Government in May 2006, the ODPM was a Government body responsible for national planning policy on regeneration, neighbourhood renewal and local government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPA</td>
<td>Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004</td>
<td>Act of the United Kingdom Parliament that introduced changes to the structure and process of land use planning, including the requirement for local authorities in England to establish Local Development Frameworks (LDFs), and subject them to Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name/Phrase</td>
<td>Definition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance (Note)</td>
<td>A Government planning document that is to be replaced by a Planning Policy Statement – see PPS below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Planning Policy Statement</td>
<td>Government planning document that explains statutory provisions and provides guidance to local authorities and others on a certain area of planning policy and the operation of the planning system. It explains the relationship between planning policies and other policies that have an important bearing on issues of development and land use. Local authorities must take its contents into account in preparing their development plans. The guidance may also be relevant to decisions on individual planning applications and appeals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROW</td>
<td>Public Right-of-Way</td>
<td>A path for pedestrians, cyclists and/or equestrians that has been formally adopted by the Council as part of the “PROW network”, and is therefore maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal</td>
<td>Generic term used to describe a process and technique of assessing the sustainability effects of (for example) a planning document, and making recommendations to maximise beneficial effects and to eliminate or minimise the potential adverse effects. SA, as applied to local development documents, incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Special Area of Conservation</td>
<td>European nature conservation site designated under the Habitats Regulations (which transpose the Habitats Directive into English law) for the protection of certain habitat or species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Statement of Community Involvement</td>
<td>A component of Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) that sets out a local planning authority’s policy for involving the community in the preparation and revision of local development documents and planning applications. It explains to stakeholders and the community how and when they will be involved in the preparation of the Local Development Framework, and the steps that will be taken to facilitate this involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI (alternative meaning)</td>
<td>Site of Community Importance</td>
<td>Also known as a cSAC – see definition above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name/Phrase</td>
<td>Definition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Strategic Environment Assessment</td>
<td>Generic term used internationally to describe environmental assessment as applied to policies, plans and programmes. In the UK, SEA is increasingly used to refer to an environmental assessment in compliance with the ‘SEA Directive’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Special Protection Area</td>
<td>European nature conservation site designated under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (which transposes the Birds Directive into English law) for the protection of certain species of bird.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Supplementary Planning Document</td>
<td>A type of local development document. Supplementary Planning Documents are intended to elaborate upon DPD policies and proposals, but do not have statutory status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>Site of Special Scientific Interest</td>
<td>National nature conservation site designated under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 for the protection of certain flora, fauna, or geological or physiographical features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

I Introduction

The North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD (hereafter referred to as ‘the SPD’) has been examined to see how it could be improved upon in order to support the Government’s objectives for sustainable development. As stated in Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) by the former Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), these objectives are:

i. social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;

ii. effective protection of the environment;

iii. the prudent use of natural resources; and

iv. maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment

ODPM, 2004a, p. 22

A Scoping Report was previously produced summarising the current environmental, social and economic situation within North East Derbyshire. This formed the basis for the examination of the SPD that is documented in this SA Report.

II Aims of the SPD and the SA/SEA

The SPD is intended to help North East Derbyshire District Council attain appropriate contributions, in association with developments, to certain local community needs such as infrastructure and open space (the full list of “contribution topics” is below). As a result of the SPD, and of the Local Plan it is based on, where there is new development, there would be expenditure on facilities and infrastructure in order to try and avoid strain on those which currently exist, or make improvements where deemed necessary.

The SPD will essentially be a guidance tool for developers, applicants, planning consultants, architects, officers of North East Derbyshire District Council and elected members (who may be involved with making decisions on planning applications) to secure funding, provision and improvements towards:

- affordable housing;
- community safety;
- community facilities;
- education;
- highways and transport;
- public realm;
- public art;
- open space and recreation; and
- environmental improvements.

3 The ODPM was replaced by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in May 2006.
This SA/SEA examines the SPD using a process known as Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and attempts to predict the likely effects, both positive and negative, that its implementation will have on people and the environment. The SA incorporates Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), as required by both European and national law. The SA/SEA makes recommendations to improve the SPD so that negative effects can be lessened or eliminated altogether, and positive effects created or enhanced. It also proposes monitoring that could be undertaken in order to measure how its implementation affects people and the environment in reality.

### III The SA/SEA Process

#### III-A Scoping Stage

Before this examination stage, the SA/SEA first gained an understanding of the background to the SPD and the current state of society and the environment. The stage of the SA/SEA at which this information was collected is called the ‘scoping stage’. The results of the scoping stage helped to focus the current stage of the SA/SEA on important social, economic and environmental goals, called SA Objectives, for North East Derbyshire, and to identify any priorities for improvement (or alternatively, priorities for avoiding or minimising negative effects). They also helped to identify any potential constraints and opportunities for the developing SPD.

The collection of background information for North East Derbyshire included the relationship between the future SPD and other planning documents, the environmental objectives (including social and economic objectives) relevant to North East Derbyshire at international, national, regional and local level, the current state of the environment (including social and economic concerns), the predicted future state of the environment (based on such things as past trends), and any identified issues or problems relating to the current or future state of the environment.

The scoping stage led to the creation of objectives or goals for North East Derbyshire, which together are called the SA Framework or SA Objectives. They address a range of potential effects upon people (including social and economic effects) and the environment, but are considered to represent the key social, environmental and economic goals for North East Derbyshire, in light of numerical data, known issues (social, environmental and economic), other strategic documents and what the SPD itself can achieve. Each of these SA Objectives is linked to indicators, which are different, typically numerical measures that represent the state of the environment (past, present and future).

Both this SA Report and the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD SA/SEA Scoping Report document this process, the information attained and analysed, and the identified SA Objectives and indicators. However, the Scoping Report documents the scoping work, and particularly the methods used and consultation undertaken, in slightly more detail.

The Scoping Report was consulted upon with the statutory consultees (Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency) and interested parties as outlined in the North East Derbyshire Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The comments received led to certain improvements of the Scoping Report, of the overall baseline information, and of the SA Objectives. The changes as a result of consultation have been taken forward into this report, and are documented in a final draft of the Scoping Report, issued May 2007.
III-B  Assessment and the SA Report

The SA/SEA has assessed the SPD against the SA Objectives developed during the scoping stage. The SA/SEA has examined the potential effects of the SPD, inclusive of its potential to influence indicators tied to the SA Objectives. The assessment process has considered the effects and this influence against how things are today for North East Derbyshire, including any existing problems for local communities or the environment, and also with consideration to how things are predicted to be in the future.

The SA/SEA has assessed alternative approaches to the SPD – which is to say, alternative ways of writing the SPD document that would lead to different ways of meeting the SPD’s aims of securing funding, provision and improvements towards services, facilities and infrastructure. This has influenced the final agreed approach, and thus content, of the SPD.

The SA/SEA has assessed the SPD implemented in combination with the policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (2005) and other strategic-level documents. It has considered the effects of the SPD on people and the environment within North East Derbyshire, and its effects on other people and areas of the environment (namely in neighbouring districts). The assessment of effects in combination with the Local Plan and other active documents provides a clearer picture of how the SPD will affect people and the environment, as the SPD will not operate without the Local Plan and other strategic documents in place.

In light of these effects, the SA/SEA has led to recommendations to improve the SPD. Recommendations can include a number of different ways of changing the SPD, advice to planners applying the SPD, or advice to others involved in planning or development in order to minimise or eliminate negative effects and/or to create or maximise positive effects. The actual recommendations are described by topic in Section IV below.

The SA/SEA of the SPD has also led to a recommended selection of indicators for monitoring the potential effects of the SPD on the ground (i.e. its implementation). Indicators are aimed at providing measures of progress that can be collected, however the feasibility or appropriateness of collecting such data is to be determined by North East Derbyshire District Council (and reported once the SPD is finalised).

The SA Report has been consulted upon with statutory consultees and other interested parties in accordance with the North East Derbyshire SCI. The comments received as a result of consultation are documented in Appendix 4. They have been reviewed, any recommended actions considered, and the changes documented in Section 2.14 of this final draft of the SA Report.

IV  The Results of the SA/SEA

This section briefly summarises the results of the SA/SEA. Chapters 4 to 15 provide a thorough account of the information and assessments documented in this report.

The current SA Framework (i.e. SA Objectives) is provided in Appendix 2.

The SPD is considered to have 19 spatially oriented objectives, which have been appraised for their consistency with the SA Framework. The results of the appraisal show that the SPD objectives are mostly consistent with SA Objectives, which reflects that the SPD is a guidance documented geared towards reducing or eliminating the
potential negative effects of development. There are some potential conflicts though; the SPD guides for the provision of new infrastructure and facilities that could require building on greenfield land, which could be in conflict (for example) with protecting wildlife, the historic environment, the landscape, water quality or flood risk.

Four optional approaches were considered during the preparation of the SPD. These were appraised, and the option considered most sustainable was selected as the preferred approach to writing this DPD. The options appraisal process is described in detail in Chapter 5.

IV-A **Health and Fitness**

**Context – Key Messages from Other Planning Documents and Environmental Objectives**

There are a number of planning documents from the international to the local level that attempt to provide opportunities for people to become healthier and more physically fit. The key objectives from the context review relevant to improving health and fitness levels in North East Derbyshire are considered to be:

- To ensure a healthy and just society, creating opportunities that will improve the well-being of individuals;
- To take advantage of the linkages between amenity/recreation and biodiversity;
- To promote recreation in the countryside, safeguarding green wedges and corridors in towns to enhance access to the countryside; and
- To protect and improve rights of way.

**Current State of the Environment, Problems and Trends (Known/Likely Changes)**

The data on health and fitness for North East Derbyshire generally shows that people are relatively healthy overall. However, in a comparative sense, people are living less healthy lifestyles than the average for the East Midlands and for England in terms of obesity and consumption of fresh fruit and vegetables. Although the data is not available to show trends, it is considered that obesity has likely been increasing, and will likely increase into the future without intervening measures.

The data also shows that although there is a healthy level of outdoor sport provision in the district, there is a lack of adequate children’s play areas and youth facilities. People also feel that they are using their car to access open space and other recreational areas, when they would prefer to walk. It is known that poor quality and fear of crime are deterring people from using open space and outdoor facilities such as children’s play areas. As before, although the data is not available to show trends, it is thought that the availability and accessibility of facilities has been on a relative decline over time, and will continue to decline into the future without intervening measures.

**Relevant SA Objectives Identified**

SA Objective 1: To improve levels of health and fitness.
Potential Significant Effects of the SPD

The SPD is likely to create opportunities for physical activity, including everyday walking and cycling. It guides for the provision of recreational facilities that can directly encourage people to exercise, and an improved walking and cycling environment, which can more indirectly lead to people being healthier by choosing not to drive.

However, the level of uptake of lifestyle opportunities and thus the effectiveness of the SPD is inevitably up to individual choice.

Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring

The SA/SEA recommends that the SPD guide more specifically for facilities that include fresh food shops, and post offices and GP surgeries within walking and cycling distance of residents, in order to better encourage health eating, walking and cycling.

Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline, while others considered relevant to SA Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. A list of proposed monitoring that will identify specific needs for facilities, or other health- and fitness-related issues for which a planning response may be warranted, is provided in Section 6.7 of this report.

IV-B Safety and Security

Context – Key Messages from Other Planning Documents and Environmental Objectives

There are a number of planning documents from the international to the local level that attempt to improve safety and security in the places where we live, work and travel. The key objectives from the context review relevant to improving safety and security in North East Derbyshire are considered to be:

- To address threats to public health and community safety;
- To ensure that town centres provide a safe environment for businesses, shoppers and residents;
- To reduce the numbers of casualties on the roads, with emphasis on those most vulnerable, e.g. children, pedestrians and cyclists;
- To locate business requiring lorry access away from residential areas;
- To separate noise-generating and noise-sensitive land uses; and
- To promote high-quality design that will mitigate against noisy land uses.

Current State of the Environment, Problems and Trends (Known/Likely Changes)

The data on safety and security for North East Derbyshire shows that crime has recently been increasing in the district, and the number of cyclist and motorcycle casualties have recently increased such that they are not expected to meet the national target for reductions. However, the level of crime and disorder is still better than the Crime and Disorder Partnership family average relevant to North East Derbyshire, and the number of child, pedestrian, and car user casualties on roads is on-target.
Vandalism and anti-social behaviour are known issues for North East Derbyshire, with recent increases in calls to police in response to anti-social behaviour. Fear of crime is deterring people from using recreational facilities. Gypsies often experience a high fear of crime due to racially motivated incidents.

Past trends show that cyclist and motorcycle casualties on roads had been declining, and so it is predicted that they will decline again in future years, however probably not enough to meet national targets without intervening measures. It is considered likely that crime and fear of crime will increase without improvements to local recreational facilities or other intervention, however a number of initiatives are already in place.

**Relevant SA Objectives Identified**

SA Objective 2: To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime, including with regard to transport.

**Potential Significant Effects of the SPD**

The SPD guides for design that prevents crime or fear of crime, applying measures that are specific to local community needs (such as CCTV, lighting or youth projects). The SPD also guides for developer contributions that will maintain and possibly improve safety on the road network, and improve the safety of walking, cycling and public transport.

**Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring**

The SA/SEA makes no mitigation recommendation with regard to safety and security.

Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline, while others considered relevant to SA Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. A list of proposed monitoring that will identify safety and security issues for which a planning response may be warranted, is provided in Section 7.7 of this report.

**IV-C Soil and Land Resources**

**Context – Key Messages from Other Planning Documents and Environmental Objectives**

As land is a finite resource limiting all human activities, but perhaps particularly rubbish disposal, there are a number of planning documents from the international to the local level that attempt to encourage people to reduce, reuse and recycle waste, and also to make best use of our existing land resources. The key objectives from the context review relevant to making best use of land in North East Derbyshire are considered to be:

- To manage natural resources more responsibly (including waste generation);
- To improve land use efficiency, including through opportunities allowed through well designed transport and taking advantage of synergies in land usage and management; and
- To protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.
Current State of the Environment, Problems and Trends (Known/Likely Changes)

The data on waste disposal and management for North East Derbyshire shows that the district is meeting its combined recycling and composting targets, and is therefore on par to meet its longer-term goals. However, the data also shows that the average person in Derbyshire County sends more waste to landfill than the average person in other parts of the East Midlands. There are currently 11 years’ worth of landfill land available within Derbyshire. The data on waste to landfill and landfill capacity, however, is not available for North East Derbyshire District.

The rate of recycling and composting is predicted to increase in line with efforts to meet increasingly difficult targets. It is difficult to predict the level of this increase without more information. This increase should decrease the average amount of waste sent to landfill per person. However, waste will continue to be sent to landfill, and the supply of land available for waste disposal will continue to decline without intervening measures.

Relevant SA Objectives Identified

SA Objective 3: To promote prudent and efficient use of land resources.

Potential Significant Effects of the SPD

The SPD guides for the provision of civic waste amenities, which can be interpreted to include waste collection facilities, such as public recycling and composting bins.

However, the potential positive effects are based on assumption/interpretation regarding statements in the SPD. As such, it is unlikely that this assumption would be universally implemented (if implemented at all), and thus it is likely that any benefits would be quite limited.

The SPD states that the Council will seek to ensure that affordable housing provision remains affordable permanently. As such, this policy will help to alleviate any demand on new build for affordable housing into the future, thus helping to conserve land resources.

However, conversely, the SPD is likely to indirectly lead to a limited amount of increased greenfield landtake through planning obligations for new facilities and infrastructure, of which there are numerous types to be provided.

Although much of the requirement for such facilities and infrastructure will likely be met on-site, and in many cases, on brownfield sites, it is considered likely there will be some limited landtake from greenfield land, including agricultural land.

It is considered that in terms of landtake, the potential adverse effects of the SPD on land resources is somewhat more significant than the potential benefits. However, the adverse effect on land resources would be very limited in the short and medium term, and may only accumulated into a significant adverse effect in the long term.
Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring

The SA/SEA recommends that the SPD guide for the specific developer contribution towards on-site recycling and composting collection facilities, which should aim to make recycling and composting convenient and attractive to users of developments.

Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline, while others considered relevant to SA Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. A list of proposed monitoring that will identify specific needs for facilities, or other soil and land resource issues for which a planning response may be warranted, is provided in Section 8.7 of this report.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Context – Key Messages from Other Planning Documents and Environmental Objectives

There are a number of planning documents from the international to the local level that attempt to reduce or halt biodiversity decline, and also to enhance and improve biodiversity and geodiversity. The key objectives from the context review relevant to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity in North East Derbyshire are considered to be:

- To halt biodiversity decline by 2010;
- To conserve, manage and make sustainable use of biological and geological diversity, enhancing the natural environment such as through incorporating features within the design of development, and supporting a net increase in quality and active management;
- To achieve a step change increase in the level of the region’s biodiversity;
- To support education, training and awareness of biodiversity issues;
- To promote access, education and tourism in the Peak District;
- To conserve wetlands and their resources;
- To protect designated Ramsar sites;
- To make wise use of wetlands and their resources, including for public benefit;
- To protect designated Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) from loss of area or other harm;
- To protect wild populations of certain species of plant and animal;
- To protect designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs);
- To prevent the spread of certain non-native species;
- To secure appropriate and sympathetic management of important local habitats;
- To expand the number /extent, and decrease fragmentation, of important local habitats;
- To restore non-native plantations to broadleaved woodland wherever possible;
- To improve the biodiversity value of important local habitats; and
- To maintain the population/distribution of priority species.
Current State of the Environment, Problems and Trends (Known/Likely Changes)

North East Derbyshire is essentially split in biodiversity terms between the Peak District, and the lower Derbyshire area, both of which have unique and valuable biodiversity and geodiversity resources. There are no Ramsar sites within North East Derbyshire, but the Peak District in the west and northwest of North East Derbyshire carries the designations of SPA, SAC and SSSI. Overall, there are 7 SSSIs within North East Derbyshire. North East Derbyshire also has 180 local Wildlife Sites and 1 Local Nature Reserve, as well as 7 Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS).

Like much of England and the UK, biodiversity has been on a long-term decline in North East Derbyshire since the early 20th century (and likely earlier). There are a number of locally important habitats and species that have declined dramatically in more recent decades. In the Peak District, these include:

- 50% loss of flower-rich hay meadows within the Peak District National Park between the mid-1980s and mid-1990s;
- loss of up to 75% of lead rakes in parts of the National Park;
- significant and continuing decline of ponds thought to be in the order of 33 - 50% since the 1960s;
- loss of 42.1 km of hedgerows from the 1970s to the 1980s;
- loss of 270 ha of upland heath from the 1970s to the 1980s;
- declines of up to 75% in water vole populations in some parts of the Peak District; and
- the extinction of black grouse.

In the lower Derbyshire area of North East Derbyshire District (which is the majority of the district), the declines in habitat include:

- 80-91% decline in semi-natural grassland between 1984 and 1999;
- decline both in extent and quality of ponds, lakes and canals, particularly in the second half of the twentieth century;
- loss of hedgerows at a rate potentially greater than the national average loss;
- the biodiversity value of woodlands may be decreasing due to lack of management;
- decline of wet woodland;
- decline of wood pasture, parkland and veteran trees;
- decline of swamps, reedbeds, mires and fens due to agricultural intensification and urbanisation;
- past modification of the majority of rivers and streams, often severely, for land drainage, agriculture, flood defence and other reasons; and
- recent loss of floodplain grazing marsh due to development and mineral extraction, and decline in quality due to agricultural improvement or neglect of management.

In terms of habitat management information, many of the declines are as a result of modern methods of agriculture and modern lifestyles changing the way in which land is managed. There are fewer people managing the land in larger overall areas, although biodiversity is always within reach of where we live, work and travel. For this reason,
management of biodiversity needs to be secured by users of all sites, urban and rural. Where historically habitats such as hay meadow, hedgerows and ponds have been removed or changed to make way for intensive agriculture or development (e.g. residential), today they can be supported and managed in tandem with development in order to halt biodiversity declines and increase sustainable wildlife populations.

Data on recent trends is largely incomplete, however it is thought that management of habitats has recently been increasing in tandem with various initiatives such as Environmental Stewardship. In terms of habitat area and quality, there is no reliable monitoring data to gauge how individual habitat types are doing, or individual species.

**Relevant SA Objectives Identified**

SA Objective 4: To protect existing biodiversity and geodiversity resources.

SA Objective 5: To enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, increasing management, accessibility and awareness.

**Potential Significant Effects of the SPD**

The SPD states that contributions will be focused upon mitigating the potential impacts of development on wildlife sites identified in the adopted Local Plan. As such, the SPD certainly contributes towards the protection of existing biodiversity resources, though no specific mention is made of geodiversity.

The SPD is likely to indirectly lead to a limited amount of increased greenfield landtake through planning obligations for new facilities and infrastructure. Any greenfield landtake as a result of facilities or infrastructure provided through planning obligations would lead to loss of habitat, some potentially of decent or good quality, indirectly as a result of the SPD.

The SPD states that the Council will proactively seek to improve biodiversity on all development sites, and this may involve low-cost provision of habitat (e.g. bird or bat boxes). Additionally, the SPD directs development to contribute towards green space, green corridors and parks (among other outdoor recreation areas).

From the previous two paragraphs, it is difficult to weight the potential benefits and detriments of the SPD to local biodiversity, and the degree of any potential adverse effects upon biodiversity can only be determined on a site-by-site basis.

The SPD directs development to incorporate measures that are likely to improve the accessibility of local sites to local residents. The accessibility measures may secondarily improve accessibility to wildlife sites in the district, however it must be recognised that this is not a clear objective of the SPD, and so opportunities may be missed.

**Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring**

With biodiversity having experienced a dramatic decline in North East Derbyshire this century, it is urgent that declines are halted, and furthermore, that increases in biodiversity are experienced. The SPD’s commitment to only low-cost habitat provision is not likely adequate to make up for the potential secondary habitat losses of infrastructure and facilities, and any habitat fragmentation imparted by these losses
and those by the developments themselves. It is therefore recommended that the SPD require the creation, enhancement and/or management of habitats, the habitat types being determined by either existing native habitats or historic native habitats on or near to those sites. In keeping with the constraints of the SPD, developer contributions should be seeking a net improvement of biodiversity on sites where they would otherwise lead to greenfield landtake and/or potential habitat fragmentation.

The SA/SEA also recommends that the SPD address geological conservation sites, which includes RIGSs and SSSIs.

Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline, while others considered relevant to SA Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. A list of proposed monitoring that will identify specific needs for facilities, or other biodiversity and geodiversity issues for which a planning response may be warranted, is provided in Section 9.7 of this report.

**IV-E Population, Social Cohesion and Inclusion**

**Context – Key Messages from Other Planning Documents and Environmental Objectives**

There are a number of planning documents from the international to the local level that attempt to encourage social cohesion, or unity, and reduce social exclusion. The key objectives from the context review relevant to making best use of land in North East Derbyshire are considered to be:

- To achieve a wide choice of housing and meet the needs of all in the community, including those in need of affordable or special housing in both urban and rural areas;
- To expect housing developments in villages as well as towns to contribute to affordable and social housing provision;
- To meet housing requirements in rural areas;
- To combat poverty and social exclusion, ensuring access to a range of shopping, leisure and local services, and addressing gaps in provision;
- To improve access to essential services;
- To regenerate deprived areas, creating new and additional employment opportunities;
- To provide opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population;
- To provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas;
- To promote accessibility and overcome ‘peripherality’ in the Region’s rural areas;
- To deal with the economic and social implications of an ageing society;
- To attain social cohesion that leads to a strong sense of community, including through the involvement of citizens;
- To promote social identity, including through the provision of public art;
- To maintain the vitality of rural communities through meeting business and community needs; and
• To ensure that people have a choice as to who provides their telecommunications service.

Current State of the Environment, Problems and Trends (Known/Likely Changes)

The population of North East Derbyshire was estimated to be 97,290 in 2005, and 18% of the population was aged 65 or over, as compared to 16% for England. Ethnically, the district is predominately of British origin, being 97.95% as compared to 86.99% for England. After ‘other white’, the most significant minority is ‘mixed ethnicity’, followed by Irish and Asian.

Only 9.5% of North East Derbyshire’s Super Output Areas (SOAs) are considered deprived, as compared to 17.6% for the East Midlands and 20% for England. Homelessness is reported to be only 4.0% as compared to 6.6% for the East Midlands and 7.8% for England. Affordable home provision in 2002-03 was significantly less than the regional average.

A far greater proportion of Asian students achieve 5 or more GCSEs at grade C or better than others for which data is available.

The proportion of the population satisfied with their location as a place to live is greater than the Derbyshire average. The proportion of the population volunteering in sport and active recreation is greater than the regional and national averages, but the percentage of people who voted in the last general election was slightly under the England average.

Gypsies and travellers are often marginalised and excluded, experiencing widespread problems with literacy, problems accessing healthcare, and lack of provision of suitable accommodation.

75% of the wards considered ‘most deprived’ experience lower-than-average life expectancies, suggesting a correlation between poverty and reduced health. A high proportion of the North East Derbyshire population does not have access to a car.

It is known that physical access to green spaces, children’s play areas and youth facilities is often problematic for disabled people due to motorbike barriers (etc.).

Relevant SA Objectives Identified

SA Objective 6: To reduce social exclusion by reducing inequalities.

SA Objective 7: To promote social cohesion and identity.

Potential Significant Effects of the SPD

The SPD requires provision of affordable housing, either on-site where deemed appropriate, or through contributions to the local planning authority to address needs in other parts of the district. The SPD also reinforces the use of planning obligations to secure the permanence of affordable housing.

Increases in affordable housing would serve to improve social inclusion. Furthermore, a mix of housing types could lead to improved social cohesion by promoting the interaction of a wider range of society.
The SPD directs development to incorporate measures that are likely to improve accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport. The SPD also directs development to provide for community facilities and other operational facilities within settlements, which in turn may be more accessible than existing facilities by non-car transport, depending upon the locations.

Improvements in accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport allow a wider proportion of society to benefit from services and facilities. Safety measures are a big factor in ensuring accessibility and reducing social exclusion, helping to eliminate disadvantage to those who are inhibited from accessing services and facilities by crime or fear of crime. Such reductions in social exclusion are likely to equate to increases in social cohesion and identity, promoting greater interaction within communities, and potentially a greater sense of belonging or acceptance.

New or improved community facilities and improvements to the public realm also increase opportunities for people to convene, and thus have a more direct positive influence on social cohesion and identity.

The SPD guides for the provision of public art, which can both enhance awareness of local identity (e.g. by embodying local identity), and create it by forming common references that people identify with their community.

The SPD also guides for the conservation of historic assets, including through measures to enhance the setting of Listed Buildings or improve access to historic parks and gardens (etc.). Historic assets are an important component of local culture and identity.

**Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring**

The SA/SEA recommends that the SPD use planning obligations for the provision of special needs housing, such as dwellings designed to mobility standards.

In response to the Department for Communities and Local Government publication ‘Local Authorities and Gypsies and Travellers: A Guide to responsibilities and Powers’, it is recommended that Gypsy and Traveller sites are recognised as affordable housing, and they should be considered eligible for provisions under Section 106 Agreements.

Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline, while others considered relevant to SA Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. A list of proposed monitoring that will identify specific needs for facilities, or other social cohesion and inclusion issues for which a planning response may be warranted, is provided in Section 10.7 of this report.

**IV-F Cultural Heritage**

**Context – Key Messages from Other Planning Documents and Environmental Objectives**

There are a number of planning documents from the international to the local level that promote the conservation and enhancement of built heritage and archaeology. The key objectives from the context review relevant to conserving and enhancing cultural heritage in North East Derbyshire are considered to be:
• To protect the historic environment and promote the management of cultural heritage;
• To achieve conservation in line with sustainable economic growth, putting historic buildings to good economic use in commercial or residential occupation;
• To enhance the historic environment where possible;
• To support a net increase in the quality and active management of historic assets; and
• To promote the role of archaeology in education, leisure and tourism.

Current State of the Environment, Problems and Trends (Known/Likely Changes)

North East Derbyshire has 29 designated Conservation Areas, 31 Grade I and II* Listed Buildings, 456 Grade II Listed Buildings, 32 Scheduled Monuments and 1 Historic Park and Garden.

The annually updated national register of Grade I and II* Listed Buildings ‘At Risk’ (English Heritage, 2007a) shows 3.23% currently ‘At Risk’ in North East Derbyshire, compared with 4.2% for the East Midlands and 3.4% for England, meaning North East Derbyshire fares better than the region and nation. However, the same register shows that 3.1% of Scheduled Monuments are ‘at risk’, compared with 2.1% for the region and 2.2% for England, significantly worse.

A county register of Grade II Listed Buildings (Derbyshire Historic Buildings Trust, 1999) shows that 8.71% are ‘At Risk’, which is high relative to the estimated average for the East Midlands. Again, according to the county register, there are 10 historic buildings at risk within Conservation Areas.

As with many places, there are opportunities to enhance, and the improve access to, the historic environment that could potentially be missed if not looked out for.

Relevant SA Objectives Identified

SA Objective 8: To protect and enhance the historic environment.

SA Objective 9: To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the district’s heritage.

Potential Significant Effects of the SPD

The SPD guides for developer contributions towards works for conservation of historic assets, a case-by-case basis and taking any impacts into account. These includes measures for improving the accessibility of historic sites.

The SPD also guides for certain ‘tools’ that could be used to improve the setting of historic buildings, including the provision of street furniture and other elements of the public realm, public art (which can be used to compliment historic sites), green infrastructure, and other outdoor open space and recreation. These tools can be used to enhance the setting and general area around historic sites.

The SPD directs development to incorporate measures that are likely to improve accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport. As such, the SPD may indirectly
improve the opportunities present for people to enjoy the district’s cultural heritage resource.

Transport measures to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport may help to reduce or minimise the adverse effect that air pollution has on many historic buildings, however this effect is likely negligible.

Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring

The SA/SEA recommends that the SPD could state more clearly the types of impacts by which developer obligations may be sought for mitigation. These should include impacts on the setting of historic assets and accessibility to historic assets, as well as any impacts on the integrity of the historic feature itself.

Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline, while others considered relevant to SA Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. A list of proposed monitoring that will identify specific needs for facilities, or other cultural heritage issues for which a planning response may be warranted, is provided in Section 11.7 of this report.

IV-G  

Emissions, Air Quality and Climate Change

Context – Key Messages from Other Planning Documents and Environmental Objectives

There are a number of planning documents from the international to the local level that are aimed at reducing climate change emissions, and benefiting air quality. The key objectives from the context review relevant to emissions, air quality and climate change in North East Derbyshire are considered to be:

- To stabilise greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous man-made interference with the global climate system;
- To reduce the need to travel, especially by car;
- To promote a range of transport alternatives which assist in reducing dependency on the private car;
- To promote energy-efficient modes of transport;
- To make preference for increased rail freight where appropriate;
- To achieve levels of air quality that do not give rise to significant negative impacts on, and risks to human health and the environment;
- To (urgently) increase the use of clean/renewable energy;
- To promote the use of renewable energy technologies, but only where it is viable and not an undue burden; and
- To support the ‘polluters pay’ principle.

Current State of the Environment, Problems and Trends (Known/Likely Changes)

In 2001, over 71% of the population travelled to work by car. The percent of travel to work by non-car modes is less than both the regional and national averages. The rate
of road transport emissions is higher for North East Derbyshire than the regional and national averages.

The proportion of industrial and commercial energy consumption from renewable energy sources is far below the regional average.

Relevant SA Objectives Identified

SA Objective 10: To reduce emissions of atmospheric pollutants, including greenhouse gases.

Potential Significant Effects of the SPD

The SPD directs development to incorporate measures that are likely to improve and prioritise the pedestrian and cyclist environment, as well as public transport infrastructure. The SPD also directs development to provide for community facilities and other operational facilities within settlements, which in turn can reduce reliance upon the private car, depending upon the location of such facilities. Travel plans are required for certain types of employment development and schools.

The SPD thus has a positive effect on emissions, in that decreasing dependence on the private car should reduce total emissions.

Additionally, the SPD guides that where proposed development would be likely to worsen traffic problems on the highway network, developer contributions will be necessary to alleviate the problem. Traffic management measures may be geared towards reducing congestion and pollution and minimising the impact of traffic on the environment. Traffic and congestion alleviation will help to maintain air quality status, and reduce emissions to a certain extent.

The SPD does, however, guide for the accommodation of the car through highway and parking provision. Transport-related schemes may be funded by individual developers, or more likely, cumulatively. As such, the opportunity for people to remain dependent on the car would not be significantly restricted.

Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring

The SA/SEA recommends that the SPD include guidance on the location of community facilities secured through developer contributions, ensuring that contributions are adequate for facilities in locations well served by footpaths, cycle paths and/or public transport.

Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline, while others considered relevant to SA Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. A list of proposed monitoring that will identify specific needs for facilities, or other emissions and air quality issues for which a planning response may be warranted, is provided in Section 12.7 of this report.
IV-H  Landscape and Townscape

Context – Key Messages from Other Planning Documents and Environmental Objectives

There are a number of planning documents from the international to the local level that are aimed at protecting and improving high-quality landscapes and townsapes. The key objectives from the context review relevant to landscape and townscape in North East Derbyshire are considered to be:

- To retain attractive landscapes, and enhance townsapes, near to where people live;
- To respect countryside character and the character of places;
- To promote ‘sense of place’;
- To enhance landscapes / countryside character, townsapes and local distinctiveness;
- To improve damaged and derelict land around towns;
- To facilitate the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems whilst keeping the environmental impact to a minimum;
- To promote good design of waste infrastructure, protecting the street scene and local landscape; and
- To help everyone involved in the display of outdoor advertising to contribute positively to the appearance of an attractive and cared-for environment in cities, towns and the countryside.

Current State of the Environment, Problems and Trends (Known/Likely Changes)

North East Derbyshire experiences a varied landscape, overlapping in the west with the Peak District National Park and having in the east areas of attractive countryside mixed with evidence of an industrial past. The Peak District National Park is made up of a highly scenic landscape with rolling hills, river valleys and small attractive villages. The eastern part of the District contains larger settlements and large areas of attractive countryside where the landscape has a distinctive local character.

The western part of the District neighbouring the Peak District National Park contains designated Special Landscape Areas, which represent the finest Derbyshire landscape outside of the park and represent those areas of landscape most similar in character to the Peak District National Park. There are four distinct Special Landscape Areas within the district: one in the southwest, two west-central, and one north-central.

Relevant SA Objectives Identified

SA Objective 11: To enhance (minimum protect) landscape/townscape character and local distinctiveness.

Potential Significant Effects of the SPD

The SPD states that public realm improvements may be appropriate in some circumstances, for example due to the scale or impact of the development. The SPD states that a goal is to have well-designed, attractive and well-maintained environments
towards the benefits of residents and attracting businesses. The SPD also guides for development to provide green space and green infrastructure, and for works for conservation of historic assets to include such measures as the use of green infrastructure to enhance the setting of Listed Buildings. Additionally, the SPD guides for the provision of public art through planning obligations.

Street improvements, public art and green infrastructure would contribute toward the local landscape and street scene, and could be used to integrate places better. In areas where new development is occurring, this may help the development to fit in with the existing landscape/townscape, and create a more cohesive landscape/townscape as a net benefit. Such measures, particularly public art, also have the potential benefit of contributing towards local distinctiveness.

**Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring**

As for biodiversity reasons, the SA/SEA recommends that the SPD require the creation, enhancement and/or management of habitats. This would simply be one more tool that developers could use in order to enhance landscapes and views within the district.

Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline, while others considered relevant to SA Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. A list of proposed monitoring that will identify specific needs for facilities, or other landscape and townscape issues for which a planning response may be warranted, is provided in Section 13.7 of this report.

**IV-I Water Quality and Flood Risk**

**Context – Key Messages from Other Planning Documents and Environmental Objectives**

There are a number of planning documents from the international to the local level that are aimed at protecting and improving water quality, and minimising flood risk. The key objectives from the context review relevant to water quality and flood risk in North East Derbyshire are considered to be:

- To adapt to climate change, reducing the risk to flooding while incorporating drainage benefits with other sustainability benefits (e.g. biodiversity, regeneration);
- To avoid flood risk to people, property, infrastructure, habitats and statutory sites where possible, and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change; and
- To protect and manage natural resources, including surface and ground water.

**Current State of the Environment, Problems and Trends (Known/Likely Changes)**

The East Midlands missed its 2005 target of 91% compliance with River Quality Objectives, although it achieved 90% compliant or marginal failure as compared to 89% compliant or marginal failure for England.

Within North East Derbyshire, the biological quality of rivers is somewhat worse than the average for the East Midlands, with 7% of river length of poor quality as compared
to 4% for the region. Chemical quality, however, is perhaps slightly better than the regional average, having a lesser percentage of river length of poor quality, but also a slightly lesser percentage of good quality (as compared to fair).

There is currently no information available on flood risk for North East Derbyshire. The East Midlands has a lower percentage of properties at risk from flooding than England, but a significantly higher percentage of its land area at risk.

There is currently no information available on past trends, however flood risk is predicted to increase with time, as a result of climate change, likely increasing the percentage of land at risk, and increasing the percentage of properties at risk without intervening measures.

**Relevant SA Objectives Identified**

SA Objective 12: To protect and enhance the quality of ground and surface waters.

SA Objective 13: To protect people, the built environment and the natural environment against the adverse effects of flooding.

**Potential Significant Effects of the SPD**

The SPD guides for requirements to be sought, where appropriate, for mitigation of flood risk and the provision of flood prevention measures. In addition, contributions for maintenance of such measures and management of surface water runoff will be required. This policy would contribute toward the reduction of flood risk to people, property, infrastructure, habitats and statutory sites. It would enable adaptation to the increased risk of flooding due to climate change, whilst taking account of surface water management.

Depending upon whether nature conservation sites are dependent upon good water quality, or otherwise upon whether good water quality is considered important for the protection of such sites or nationally rare species, the SPD could contribute towards the protection of water quality through nature conservation measures.

**Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring**

The SA/SEA recommends that the SPD more prescriptively encourage the consideration of SUDS as a developer contribution, promoting it most strongly for large-scale developments in order to mitigate the detrimental impacts upon water quality and guarantee wider benefits to flood risk. It is also recommended that the SPD clearly state that risk to other areas of land will be a factor in considering the measures deemed appropriate to a development.

Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline, while others considered relevant to SA Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. A list of proposed monitoring that will identify specific needs for facilities, or other landscape and townscape issues for which a planning response may be warranted, is provided in Section 14.7 of this report.
IV-J  

Economy, Skills and Employment

Context – Key Messages from Other Planning Documents and Environmental Objectives

There are a number of planning documents from the international to the local level that are aimed at guaranteeing a sustainable, healthy and innovative economy. The key objectives from the context review relevant to economy, skills and employment in North East Derbyshire are considered to be:

- To secure economic prosperity, employment opportunities and competitiveness;
- To achieve a sustainable economy;
- To improve access to education and higher learning programmes;
- To support business innovation;
- To combat poverty;
- To regenerate deprived areas, creating new and additional employment opportunities;
- To deal with the economic implications of an ageing society;
- To attain more balanced competitiveness;
- To improve the transport system;
- To improve international, inter and intra-regional connectivity;
- To make best use of rail infrastructure and the strategic road network to develop new opportunities for local jobs in the storage and distribution sector;
- To improve public transport access to Robin Hood Airport near Doncaster;
- To raise the economic performance of Chesterfield and Mansfield;
- To encourage the market to work for the environment;
- To support education, training and awareness of biodiversity issues;
- To support rural businesses;
- To maintain the vitality of rural communities through meeting business and community needs;
- To support sustainable tourism in delivering high-quality facilities to enjoy the countryside;
- To support market towns as comprehensive local service centres;
- To support Chesterfield and Mansfield as Sub-Regional Centres for economic activity;
- To support an efficient, competitive and innovative retail and leisure sector;
- To promote opportunities for the incorporation of beneficial biodiversity and geological features within the design of development;
- To facilitate the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems;
- To achieve conservation in line with sustainable economic growth, putting historic buildings to good economic use in commercial or residential occupation; and
- To promote the role of archaeology in education, leisure and tourism.
Current State of the Environment, Problems and Trends (Known/Likely Changes)

The economic activity rate for North East Derbyshire is somewhat lower than the regional and national averages, as is the percentage of the working population with a qualification of at least NVQ level 3 (vocational training). The unemployment rate, however, is lower than the regional and national averages, and GCSE achievement is generally on par with the national average (though it may have fallen just below in very recent years – data is incomplete).

The number of tourist visitors to North East Derbyshire has declined in recent years from just over 36.5 million in 2003, to 35.8 million in 2005. This trend contrasts from increases in number of tourists visiting the East Midlands overall. The proportion of VAT registered businesses relative to the population is below the regional and national averages, but increasing.

Other known sustainability issues include the decline of smaller town centres, peak time traffic congestion on key routes around Chesterfield town centre, and a low tourism profile.

GCSE achievement is not expected to drop dramatically, but the district should be cautious of future declines. The achievement of vocational qualifications is not expected to improve without intervening measures. There are a number of initiatives aimed at supporting and improving the local economy in North East Derbyshire, and taking this into consideration, rises in VAT registered businesses are expected to continue into the future. However, it is difficult to predict whether tourist numbers will continue to decline into the future, though this can be considered likely without intervening measures.

Relevant SA Objectives Identified

SA Objective 14: To maintain and improve levels of attainment in education and skills qualifications.

SA Objective 15: To provide physical conditions for a modern economic structure.

Potential Significant Effects of the SPD

The SPD guides for development to provide school places in order to help the district keep up with demand. It is difficult to assess whether the net effect of such provision will be maintaining the ‘status quo’ in terms of provision of school capacity, or whether there are potential improvements in terms of newer classrooms being to a better design standard, or indeed redressing any current capacity issues. There is also no specific mention of funding school staff in terms of addressing capacity.

The SPD guides for developer contributions towards new or improved community facilities, encouraging multi-purpose buildings and use of buildings for learning.

The SPD guides for development to contribute towards training and workforce development, including employment and training initiatives, programmes to meet specific community and sector needs, apprentice schemes and work-based placement. This is likely to contribute towards the rate of skills qualifications in the district, as well as overall employment.
Particularly in the media, there is a reported linkage between the amount of affordable housing and economic opportunities, particularly as relates to the supply for key workers. Various industries can have difficulties acquiring and retaining staff as a result of the high cost of housing. The SPD states requirements for affordable housing in new development, which could help to maximise opportunities for economic growth as and when they occur.

The economy also benefits from having adequate and even spare capacity on transport infrastructure. The SPD provides a mechanism whereby the cumulative demand on infrastructure may be considered, including before all of the developments have come forward. Additionally, it sets the precedent that “spare capacity… will not be credited to developers.” As such, the SPD contributes significantly towards the ability of decision-makers to plan for infrastructure ahead of development, helping to prevent deficits of capacity, particularly where such deficits could lead to the missing or ‘reduction’ of important economic opportunities.

Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring

The SA/SEA recommends that it is considered possible that the SPD could address provision of adult training facilities specifically in areas where a relative lack of such facilities is experienced.

Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline, while others considered relevant to SA Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. A list of proposed monitoring that will identify specific needs for facilities, or other landscape and townscape issues for which a planning response may be warranted, is provided in Section 15.7 of this report.

V Next Steps in the SA/SEA Process

V-A Next Stages of SA/SEA

The bulk of the SA/SEA of the Developer Contributions SPD is now complete. North East Derbyshire District Council will decide which of the recommendations of the SA/SEA (as presented in the previous chapter), including proposed monitoring, it will take up as part of the SPD or its implementation. Any changes to the Developer Contributions SPD taken on board as a result of these recommendations will be incorporated into a final draft of the SPD.

The only remaining stage of SA/SEA is the monitoring of indicators that represent the status of society and the environment, which will be done by North East Derbyshire District Council over a number of years. As stated above, the Council will decide which indicators recommended by the SA/SEA it can feasibly monitor, including those which will be most useful in informing decision-making in the future. Any future SA/SEAs can therefore be informed or even based upon the data obtained.

V-B SEA Statement

Once the SPD is adopted, an SEA Statement will be issued, summarising how the SA/SEA process, and environmental considerations generally, have influenced the SPD. This will include how comments as a result of consultation have been taken into account. The SEA Statement will describe why the SPD was adopted in the form as chosen, considering the alternative approaches considered. It will also describe the
environmental monitoring that will be carried out alongside the implementation of the SPD, such as in light of that recommended by the SA/SEA.
1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal and this report

1.1.1 In Summer 2004, the passage of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) introduced changes to the structure and process of land use planning in the UK, requiring local authorities to progressively replace their adopted Local Plan with a new set of planning documents, the Local Development Framework (LDF). The main components of the LDF are Development Plan Documents (DPDs), however Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) can be prepared to expand policy or provide further detail to policies for a range of issues, both thematic and site-specific, and must then be included in the LDF, forming part of the planning framework for the area.

1.1.2 On behalf of North East Derbyshire District Council, Scott Wilson Limited is in the process of preparing a draft Developer Contributions SPD in order to expand upon policy relating to developer contributions towards certain community needs within the district. The SPD is intended to secure funding, provision and improvements towards:

- affordable housing;
- community safety;
- community facilities;
- education;
- highways and transport;
- public realm;
- public art;
- open space and recreation; and
- environmental improvements.

1.1.3 National planning guidance states that an SPD can supplement policies in a DPD or amplify how policy will be implemented⁴. North East Derbyshire is in the transitional stage as it moves from the former development plan system to the structure provided by the PCPA. The Developer Contributions SPD is being prepared in parallel with the Core Strategy DPD, and will therefore be linked to the existing, adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (2005). Of this adopted plan, the SPD will mainly amplify the implementation of:

- Policy GS9: Planning Obligations,

but the SPD will also amplify:

- Policies H3, H6, H9 and H10 on housing,
- Policies E3, E4 and E5 on the implementation of mixed use developments,
- Policies T2, T5 and T6 on transport,
- Policies R5 and R8 on provision for public open space and recreation,
- Policy CSU2 on the provision of community facilities,
- Policy GS10 on crime prevention;

⁴ Paragraphs 2.42 to 2.44 (inclusive) in source: ODPM, 2004a – see Appendix 1.
1.1.4 Section 39 of the PCPA requires that in the preparation of an LDF, local authorities ensure that policies in the documents contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Towards this end, Section 19(5) of the PCPA requires that local authorities "(a) carry out an appraisal of the sustainability of the proposals in each document [in the LDF]; [and] (b) prepare a report of the findings of the appraisal" (Section 19(5)); this process is referred to as Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The purpose of SA is:

...to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans. ...SA is an iterative process that identifies and reports on the likely significant effects of the plan and the extent to which implementation of the plan will achieve the social, environmental and economic objectives by which sustainable development can be defined.

(ODPM, 2004c, p.16)

1.1.5 In July 2004, the requirement to undertake the process of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) – ratified in European Union Directive 2001/42/EC in 2001 – was transposed into UK law by the Environmental Assessment Of Plans And Programmes Regulations 2004 (SI No.1633), the ‘SEA Regulations’. Regulations 2-(1), 5-(2) and 5-(3) of the SEA Regulations define the requirement to undertake SEA of the certain types of plan that are likely to have significant environmental effects, and that set a “framework for future development consent of projects” (HM Government, 2004, Regulation 5-(2)(b)). Documents comprising the LDF can meet both of these criteria, as they may determine the scale, pattern and process of controlling changes in land use in the district.

1.1.6 Government guidance advocates that SA and SEA occur as a unified assessment (ODPM, 2005c and ODPM, 2005d). Current guidance also requires that assessment is ‘front-loaded,’ meaning that it occurs in parallel with plan development so that impacts can be mitigated, compensated or eliminated before the plan is finalised. This combined SA/SEA is occurring simultaneously with the development of the SPD.

1.1.7 In practice, SA/SEA occurs essentially in two stages: the first is the scoping stage, setting the policy and environmental context and background to the SPD and its area of influence. The second is the assessment stage, inclusive of the assessment of alternatives, assessment of the SPD, recommended mitigation and monitoring. (Chapter 2 provides more detail on the SA/SEA process.)

1.1.8 This report presents documentation of the process and the results of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in preparation for the emerging North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD.

1.2 Plan objectives

1.2.1 Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that “a local planning authority may enter into an agreement with any person interested in land in their area for the purpose of restricting or regulating the development or use of the land”, and these agreements “may contain such incidental and consequential provisions (including
financial ones) as appear to the local planning authority to be necessary or expedient for the purposes of the agreement” (HM Government, 1990). These have come to be known as Section 106 Agreements.

1.2.2 In different terms, Section 106 Agreements are private legal agreements between a local planning authority and a developer/applicant (for planning permission), and any other person who may have an interest in the application site, that allow specific demands on local services and infrastructure to be met. Government Guidance states that planning obligations (usually secured through Section 106 agreements) must be:

(i) relevant to planning;
(ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;
(iii) directly related to the proposed development;
(iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and
(v) reasonable in all other respects.

(ODPM, 2005a, p. 10)

1.2.3 The overall objectives of the Developer Contributions SPD are:

- to provide clarity about the application of planning obligations in North East Derbyshire;
- to assist applicants/developers/agents in pre-application discussions with the Council;
- to amplify the polices of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan and provide guidance to applicants, developers, agents, officers and councillors;
- to ensure a consistent approach to planning obligations across the District;
- to provide a framework for negotiating planning obligations;
- to give transparency to planning obligations;
- to enable members of the public to understand the process and application of planning obligations;
- to outline a procedure for monitoring planning obligations and adjusting policy as may be required; and
- to operate within the principles of sustainable development.

1.2.4 The SPD is being developed alongside this SA/SEA (currently in the process of being finalised), and a draft version was consulted upon alongside this SA Report between June and August of 2007 (see Section 2.13).
2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The stages of this Sustainability Appraisal are outlined in Figure 2-1 below. Thus far in the assessment of the SPD, Stages A through D have all been conducted, Stage C leading to the publication of this SA Report. The stages are iterative, being revisited as appropriate in response to consultations and development of the SPD.

Figure 2-1: Five-Stage Approach to Sustainability Appraisal

2.1.2 While this section summarises the SA/SEA methodology, Chapters 6 through 15 of this report contain summaries of the results of Stages A and B of the SA/SEA of the Developer Contributions SPD by sustainability topic (see chapter titles). A more detailed methodology for Stage A is provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report. Section 2.13, Section 2.14 and Appendix 4 summarise the consultation undertaken, and its results.

2.1.3 The results of Stage A work have served as the foundation for Stage B of SA/SEA, the assessments having taken account of the identified sustainability issues facing North East Derbyshire, and having been carried out against the SA Objectives defined during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.
2.2 Stage A

2.2.1 Stage A, itself based on five stages, was conducted in March, April and May 2007, and culminated in the production of an SA/SEA Scoping Report for the SPD. It involved establishing the framework for undertaking the SA – essentially a set of sustainable development objectives against which the SPD has been assessed – together with an evidence base to help inform the appraisal. Table 2-1 below summarises the ‘sub-stages’ of Stage A.

Table 2-1: Sub-Stages Within Stage A of SA/SEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identify other relevant plans, programmes and sustainability objectives that will influence the SPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Collect relevant social, environmental and economic baseline information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Identify key sustainability issues for the SA / SPD to address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Develop the SA framework, consisting of the SA objectives and sub-objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Produce a scoping report and consult relevant authorities, the public and other key stakeholders on the scope of the appraisal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 Task A1 in the SA/SEA of the SPD involved establishing the context in which the SPD has been prepared – i.e. the other policies, plans, programmes, strategies and initiatives that have influenced its content (and vice-versa), and the opportunities and challenges these have presented.

2.2.3 Task A2 involved the collection of baseline information. It is a key component of the SA process and a legal requirement under the SEA Regulations. Baseline information helps to provide a basis for predicting and monitoring effects, and assembling baseline data helps to identify sustainability problems.

2.2.4 The Developer Contributions SPD is to apply to North East Derbyshire district as a whole. With this in mind, a broad baseline has been set out for the district based on a series of indicators. The SA/SEA has then highlighted which of these indicators are not recognised as needing action (i.e. are healthy), and which the Council should consider for action (i.e. are unhealthy, based on the data). ‘Action’ implies particular focus or effort for halting declines in, or improving, conditions that an indicator measures (although it is recognised that some of these might be beyond the Council’s sphere of influence and could be better addressed by other organisations or partnerships).

2.2.5 Task A3 involved identifying the sustainability issues and problems facing the area in question. These were drawn not only from the baseline data collected, but also from the context review and consultation with key stakeholders carried out.

2.2.6 Task A4 involved the development of a series of objective for sustainable development, also known as the SA Framework or SA Objectives, based on Tasks A1 through A3. SA is fundamentally based on an objectives-led approach, whereby the potential effects of a plan are gauged in relation to the SA Framework. In other words, the SA
Framework provides a methodological yardstick against which to assess the effects of the plan.

2.2.7 The work undertaken during Stage A of the SA/SEA process was documented in a Scoping Report of May 2007, which has attempted to make the Stage A process transparent. This SA Report summarises this information, but the Scoping Report should be referred to for more detail on the methodology and results of Stage A.

2.2.8 The Scoping Report was consulted upon with the statutory consultees and other interested parties. The first draft of the Scoping Report was published prior to consultation, and the final version (May 2007) has taken account of the comments received.

2.3 Stage B

2.3.1 Stage B of SA/SEA is based on six sub-stages that deal with the assessment of the SPD’s compatibility with the SA Framework, the assessment of the SPD’s potential significant effects on people and the environment, including with respect to alternative approaches to the final chosen form of the SPD, and the identification of potential mitigation and monitoring measures in order to help reduce or eliminate potential adverse effects, and/or maximise sustainability benefits. Table 2-2 below summarises the sub-stages of Stage B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Stages Within Stage B of SA/SEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Task B1: Testing the SPD Objectives

2.4.1 The compatibility test arises from Government guidance on SA, which states:

*It is important for the objectives of the SPD to be in accordance with sustainability principles. The objectives should be tested for compatibility with the SA objectives. This will help in refining the SPD objectives as well as in identifying options. The SPD objectives also need to be consistent with each other, and the SA objectives will be*
one way of checking for this. Where there is conflict between objectives, the LPA will need to reach a decision on priorities.

(ODPM, 2005d, p.68)

2.4.2 The test for compatibility of SPD objectives with SA Objectives (the SA Framework) is inherently subjective, however Task B1 of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD has been supported by a technique and rationale that takes account of:

- the measures or development potentially implemented towards the end of achieving the SPD objective;
- what the SA Objective is trying to achieve (as interpreted through sub-objectives and indicators);
- the status of the relevant baseline (including quantitative and qualitative data), and how it might change over time; and
- current knowledge of the various relationships between development and the objectives of social, economic and environmental sustainability.

2.4.3 In helping to refine SPD objectives, the SA/SEA has recommended changes in order to reduce or eliminate incompatibility or maximise the number of compatibilities.

2.5 Task B2: Testing the SPD Options

2.5.1 Once the SPD objectives were finalised following Task B1, the next stage of SPD development paralleling the SA/SEA was the consideration of various options, or alternatives, that represent different ways of achieving the SPD objectives. Task B2 involves the testing of these SPD options against the SA Framework. Government guidance states:

The options need to be compared with each other and with the current social, environmental and economic characteristics of the area which is subject to the SPD and the likely future situation without a SPD. In doing so they need to be tested against the SA framework. …This will inform the selection of options and their development in detail for inclusion in the draft SPD to be published for consultation.

(ODPM, 2005d, p.69)

2.5.2 The appraisal of options also fulfils requirements of the SEA Regulations, as quoted below.

The report shall identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of—

…

(b) reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme.

(HM Government, 2004, Regulation 12-(2))

The report shall include… An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with…

(HM Government, 2004, Regulation 12-(3) and Schedule 2-8)
2.5.3 Each of the SPD options developed (provided in Section 4.1) has been appraised against each of the SA Objectives, using the technique described in Section 2.4 above, and the definitions and scoring symbols described in Section 2.6 below.

2.6 Task B3: Predicting the Effects of the SPD

Effects Definitions

2.6.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

…the likely significant effects on the environment of—
(a) implementing the plan or programme…

(HM Government, 2004, Regulation 12-(2))

The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects…

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

2.6.2 In assessing the temporal aspect of the potential significant effects of the SPD, the following approximate timescales have been used:

- **short term** = approximately 2008 – 2018: the period from the operation of the first development to be approved in line with the SPD’s guidelines (assumed to be within the next year or so – essentially now) to approximately 10 years thereafter;
- **medium term** = approximately 2018 – 2028: the period spanning from approximately 10 years from now to approximately 20 years from now; and
- **long term** = approximately 2028 – 2038: the period from approximately 20 years from now to approximately 30 years from now.

2.6.3 The permanence of effects has been accounted for through the temporal account (short-, medium- and long-term); where not obvious that an effect is either permanent or temporary by the appraisal scoring (see the next section), it has been described in the text.

2.6.4 The assessments have been carried out in such a way as to account for both potential positive and potential negative effects, including as expressed through the potential influence of the SPD upon indicators that represent potential receptors of effects (i.e. people or the environment).

2.6.5 Primary effects (or direct effects) are those that occur as a direct result of the implementation of a Local Development Document (LDD), for example a land allocation that overlaps a woodland and thus whose development would directly lead to an impact on those trees. Secondary effects (or indirect effects) are “effects that are not a direct result of the SPD, but occur away from the original effect or as a result of a complex pathway”, for example “a development that changes a water table and thus affects the ecology of a nearby wetland; and construction of one project that facilitates or attracts other developments” (ODPM, 2005d, p.137). The nature of the Developer Contributions SPD is such that all of the potential effects would be secondary ones.
2.6.6 Effects (particularly secondary ones) may traverse political or geographical boundaries, affecting receptors, the people or aspects of the environment that receive an impact or effect, both within and beyond the area of study (in this case, North East Derbyshire).

2.6.7 In accordance with current guidance on SA and other best practice guidance, this assessment has used the following definitions of ‘cumulative’ and ‘synergistic’:

- **cumulative effect**: an effect that results from policies external to the SPD acting in combination with the policies of the SPD upon a common receptor; and
- **synergistic effect**: a type of cumulative effect, whereby the effects from different policies “interact to produce a total effect greater than the sum of the individual effects” (ODPM, 2005d, p.137).

2.6.8 In addition, another type of effect not specified by Schedule 2-6 of the SEA Regulations is:

- **dysergistic effect**: a type of cumulative effect, whereby the effects from different policies interact to produce a total effect less than the sum of the individual effects, including the potential to cancel out effects altogether.

**Effects Assessed**

2.6.9 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

> The likely significant effects on the environment, ...on issues such as—
> (a) biodiversity;
> (b) population;
> (c) human health;
> (d) fauna;
> (e) flora;
> (f) soil;
> (g) water;
> (h) air;
> (i) climatic factors;
> (j) material assets;
> (k) cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage;
> (l) landscape; and
> (m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (l).

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

2.6.10 As part of Stage A of the SA process, a series of 15 SA Objectives were established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD, and these address the topics of Schedule 2-6 of the SEA Regulations above. Appendix 2 contains a summary table of the SA Objectives, their relationship with ‘Sustainability Appraisal Topic’ as in this SA Report and their relationship with the topics detailed under Schedule 2-6 of the SEA Regulations.

2.6.11 Sub-objectives have also been developed, and indicators identified during Sub-Stage A2 have been linked to one or more SA Objective. The Scoping Report provides further details of how these objectives, sub-objectives and indicators were developed and consulted upon.
Assessment Method

2.6.12 The assessment of the draft SPD has involved a textual analysis of the potential effects upon people and the environment in North East Derbyshire as relates to each topic paper, or ‘Sustainability Appraisal topic’, taking account of the effects definitions described above.

2.6.13 The SPD has been assessed in detail to determine:

- the potential significant effects of the SPD on people and the environment;
- whether the SPD supports or conflicts with each SA Objective vis-à-vis indicators;
- the importance/magnitude of the influence on each SA Objective relative to the current status, or “health”, of indicators; and
- the way this influence might change over time.

2.6.14 In order to arrive at a conclusion about how development as guided by the SPD will affect achievement of an SA Objective, each assessment of the SPD against an SA Objective has combined qualitative and quantitative techniques, taking account of:

- what the SA Objective is trying to achieve (as interpreted through sub-objectives and indicators);
- the status of the relevant baseline (including quantitative and qualitative data), and how it might change over time; and
- current knowledge of the various relationships between development and the objectives of social, economic and environmental sustainability.

2.6.15 In order to make the appraisal process as simple and clear as possible, the appraisals have addressed two separate types of receptor: 1) potential receptors within North East Derbyshire, and 2) receptors outside of North East Derbyshire, or more appropriately, the potential implications of the SPD on neighbouring districts. The appraisals in either case have taken account of the requirements and definitions outlined above.

2.6.16 Sustainability Appraisal is an inherently uncertain process that involves making predictions concerning environmental and sustainability conditions on the basis of often limited or possibly inadequate data. As such, the assessment process has also accounted for the degree of uncertainty for each assessment, which could be, for example, as a result of the unpredictability of externally influencing factors or a variety of possible interpretations of the SPD.

2.6.17 Current guidance on SA/SEA advises that each SA Objective can be defined more precisely using sub-objectives that ask a question worded in the manner of, ‘does the policy do x?’ These sub-objectives can be used to fine-tune the policy assessment to meet specific local issues; for example, the need to avoid dust contamination, which may be part of a broader objective of maintaining and improving air quality, or reducing pollutants of various forms. These sub-objectives were defined in the Scoping Report, and have been employed within the assessments documented in this SA Report.
### 2.7 Task B4: Evaluating the Significance of Effects

#### 2.7.1

In order to allow for a concise overview and comparison of the various influences of the SPD on the SA Objectives (including in combination with other strategic level documents), the assessment of the SPD has been summarised using scoring symbols within matrices. **Table 2-3** below describes the scale to be used in summarising the potential significant influences of the SPD on each SA Objective.

#### Table 2-3: Appraisal Scoring Symbols and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Influence / Effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Relevant Baseline</th>
<th>General Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ++     | Major positive     | Potential improvement to the relevant baseline | Indicator(s) is/are:  
• far off-target; or  
• off-target and declining. |
| +      | Moderate positive  | Potential improvement to the relevant baseline | Indicator(s) is/are:  
• on-target and relatively unmoving or improving. |
| 0      | None / negligible  | No apparent relationship; or No apparent effect, or effects will largely be absorbed by other factors; or Negligible change to the relevant baseline. | Indicator(s) is/are:  
• on-target and relatively unmoving or improving. |
| -      | Moderate negative  | Potential deterioration of the relevant baseline | Indicator(s) is/are:  
• on-target and relatively unmoving or improving. |
| --     | Major negative     | Potential deterioration of the relevant baseline | Indicator(s) is/are:  
• off-target, but improving or unmoving; or  
• on-target but declining. |
The scale uses best practice, explaining and justifying “the choice of symbol with reference to the baseline situation relevant to the SA objective” (ODPM, 2005d, p.132). As such, the influence of the SPD on SA Objectives has been categorised by potential influence on indicators, which in turn reflect the assessments of potential significant effects on people and the environment.

Current guidance advocates that “flexibility is important so that individual cases can be assessed. Criteria should be used as guidelines, not rules” (ODPM, 2005d, p.71). It should be noted that the description of the relevant baseline is indicative, as in some assessments there have been multiple indicators of different status or “health” for one SA Objective, and in others, such as where there are information ‘gaps’ (see Section 2.14), supplementary information or context has informed individual appraisals.

As described in Section 2.6, the assessment has accounted for a degree of uncertainty in each appraisal. Causes of uncertainty in the appraisal process can include:

- the broad or contextual nature of certain SA Objectives;
- the number of factors external to infrastructure and facilities that could influence the achievement of certain SA Objectives; and
- information gaps.

It is considered appropriate to assess the SPD in relation to it can reasonably contribute towards the achievement of the SA Objective or Sub-Objectives.

‘Uncertainty levels’ have been assessed in order to account for the unknowns that influence the degree of change to be realised in the list of suggested indicators. Table 2-4 below describes the scale used in assessing the probability that the sustainability effects realised on the ground as seen through indicators will occur as appraised, should SPD policies be implemented.

Table 2-4: Uncertainty Level Scoring Symbols and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Basic Interpretation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly certain</td>
<td>Both the direction (beneficial/neutral/adverse) and magnitude (moderate/major) are considered highly likely to occur as assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderately certain</td>
<td>Only the direction (beneficial/neutral/adverse) is considered highly likely to occur as assessed, including negligible benefits or negligible adverse effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Effect of policy may vary from indicators</td>
<td>If the effect were entirely up to development, it would be likely to occur as assessed. External factors (e.g. lifestyle and personal choice) have a strong influence over the actual effect realised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately uncertain</td>
<td>Depends upon the way in which a policy is implemented on the ground, or the assessment relies upon a value judgement due to conflicting messages/effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly uncertain</td>
<td>The effect assessed is based on speculation, due to incomplete or missing baseline data, lack of available research forming linkages with development, or a potential random effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8 Task B5: Proposing Mitigation

2.8.1 The results of the assessment have been used to recommend mitigation to the SPD. Theoretically, mitigation relevant to the SPD could include amendments (e.g., changes to wording), additional text to elaborate upon guidance or requirements, or the removal of text. Mitigation recommendations can also address other planning and appraisal processes, either indirectly tied to the SPD or that otherwise can have effects upon like receptors of effects.

2.9 Task B6: Proposing Monitoring

2.9.1 The results of the assessment have also been used to make proposals for additional monitoring. Proposals for additional monitoring can include a variety of new indicators, and in terms of helping to facilitate early remedial action to any unforeseen adverse effects, will inform project-level management decisions and help guide future planning applications.

2.10 Stage C

2.10.1 The actions in Stages A, B and D of the SA/SEA process are documented in this SA Report, which attempts to make the process transparent, inclusive of:

- reasons for and aims of the assessment (addressed in Chapter 1);
- methods employed (addressed in Chapter 2, Sections 2.1 to 2.10 and 2.13);
- how these methods have applied in reality, particularly with regard to any difficulties encountered (addressed in Chapter 2, Sections 2.11 to 2.15);
- the results of the SA/SEA, inclusive of the context review, sustainability baseline, sustainability issues identified, the SA Framework and the results of various stages of appraisal (addressed in Chapters 5 to 14);
- the recommended mitigation and monitoring (addressed in Chapters 5 to 14); and
- the way in which the results of consultation on the SA/SEA have been taken into account (addressed in Sections 2.13, 2.14 and Appendix 4).

2.10.2 This SA Report is now considered final, having been consulted upon with the statutory consultees and other interested parties (see Section 2.13 on consultation), and modified as considered appropriate to the comments received (see Appendix 4).

2.11 When the SA/SEA was Carried Out

2.11.1 Stage A of the SA/SEA process was undertaken in February, March and April 2007, and resulted in the production of a draft Scoping Report documenting its output. Following consultation, and the consideration of any comments received, a final draft of the Scoping Report was prepared and issued in May 2007.

2.11.2 Stages B and C were conducted in April and May 2007, being revisited as appropriate in response to consultation on the Scoping Report. This SA Report will be issued alongside the draft SPD in June 2007 for consultation with the statutory bodies and the
public (Stage D). A final draft of the SA Report will be issued upon completion of this consultation period.

2.12 Who Carried out the SA/SEA

2.12.1 Scott Wilson is carrying out the SA/SEA of the SPD on behalf of North East Derbyshire District Council, having at this stage carried out the scoping work and appraisal, and produced a (final) Scoping Report and this draft SA Report.

2.13 Who was Consulted, When and How?

Consulting on the Scope (Stage A)

2.13.1 The SEA Regulations require that:

When deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information that must be included in the report, the responsible authority shall consult the consultation bodies.

(HM Government, 2004, Regulation 12-(5))

and

Where a consultation body wishes to respond to a consultation under paragraph (5), it shall do so within the period of 5 weeks beginning with the date on which it receives the responsible authority’s invitation to engage in the consultation.

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 12-(6))

2.13.2 The SEA Regulations go on to define the ‘consultation bodies’ as “…the Countryside Agency; …English Heritage…; …English Nature; and …the Environment Agency” (HM Government, 2004, Regulation 4-(1)). However, since the SEA Regulations were created, English Nature and the Countryside Agency merged into the single body known as Natural England in October 2006. Thus, there are three consultation bodies, also called ‘statutory consultees’: Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency.

2.13.3 The North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD SA/SEA Scoping Report has been consulted upon with the statutory consultees in accordance with the SEA Regulations, and also with other key stakeholders and interested parties as outlined in the North East Derbyshire Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). In accordance with best practice and in order to increase stakeholder involvement, it was also distributed to other environmental organisations. The parties consulted on the Scoping Report include:

- Natural England,
- English Heritage,
- the Environment Agency,
- North East Derbyshire District Council,
- the East Midlands Regional Assembly,
- the East Midlands Development Agency,
- the Government Office for the East Midlands,
- Derbyshire County Council,
- the Chesterfield Area Regeneration Team (CHART),
• Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE),
• Sustrans,
• The Ramblers’ Association,
• Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB),
• the Wildlife Trust,
• interested parties in accordance with North East Derbyshire’s SCI, and
• the general public (report access via the Council website).

2.13.4 Consultation on the scoping report was conducted in April and May 2007. The deadline for comments on the scoping report was 17 May 2007, which allowed for the required five-week statutory consultation period.

2.13.5 Section 2.9 of the Scoping Report (May 2007) provides more detail on the parties consulted and the way in which the scoping report was made available. Appendix 3 of the Scoping Report summarises the comments received and the way in which they have been addressed, and Section 2.10 of the Scoping Report outlines the changes made as a result of addressing these comments.

2.13.6 The way in which comments were dealt with will also be documented in an SEA Statement once the SPD is adopted.

Consultation on the SA Report (Stage D)

2.13.7 The SEA Regulations require that:

Every draft plan or programme for which an environmental report has been prepared in accordance with regulation 12 and its accompanying environmental report (“the relevant documents”) shall be made available for the purposes of consultation…

(HM Government, 2004, Regulation 13-(1))

2.13.8 This SA Report was consulted upon alongside the draft Developer Contributions SPD for six weeks in June, July and August 2007.

2.13.9 The three SEA Statutory Consultees (as required by the SEA Regulations – see Section 2.13) of Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency were consulted, as well as other key stakeholders and interested parties as outlined in the North East Derbyshire Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). In accordance with best practice and in order to increase stakeholder involvement, it was distributed to other environmental organisations.

2.13.10 Letters and emails were distributed, notifying statutory consultees, key stakeholders, interested parties and other environmental organisations of the availability of the SA Report for consultation. Additionally, the consultation period was advertised in the local press and on the North East Derbyshire District Council website. Notices were posted in relevant areas of local libraries, local authority housing offices and council offices in the district.

2.13.11 A hard copy of the report was be made available for public viewing at a number of local libraries, local authority housing offices and the North East Derbyshire District Council office. An electronic version was be made available to download from the Council website (http://www.ne-derbyshire.gov.uk/), and electronic copies were distributed to the statutory consultees, key stakeholders and interested parties in the first instance or...
unless otherwise requested. Hard copies were supplied to members the general public upon request (there were two requests).

2.13.12 Interested parties included members of the public and representatives of organisations and businesses with an interest in the development of the Developer Contributions SPD.

2.14 Changes to this Report as a Result of Consultation

2.14.1 Table 2-5 below outlines the key changes made to this report since the issue of the first draft in June 2007 in response to consultation (as described in Sections III-B and 2.13), and where in the report they were made.

Table 2-5: Changes Made to the SA Report Since Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place in this Report (Section/Paragraph)</th>
<th>Change Made</th>
<th>General Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sections III-B, V, 2.13 and generally across the document</td>
<td>Methodology modified to reflect that consultation has now been undertaken; date changed to current issue.</td>
<td>Logical (steps previously 'to be undertaken' now undertaken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2.14/2/15</td>
<td>Section 2.14 moved to Section 2.15 – new Section 2.14 added to describe changes made to the SA Report as a result of consultation</td>
<td>Update in accordance with past actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.1/3.2 and 3.2/3.3</td>
<td>Section 3.2 moved to 3.1, and 3.3 moved to 3.2</td>
<td>Update in accordance with past actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section IV-F (Cultural Heritage)</td>
<td>Paragraphs altered in order to reflect the data sources, to remove the poor comparison made with regard to registered parks and gardens, and to identify scheduled monuments</td>
<td>Consultation with English Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9.6</td>
<td>Paragraph 9.6.2 altered – removed sentence referring to the constraints of the SPD and developments leading to greenfield landtake or fragmentation</td>
<td>Consultation with Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 11.2, Table 11-1</td>
<td>Modified to include the most up-to-date local data, remove the regional comparator from the RSS Annual Monitoring Report, and reference all of the other data clearly. Data on Scheduled Monuments obtained from English Heritage</td>
<td>Consultation with English Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 11.7</td>
<td>Added an indicator on the status of locally significant parks and gardens (e.g. Victorian parks)</td>
<td>Consultation with English Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place in this Report (Section/Paragraph)</td>
<td>Change Made</td>
<td>General Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td>New Appendix 4, summarising the comments received and how they have been taken into account in this report</td>
<td>To best communicate how consultation results were taken into account</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.15 Difficulties Encountered

**2.15.1** There are currently ‘gaps’ in the baseline data presented in the Scoping Report, which include lack of data with regard to both the past and present status of indicators. Such gaps also make it difficult, or sometimes impossible, to predict the future status of indicators, as required by the SEA Regulations. This includes gaps in the data specifically for North East Derbyshire, and in regional and national data.

**2.15.2** The use of ‘topic papers’, an approach adopted by this SA/SEA, has required a certain amount of subjective judgment as to which topics or themes warrant their own topic paper. This includes such issues as whether or not to separate common themes present in all topics into individual topic papers. The decisions made have been based upon SA/SEA requirements and best practice, including maintaining topics that address the requirements of the SEA Regulations, and the avoidance of duplication of assessment.

**2.15.3** As described in Sections 2.6 and 2.7, the assessment has accounted for a degree of uncertainty in each appraisal. Causes of uncertainty in the appraisal process have mainly included:

- the broad or contextual nature of certain SA Objectives, and lack of suitable indicators to capture influences of the SPD;
- the number of factors external to infrastructure and facilities that could influence the achievement of certain SA Objectives; and
- information gaps.

**2.15.4** The SPD has been assessed in relation to it can reasonably contribute towards the achievement of the SA Objective or Sub-Objectives. ‘Uncertainty levels’ have been assessed in order to account for the unknowns that influence the degree of change to be realised in the indicators attributed to SA Sub-Objectives. Table 2-4 in Section 2.7 describes the scale used in assessing the probability that the sustainability effects realised on the ground as seen through indicators will occur as appraised, should SPD policies be implemented.
3  NEXT STAGES

3.1  Stage E: Monitoring

3.1.1  The Council is obligated to monitor the significant effects of the SPD. The monitoring measures proposed in the SA Report will be refined following public consultation, and will be incorporated into a monitoring framework.

3.2  SEA Statement

3.2.1  Upon adoption of the SPD, the Council must produce an SEA Statement, a stage of the process required under the SEA Regulations, the central purpose of which is to describe the difference made by the SEA process and how this has affected the development of the SPD. The production of an SEA Statement is required specifically by Part 4, Regulation 16, paragraphs (1)(b)(iii) and (3)(c)(iii).

3.2.2  The SEA Regulations require that an SEA Statement describe:

(a)  how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme;
(b)  how the environmental report has been taken into account;
(c)  how opinions expressed in response to—
(i)  the invitation (of the consultation bodies and the public consultees to express their opinion on the relevant documents); (and)
(ii)  (inspection by the public), have been taken into account;
(d)  how the results of any consultations entered into under regulation 14(4) have been taken into account;
(e)  the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and
(f)  the measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the plan or programme.

(HM Government, 2004, Regulation 16-(4))
4 APPRAISAL OF SPD OBJECTIVES

4.1 Objectives of the SPD

4.1.1 As described in the previous chapter (Section 2.4), Task B1 of the SA/SEA process entails the testing of the SPD objectives against the SA Framework/Objectives. Government guidance on Task B1 states that the “objectives of the SPD set out what it is aiming to achieve in spatial planning terms and set the context for development of options for the SPD” (ODPM, 2005d, p.68). It should be noted that the SPD has a set of procedural objectives (described in paragraph 1.2.3) that are not relevant to appraisal. Rather, the appraisal is carried out of those objectives relating to the way in which planning influences the form, size, scale and pattern of development, and the influence of development on the surrounding environment.

4.1.2 The SPD is intended to secure funding, provision and improvements towards:

- affordable housing,
- community safety,
- education,
- highways and transport (including Green Travel Plans),
- public realm,
- public art,
- open space and recreation,
- natural environment,
- community facilities, and
- other categories (such as flood defence).

4.1.3 The objectives of the SPD in terms of this provision must be interpreted through the planning policy it is linked into and amplifies, as well as through the other objectives of the Section 106 Agreements as stated in the SPD. As such, Table 4-1 below summarises the objectives of the SPD appraised in this SA/SEA:
Table 4-1: SPD Objectives Appraised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>SPD Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>to ensure that any new build development in the countryside approved under Policy H3 is permanently tied to the holding which justified its erection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>to secure the provision of an element of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>to provide a proportion of dwellings that are designed to mobility standards, particularly on level sites that are well served by shops, community services and public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>to ensure that affordable housing provided on exception sites in rural areas remain available for affordable local need in perpetuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>to ensure that measures are incorporated to ensure that new schemes will add to the security and safety of occupiers (crime prevention measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>to secure newly/purpose-built community facilities, such as healthcare and medical centres, village and community halls, youth centres, places of worship and prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>to provide, or contribute towards, additional school places needed as a result of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>to alleviate any worsening traffic problems of proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>to make walking and cycling safer and more attractive forms of transport, including cycle and pedestrian priority measures, secure cycle parking facilities and the provision of changing facilities at places of employment and in town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through design, conservation and the provision of public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>to provide new works of art as part of major development proposals that are accessible to the general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>to secure the provision of amenity green space and commons (including allotments), housing green space, green corridors, parks, outdoor sports provision, and children’s play space (including equipment and outdoor youth facilities), in accordance with the Local Plan until such time as the Recreation and Green Space Strategy SPD is adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>to ensure that development can co-exist with sites which are important for historic conservation interests, mitigating any potential impact on historic assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>to secure appropriate mitigation and/or compensatory measures to protect the nature conservation interests of Sites of Special Scientific Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>to secure appropriate mitigation and/or compensatory measures to protect the nature conservation interests of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>to secure the provision of any appropriate mitigation measures to protect the status of nationally rare species with no, or very limited, legal protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>to secure the retention and physical preservation of archaeological remains in situ, and minimise disturbance by or during the actual development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>for certain mixed-use developments, to secure phasing of the development to ensure that the residential element is not implemented before or separately from the employment site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>to ensure that new development is not at risk from flooding, and/or that it does not put other areas at risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Appraisal Summary

SA Objectives

4.2.1 Each of the SPD objectives listed in Table 4-1 above has been compared against each of the SA Objectives developed during Stage A of the SA/SEA process (and documented in the Scoping Report). The SA Objectives are repeated for easy reference in Table 4-2 below.

Table 4-2: SA Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To improve levels of health and fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime, including with regard to transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To promote prudent and efficient use of land resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To protect existing biodiversity and geodiversity resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, increasing management, accessibility and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To reduce social exclusion by reducing inequalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To promote social cohesion and identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To protect and enhance the historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the district’s heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>To reduce emissions of atmospheric pollutants, including greenhouse gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>To enhance (minimum protect) landscape/townscape character and local distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>To protect and enhance the quality of ground and surface waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>To protect people, the built environment and the natural environment against the adverse effects of flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>To maintain and improve levels of attainment in education and skills qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>To provide physical conditions for a modern economic structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appraisal Summary

4.2.2 Table 4-3 on the following page is a matrix that summarises the appraisal of the compatibility of the SPD objectives with the SA Objectives, and includes a key of the symbols used in describing each compatibility assessment.
Table 4-3: Compatibility Appraisal of the SPD Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Compatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relationship, or neither compatible nor incompatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>Incompatible / Conflicting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>More than one potential outcome, depending upon the interpretation of the SPD objective or the way that it is met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPD Objective</th>
<th>SA Objective 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0/-</td>
<td>0/-</td>
<td>0/-</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>+/</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>+/</td>
<td>0/-</td>
<td>0/-</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0/+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Appraisal Results

**SA Objective 1: Health and Fitness**

4.3.1 The objectives of the SPD only have the potential to improve levels of health and fitness through the improvement of accessibility to pedestrians, cyclists and other non-car users (C, I, L and R), and secondarily through the provision of safety measures (E) and features in the public realm to encourage walking and cycling (J). Alleviating traffic problems (H) is considered likely to contribute towards a safer pedestrian and cycling environment, as well as to prevent or reduce driver stress (air quality is dealt with by
SA Objective 10). In terms of the provision of new community facilities (F) or public art (K), there is the potential that there would be no benefit and thus no compatibility, as these could be provided in places more accessible by car. However, the other objectives of the SPD would likely guarantee the compatibility of these objectives with SA Objective 1.

**SA Objective 2: Safety and Security**

4.3.2 An objective of the SPD (E) is to improve safety and security measures, paralleling SA Objective 2. There is also an SPD objective (I) on making walking and cycling safer. Secondarily, SPD objectives on providing more housing designed to mobility standards (C) and alleviating traffic problems (H) are compatible with SA Objective 2, as other housing can be more hazardous to the mobility impaired, and congestion can lead to more accidents and thus road casualties. The provision of new community facilities (F) could reduce the need to travel, depending upon location, and thus reduce the likelihood of being a victim to crime or otherwise being involved in an accident. Improvement of the public realm (J) could lead to improved lighting, and thus to safer environments, however this depends upon local baseline conditions and the types of improvements secured.

**SA Objective 3: Land Resources**

4.3.3 The SPD objective on linking new build development in the countryside with its associated holding permanently (A) is geared towards protection of greenfield land and the Green Belt, and preventing urban sprawl. Securing the permanence of affordable housing in rural areas (D) will secondarily prevent the need for additional affordable housing in the future, and thus help conserve land resources. However, depending upon the location of any additional buildings or infrastructure proposed, SPD objectives on new/purpose-built community facilities (F), alleviating traffic problems (H), art provision (K), and play space provision (L) could potentially be incompatible with SA Objective 3, as they could lead to greenfield landtake.

**SA Objective 4: Protection of Biodiversity and Geodiversity**

4.3.4 As with SA Objective 3, SPD objectives A and D would help to prevent further greenfield landtake, which contributes towards protecting biodiversity and geodiversity. However, again, SPD objectives F, H, K and L could potentially lead to greenfield landtake, and thus be incompatible with SA Objective 4. However, SPD objective L could also be compatible with SA Objective 4 through increased accessibility and awareness of sites of biodiversity and geological conservation. As such, SPD objectives C, E and I are potentially compatible.

**SA Objective 5: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity**

4.3.5 SPD objective L relates to the provision of green space, which may impart new habitat or enhancement of existing habitat, however the provision of other types of facilities may require greenfield landtake, and thus increase pressure on existing habitat. There is the potential of enhancement of access to and awareness of sites of biodiversity and geological conservation. As such, SPD objectives C, E and I are potentially compatible.
with SA Objective 5, as they would make walking and cycling more attractive, and hopefully create opportunities for local residents to become more aware of their local biodiversity and geodiversity resources. SPD objectives F, H, J, K and L could lead to landtake of greenfield land, depending upon location and scale of development.

**SA Objective 6: Social Inclusion**

4.3.6 The SPD objectives are generally compatible with SA Objective 6 by way of reinforcing the Local Plan’s requirement for affordable housing (B), for dwelling designed to mobility standards (C), for longevity of affordable housing in rural areas (D) and prevention of deflection flood risk onto other sites (S). Depending upon the location of new facilities, new infrastructure or improvements to existing facilities and infrastructure, SPD objectives relating to such provision (E, F, G, I, J, K and L) could be either compatible or incompatible with SA Objective 6, as they could either reinforce or redress inequalities. Given other objectives and the wider planning context, it is likely that these objectives would be implemented in a way that is compatible with SA Objective 6.

**SA Objective 7: Social Cohesion and Identity**

4.3.7 It is generally considered that the same SPD objectives that are compatible with SA Objective 6 are also compatible with SA Objective 7, as reducing social exclusion would likely lead to greater public participation from the (in the future) formerly excluded groups in society. Although it is considered that the provision of new facilities, new infrastructure or improvements to existing facilities and infrastructure could reinforce inequalities, it is considered that this is quickly offset by making town centres more accessible as places to convene. As such, SPD objectives E, F, I, J and L are considered either compatible, or neither compatible nor incompatible, depending upon whether inequalities are reinforced or redressed. SPD objective K allows for the provision of public art, and is considered compatible with SA Objective 7.

**SA Objective 8: Protection of Historic Assets**

4.3.8 SPD objectives that could lead to new structures of significant size or visual influence (i.e. F, H, K and L) could potentially be compatible or otherwise conflict with SA Objective 8, depending upon the association with the archaeological resource or built heritage of the district, and site-specific environmental issues. Given other objectives and the wider planning context, it is likely that these objectives would be implemented in a way that is compatible with SA Objective 8. Additionally, SPD objectives M, Q and S are compatible with SA Objective 8, helping to prevent adverse effects to historic assets.

**SA Objective 9: Enjoyment of Cultural Heritage**

4.3.9 Generally, all of the SPD objectives that can potentially increase accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists, or otherwise make the pedestrian environment more attractive, (C, E, J, K, L and M) also have the potential to increase opportunities to value and enjoy cultural heritage assets. However, this compatibility is dependent upon site-specific factors and development decisions, though it is likely that there will be circumstances where historic sites will benefit from the achievement of these objectives.
SA Objective 10: Emissions and Air Quality

4.3.10 SPD objectives that make non-car transport more attractive are considered compatible with SA Objective 10. These SPD objectives are C, H, I, J, K, L and R. SPD objective R relating to ensuring employment is pedestrian-accessible in mixed-used development early. SPD objective F on the provision of newly built or purpose-built facilities could be compatible or incompatible, depending upon the location, but again, given other objectives and the wider planning context, it is likely that it would be implemented in a way that is compatible with SA Objective 10. SPD objective M could be compatible with SA Objective 10, depending upon whether or not it makes a significant contribution to the pedestrian environment.

SA Objective 11: Landscape/Townscape

4.3.11 SPD objective E could potentially conflict with SA Objective 11, as a common security measure is nighttime lighting, which contributes towards light pollution (considered a landscape issue). The net effect depends upon the degree to which lighting is used as a security measure. SPD objective F could be either compatible or incompatible, as any new build such as new facilities has the potential to disrupt townscape or landscape character, or recover or create such character. Alleviating traffic (H) could be considered compatible with protecting townscape, as urban congestion often detracts from people’s enjoyment of town centres. SPD objectives J, K, L and M relate to measures that can directly enhance landscape/townscape through provision towards the public realm, public art, green infrastructure and protection of historic buildings.

SA Objective 12: Water Quality

4.3.12 SPD objectives that could lead to new road or parking surfaces (F and H) have the potential to lead in turn to increased hydrocarbon runoff into local ground or surface water. However, alternatively, alleviating traffic problems (H) can simply lead to better flow of vehicles on existing surfaces, and thus less hydrocarbon content in runoff. SPD objectives relating to the protection of nature conservation (N, O and P) have the potential to contribute towards the protection of water quality, depending upon whether the sites or species of interest are being influenced by water quality.

SA Objective 13: Flood Risk

4.3.13 Like for SA Objective 12, SPD objectives that could lead to new built surfaces (F and H) have the potential to lead in turn to increased runoff (depending upon whether they occur on greenfield sites), however, alleviating traffic problems (H) could lead to new infrastructure with more environmentally friendly drainage systems (e.g. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems – SUDS). Also similar to SA Objective 12, SPD objectives relating to the protection of nature conservation and archaeological resources (N, O, P and Q) have the potential to contribute towards protection from flooding, depending upon whether the sites or species of interest could be at risk of flooding. SPD objective S parallels SA Objective 13, and is therefore compatible.
SA Objective 14: Education and Skills

4.3.14 SPD objectives that relate well to improved accessibility between residents and facilities or town centres generally (C, E, I, J and L) are compatible with SA Objective 14, helping those without a car to access schools and training facilities. SPD objective G is directly related to upholding the capacity of schools, and is thus compatible. SPD objective F on creating new facilities could be compatible, depending upon whether educational and training facilities are created, and where. SPD objective H on alleviating traffic problems could also be compatible, depending upon whether traffic issues are likely to deter people from pursuing education and training significantly.

SA Objective 15: Economy and Employment

4.3.15 As with SA Objective 14, SPD objectives that relate well to improved accessibility between residents and town centres or other employment areas (C, E, H, I, J, L and R) are considered compatible with SA Objective 15. Also similar, SPD objective F on creating new facilities could be compatible, depending upon the location of facilities created and their accessibility by a variety of transport options. SPD objective S is compatible, as it concerns the protection of infrastructure from flooding.

4.4 Recommended Mitigation

4.4.1 In planning terms, the SPD itself is an LDD geared towards establishing mitigation to the potential adverse effects of development. As such, it is important that it has an adequate range of provisions (or ‘tools’) capable of addressing these potential adverse effects. The assessment of SPD objectives supports that overall, the SPD is capable of delivering sustainability benefits with regard to each SA Objective. However, it is considered that the SPD could be more capable with the below mitigation in place.

4.4.2 There is currently no provision within the SPD for developer contributions to waste collection facilities, although the baseline indicates a high rate of waste to landfill, and limited landfill capacity. It is therefore recommended that the SPD include an objective related to the promotion of recycling and composting facilities, or other measures to drive waste up the waste hierarchy.

4.4.3 The compatibility appraisal indicates only two compatibilities of the SPD objectives with SA Objective 3 relating to land resources, meaning this is a sustainability topic that the SPD aims to address least. Although this is appropriate to an SPD on developer contributions, which has limited spatial scope, an additional objective regarding waste could bolster this aspect of the SPD.

4.4.4 The degree of compatibility of the SPD objectives with SA Objective 5 on enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity is relatively poor, the compatibilities mostly relating very indirectly to the potential for a kinder pedestrian environment to increase accessibility to, and awareness of, nature and geological conservation sites. With biodiversity having experienced a dramatic decline in North East Derbyshire this century, it is urgent that declines are halted, and furthermore, that increases in biodiversity are experienced. It is therefore recommended that an additional SPD objective be related to the securing of habitat creation and/or management on sites – the habitat types being determined by either existing native habitats or historic native habitats on or near to those sites. In keeping with the constraints of the SPD, developer contributions should be seeking a net improvement of biodiversity on sites where they would otherwise lead to greenfield landtake and/or potential habitat fragmentation.
4.4.5 As with SA objective 3, an additional SPD objective regarding habitat creation and management would bolster the compatibility of the SPD with SA Objective 5, which is a sustainability topic that currently receives weak support from the SPD.
5 APPRAISAL OF OPTIONS

5.1 Alternative Options to the SPD

5.1.1 Given the duty under the PCPA on those preparing an SPD to contribute to sustainable development, it is essential for the SPD to set out to improve on the situation that would exist if there were no SPD. The assessment of the existing saved policy GS9, Option 1, therefore provides a ‘do nothing’ comparison for the SPD.

5.1.2 The existing policy framework (i.e. the adopted Local Plan) within which the SPD is being prepared, however, provides few reasonable, realistic or relevant alternative options, which can be considered. The general requirement for developer contributions is already acknowledged in the existing policy. The purpose of an SPD should be to amplify or define more precisely the way parent policies should be implemented, but not to amend them. The policy options being considered are:

- **Option 1**: Do nothing and rely on the existing Policy GS9: Planning Obligations, supplemented by other policies in the adopted Local Plan;
- **Option 2**: Produce a Developer Contributions SPD based on negotiating each case separately with developers based on protocols procedures and standard legal agreements;
- **Option 3**: Produce an SPD which contains specific information such as formulae and thresholds which quantify the requirements for different types of infrastructure; and
- **Option 4**: Produce an SPD which includes a combination of both negotiation (including protocols and procedure) and either includes or signposts to relevant standards, formulae and thresholds.

5.2 Appraisal of Alternative Options

5.2.1 Each of the proposed options was compared against the SA Objectives (identified in the Scoping Report and listed in Appendix 2) and the anticipated effect was predicted alongside comments made on the likely influence on the objective. This appraisal is documented and summarised in Table 5-1 on the following pages.

5.2.2 The appraisal was carried out using information in the Scoping Report in addition to expert judgement (as described in Section 2.6 – subsection on ‘Assessment Method’) and the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan. The scoring criteria are provided in Table 2-3 of the methodology, however the descriptions are interpreted differently for the purpose of comparison – omitting major positive and major negative in order to simplify the process. Similarly, the uncertainty analysis scoring symbols are provided in Table 2-4, but again, the descriptions are interpreted slightly more liberally for the purpose of comparison (as the options differ mostly in a procedural sense, and the comparison regards the certainty of the effectiveness of these options).

5.2.3 It should be noted that in assessing the options, Scott Wilson has not had access to information about the nature and amount of contributions that have been secured by the Council in the recent past, under the terms of Policy GS9.
## Table 5-1: Appraisal of Options to the Approach to the SPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4 (Preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To improve levels of health and fitness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td>Policies GS9, T5, T6 and R5 of the adopted Local Plan provide only a general statement of the Council’s requirements for developer contributions towards public transport, walking, cycling and recreation. R1 additionally addresses general standard for recreation area.</td>
<td>The SPD would set out a more comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach and may not secure contributions towards transport.</td>
<td>An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to emerging policy changes or to negotiate where there are site-specific circumstances, which necessitate a non-standard approach to mitigating the impact of development or ensuring that development does not generate any significant adverse impacts.</td>
<td>This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and address a range transport and infrastructure/amenity issues, increasing the probability of net benefits to health and fitness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime, including with regard to transport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td>Local Plan Policies T3 and BE1 of the adopted Local Plan provide only a general statement of the Council’s standards for development to contribute towards safety and security measures. It is unclear that planning obligations may be used in this regard.</td>
<td>The SPD would set out a more comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach to securing contributions towards community safety.</td>
<td>An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to emerging policy changes or to negotiate where there are site-specific circumstances, which necessitate a non-standard approach to mitigating the impact of development or ensuring that development does not generate any significant adverse impacts.</td>
<td>This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and address a community safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Option 4 (Preferred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To promote prudent and efficient use of land resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Local Plan does not have any policies addressing planning obligations for waste collection. Potential landtake effects are ignored for the purposes of comparison of the options.</td>
<td>The SPD would set out a more comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach.</td>
<td>An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to site-specific circumstances.</td>
<td>This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and address the provision of waste collection facilities, such as for recycling and composting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To protect existing biodiversity and geodiversity resources</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Plan Policies GS9, NE4, NE5 and NE6 provide only a general statement of the Council’s intention to seek contributions towards protection of wildlife sites and nationally rare species.</td>
<td>The SPD would set out a more comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach.</td>
<td>It is anticipated that there will only be exceptional circumstances where development would affect such habitats. An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to these exceptional circumstances.</td>
<td>Species and habitats will generally be protected from adverse impact. It is anticipated that there will only be exceptional circumstances where developer contributions would impact on such habitats. This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and secure these as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Option 4 (Preferred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary / Explanation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, increasing management, accessibility and awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Policy GS9 is guided to seek enhancements to habitat via developer contributions only through the supporting text of Policy NE3. It is thus not clear whether this will be achieved.</td>
<td>The SPD would set out a more comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach.</td>
<td>An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to site-specific opportunities and limitations, and could thus lead to confusing and ineffective contributions.</td>
<td>All development can include provision for habitat, but there are a range of habitat opportunities specific to each site. This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and secure these as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To reduce social exclusion by reducing inequalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adopted Local Plan policies GS9, H6 and H9 provide the basis for the negotiation of affordable housing. The standard is not up-to-date and the effects of this are uncertain.</td>
<td>The SPD would provide a comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach and protocols for securing contributions towards supporting infrastructure on a site-by-site basis. However in the absence of specific guidance in relation to affordable housing there would be no clear basis from which to start. The Affordable Housing requirements set out in the adopted Local Plan are based on an out-of-date standard.</td>
<td>An Affordable Housing SPD for the district is being prepared separately and will provide the evidence base and detailed requirements for affordable housing. Such an approach would provide greater certainty and transparency. However, an approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to emerging policy changes or to negotiate where there are site-specific circumstances, which necessitate a non-standard approach.</td>
<td>This SPD option provides a more comprehensive statement of the nature of the contributions, which will be sought and the Councils approach to negotiating. It has the flexibility to respond to relevant existing and emerging affordable housing policy documents as well as site-specific circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Option 4 (Preferred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To promote social cohesion and identity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies GS9, T5, T6 and CSU2 outline the planning obligations that can lead to accessible community facilities. Policies T3, BE1 and BE5 regarding safety and security, and provision for public art only provide a standard for development, and do not make it clear the developer contributions may be requested/required.</td>
<td>The SPD would set out the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions towards infrastructure provision. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency for those involved in the process of negotiation. However, without clearly stated formulae (either within the document or signposted) there would be no clear base from which start and no indication of the types or amount of contributions likely to be required. This will mean more officer time will need to be spent negotiating, and lead to inconsistencies.</td>
<td>An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to emerging policy changes or to negotiate where there are site-specific circumstances, which necessitate a non-standard approach to facilities, infrastructure, architecture and/or art that enhance community cohesion and identity.</td>
<td>This SPD option provides a comprehensive statement of the nature of the contributions that will be sought and the Council’s approach to negotiating. It will allow developers to predict the likely costs of planning obligations and has the flexibility to respond to well as site-specific circumstances, for example in areas of poor accessibility and cohesive urban fabric.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To protect and enhance the historic environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Policies BE5, BE6, BE7, BE8, BE9, BE11 and BE13 do not make it clear whether the Council would use planning obligations to protect or enhance built heritage or archaeological resources</td>
<td>The SPD would set out a more comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach.</td>
<td>An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to site-specific circumstances.</td>
<td>This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and address a range measures to mitigate the impact of development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4 (Preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary / Explanation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commentary / Explanation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commentary / Explanation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commentary / Explanation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9. To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the district's heritage

- **Option 1:** 3
- **Option 2:** + 3
- **Option 3:** 0 4
- **Option 4 (Preferred):** + 2

The Local Plan will improve accessibility through planning obligations (Policies GS9, T5 and T6), but no linkages with cultural heritage are made, including with regard to planning obligations.

The SPD would set out a more comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach.

An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to site-specific circumstances.

This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and address a range of measures to enhance accessibility to and awareness of cultural heritage features.

#### 10. To reduce emissions of atmospheric pollutant, including greenhouse gases

- **Option 1:** + 2
- **Option 2:** + 3
- **Option 3:** + 5
- **Option 4 (Preferred):** + 2

Policies GS9, T5, T6 and R5 of the adopted Local Plan provide only a general statement of the Council’s requirements for developer contributions towards public transport, walking, cycling and recreation. R1 additionally addresses general standard for recreation area.

The SPD would set out a more comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach and may not secure contributions towards transport.

An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to emerging policy changes or to mitigate where there are site-specific circumstances, which necessitate a non-standard approach to mitigating the impact of development or ensuring that development does not generate any significant adverse impacts.

This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and address a range of transport and accessibility issues, increasing the probability of reducing reliance on the private car.
### SA Objective 11. To enhance (minimum protect) landscape/townscape character and local distinctiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentary / Explanation</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4 (Preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Plan Policies BE1, NE1 and NE2 on quality of design and protection/enhancement of landscape only provide a standard for development, and do not make it clear that developer contributions can be used in this regard.

The SPD would set out a more comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach.

It is anticipated that there will only be exceptional circumstances where development would affect natural areas and landscape features. An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to these exceptional circumstances.

Valued natural areas and landscape features will generally be protected from adverse impact. It is anticipated that there will only be exceptional circumstances where developer contributions would impact on such areas. This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and secure these as appropriate.

### SA Objective 12. To protect and enhance the quality of ground and surface waters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentary / Explanation</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4 (Preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Plan Policy NE3 provides only a general statement of the Council’s intention to seek protection and management of features of importance to flora and fauna, which may include water bodies.

The SPD would set out a more comprehensive statement of the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach.

An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to site-specific circumstances.

This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and address a range measures to mitigate the impact of development on water quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Commentary / Explanation</th>
<th>Commentary / Explanation</th>
<th>Commentary / Explanation</th>
<th>Commentary / Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. To protect people, the built environment and the natural environment against the adverse effects of flooding</strong>&lt;br&gt;Local Plan Policy NE9 provides only a general statement of standards for protection from flood risk, and does not make it clear that developer contributions may be sought.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. To maintain and improve levels of attainment in education and skills qualifications</strong>&lt;br&gt;Local Plan Policy CSU1 only safeguards certain land for educational facilities, and there are no clear policies on meeting increasing demand for education and skills qualifications.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 (Preferred)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is anticipated that there will only be exceptional circumstances where development would affect flood risk. An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to these exceptional circumstances.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option 1

**Degree of certainty:** 2

**Commentary / Explanation:**

- Policies GS9, T2, T5, T6 and R5 of the adopted Local Plan provide only a general statement of the Council’s requirements for developer contributions towards transport infrastructure. Infrastructure provision can increase attractiveness as a business destination. However, there is no clear mechanism for influencing employment, business start-ups or inward investment through developer contributions.

### Option 2

**Degree of certainty:** 3

**Commentary / Explanation:**

- The SPD would set out the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency. However, basing the SPD solely on negotiating each case separately will not ensure a consistent approach.

### Option 3

**Degree of certainty:** 4

**Commentary / Explanation:**

- An approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to emerging policy changes or to negotiate where there are site-specific circumstances, which necessitate a non-standard approach to infrastructure provision or other measures to encourage employment, business start-up or inward investment.

### Option 4 (Preferred)

**Degree of certainty:** 2

**Commentary / Explanation:**

- This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and address a range of economic issues.

---

15. To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4 (Preferred)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
<td>Influence / Effect</td>
<td>Degree of certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary / Explanation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This option provides flexibility and an opportunity to influence and address a range of economic issues.
5.3 Preferred Option Selection

5.3.1 In terms of the potential benefits of developer contributions, Option 1, the “do nothing” option, is the least clear as to how developer contributions may be applied, and misses potential sustainability benefits as a result of not making use of developer contributions where they are considered likely to be appropriate.

5.3.2 Option 2, case-by-case developer negotiations, would set out the Council’s approach to negotiating developer contributions towards infrastructure provision. This would be beneficial insofar as it would provide greater transparency for those involved in the process of negotiation. It is therefore likely to have a beneficial influence on more of the SA Objectives than Option 1. However, without clearly stated formulae (either within the document, or signposted), there would be no clear base from which start and no indication of the types or amount of contributions likely to be required. This will mean more officer time will need to be spent negotiating and may lead to inconsistencies. As such, there is average certainty that benefits will be realised.

5.3.3 Option 3, formulae- and threshold-based developer contributions, would show the level of contributions that are required, and thus provide greater certainty and transparency for all those involved in the developer contributions process. It is therefore likely to have a beneficial influence on more of the SA Objectives than Option 1, however an approach based on standards and thresholds alone would not provide the flexibility to respond to emerging policy changes or to negotiate where there are site-specific circumstances, which necessitate a non-standard approach to mitigation and maximising opportunities. As such, there is a higher level of uncertainty that benefits will be realised than for Option 2.

5.3.4 Option 4 is the preferred option. It includes a combination of both negotiation (including protocols and procedure) and relevant standards, formulae and thresholds (either included or signposted to in the SPD). It is recommended as the preferred option as it provides greater clarity for all those involved in the preparation and negotiation of planning applications on the Council’s approach to seeking developer contributions in policy and operational terms, and helps to explain how requirements will be prioritised. It provides a comprehensive statement of the nature of the contributions that would be sought, and the Council’s approach to negotiating. It would allow developers to predict the likely costs of planning obligations, and has the flexibility to respond to site-specific circumstances as well. It is considered that this SPD option would have a direct or indirect beneficial influences on the majority of the SA Objectives, and it would have the greatest certainty in realising these benefits.

5.3.5 Provided that the SPD guidance is followed, the option selected is clearly the more sustainable option, even though it is somewhat difficult to identify the precise outcomes as a result of the SPD.
6 HEALTH AND FITNESS

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as—

\( \ldots \)

(c) human health; \ldots \) and

\( \ldots \)

(m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (l).

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

6.1.2 The UK has adopted a set of shared sustainable development principles. Among others, this includes:

- “Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society” (Defra, 2005b, p.16).

6.1.3 As described in Section 2.2 of this report on the methodology, Stage A of the SA process has already been conducted, and a series of 15 SA Objectives have been established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD. Of these, the following SA Objective relates specifically to health and fitness:

- **SA Objective 1**: To improve levels of health and fitness.

6.2 Environmental Context and Baseline Summary

6.2.1 The information provided in this section is a summary of that provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report (final draft of May 2007), which documents the work conducted during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

6.2.2 There are a number of key objectives, from the international to the local level, relevant to promoting health and fitness through planning. Those identified during Stage A of this SA/SEA are:

- To ensure a healthy and just society, creating opportunities that will improve the well-being of individuals;
- To take advantage of the linkages between amenity/recreation and biodiversity;
- To promote recreation in the countryside, safeguarding green wedges and corridors in towns to enhance access to the countryside; and
- To protect and improve rights of way.

6.2.3 **Table 6-1** below summarises indicators and targets relating to human health and fitness within North East Derbyshire, providing an assessment of the status of each indicator.
## Table 6-1: Summary of Health and Fitness Indicators for North East Derbyshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Health of Population</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2001: 64.44% Good</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2001: 67.58% Good</td>
<td>Status: worse than regional or national average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.47% Fairly Good</td>
<td>23.27% Fairly Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.09% Not Good</td>
<td>9.14% Not Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.66% Long-term Illness</td>
<td>18.41% Long-term Illness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2001: 64.44% Good</td>
<td>England, 2001: 68.76% Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.47% Fairly Good</td>
<td>22.21% Fairly Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.09% Not Good</td>
<td>9.03% Not Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.66% Long-term Illness</td>
<td>17.93% Long-term Illness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese Children (2-15 years old)</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2002-2004: 17%</td>
<td>PSA Target: halt the year-on-year rise in obesity among children aged under 11 by 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy - Males</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2002-2004: 76.8 years</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2002-2004: 76.5 years</td>
<td>Status: slightly better than the East Midlands and England averages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy - Females</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2002-2004: 80.4 years</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2002-2004: 80.7 years</td>
<td>Status: slightly worse than the East Midlands and England averages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPPORTUNITIES FOR HEALTHY LIFESTYLES

Preferred transport mode in accessing…

...green spaces

| INFORMATION GAP | 2006: Foot: 72.44% Car: 18.43% Wouldn’t use facility: 2.88% | Actual transport mode: Foot: 61.19% Car: 32.24%, Don’t use facility: 4.07% | Residents actually travel more by car and less on foot than preferred. 1.19% of residents would prefer to go to the recreation facility, but don’t |

**CONSIDER ACTION**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...outdoor sport provision</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2006: Foot: 31.74%, Car: 12.73%, Wouldn’t use facility: 51.57%</td>
<td>Actual transport mode: Foot: 17.00%, Car: 17.00%, Don’t use facility: 65.35%</td>
<td>Residents actually travel more by car and less on foot than preferred. 13.78% of residents would prefer to go to the recreation facility, but currently don’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...children’s play areas</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2006: Foot: 47.04%, Car: 6.25%, Wouldn’t use facility: 43.91%</td>
<td>Actual transport mode: Foot: 37.99%, Car: 12.01%, Don’t use facility: 49.19%</td>
<td>Residents actually travel more by car and less on foot than preferred. 5.28% of residents would prefer to go to the recreation facility, but currently don’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...youth facilities</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2006: Foot: 21.11%, Car: 5.41%, Wouldn’t use facility: 70.10%</td>
<td>Actual transport mode: Foot: 4.98%, Car: 6.01%, Don’t use facility: 87.46%</td>
<td>Residents actually travel more by car and less on foot than preferred. 17.36% of residents would prefer to go to the recreation facility, but currently don’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion of the quantity of...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...children’s play areas</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2006: too many: 1%, correct amount: 48%, not enough: 40%, don’t know: 11%</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>Status: high proportion of ‘not enough’ corresponds with low capacity (0.071ha/1000 pop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...youth facilities</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2006: too many: 1%, correct amount: 13%, not enough: 81%, don’t know: 25%</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>Status: high proportion of ‘not enough’ corresponds with low capacity (0.0036ha/1000 pop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion of the quality of...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...children’s play areas</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2006: v.good: 4.84%, good: 33.91%, neither: 22.34%, poor: 17.81%, v.poor: 5.78%</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>Status: poor quality is a known issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...youth facilities</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2006: v.good: 1.12%, good: 5.27%, neither: 15.18%, poor: 24.60%, v.poor: 16.93%</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>Status: poor quality is a known issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of adults participating in at least 30 minutes moderate intensity sport and active recreation on 3 or more days a week</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2006: 21.0%</td>
<td>Derbyshire, 2006: 20.2%, England, 2006: 21%</td>
<td>Status: better than Derbyshire average, equal with England average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children who play out for less than 1 hour per week</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>Great Britain, 2005: 20%</td>
<td>Status: better than Derbyshire average, equal with England average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of adults who eat 5 or more servings of fruit or vegetable per day</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2001-2002: 20.9%</td>
<td>England, 2001: 24%</td>
<td>Status: significantly lower than the England average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2.4

The baseline for health and fitness in North East Derbyshire generally indicates that people are relatively healthy overall. The baseline indicates that although there is a healthy level of outdoor sport provision in the district, there is a lack of adequate children’s play areas and youth facilities. People also feel that they are using their car to access open space and other recreational areas, when they would prefer to walk. It is known that poor quality and fear of crime are deterring people from using open space and outdoor facilities such as children’s play areas.

### 6.2.5

- slightly worse general health than the regional and national averages, with the percentage of people with a limiting long-term illness being significantly higher;
- a significantly higher proportion of obese adults than the England average;
- "a higher than average proportion of people with diabetes recorded on primary care registers" (DH, 2006);
- gypsies and travellers face some of the worst health and life conditions of any group, including problems with access to healthcare, and high levels of stress due to racism, evictions and lack of essential services;
- poor quality (and fear of crime) deters people from using recreation facilities and open spaces;
some residents are unable to use their preferred transport mode in accessing open space and recreation areas, and significant percentages don’t use facilities at all; and

- significantly lower proportion of adults eating healthily (5 or more servings of fruit or vegetable per day) than the England average.

6.3 Effects Upon Receptors Within North East Derbyshire

Other Relevant Elements of Planning Policy

6.3.1 As described in Section 1.1, the Developer Contributions SPD amplifies certain policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDDC, 2005). However, there are additionally other relevant aspects of the local planning framework that will act alongside the SPD in guiding development.

6.3.2 The SPD will apply to applications for new development (including redevelopment) of certain sites. As such, it is relevant that Policy H1 supported by Table 5.2 of the adopted Local Plan provides for land allocations and windfall sites of a capacity of 700 new dwellings to 2011 in the Chesterfield Sub-Area. Policies E1 through E5 of the adopted Local Plan are supported by a requirement for 95 hectares (ha) of employment land in the Chesterfield sub-area, and an additional 30 ha of employment land in the Northern Parishes sub-area.

6.3.3 The Council is in the process of producing a Recreation and Green Space SPD, which will provide guidance on the local recreation standard and explain the Council’s requirements for the provision of recreation facilities and open/green spaces in new developments. Once adopted, this will be implemented alongside the Developer Contributions SPD towards the protection of existing facilities, the provision of new recreation facilities and open spaces, or the enhancement of the quality of existing facilities.

Effects

6.3.4 The SPD directs development to incorporate measures that are likely to improve the pedestrian and cyclist environment, and to create opportunities for physical activity. Contributions may be required towards:

- community safety measures, including to pedestrian and cyclists routes, public transport interchanges and town centres;
- traffic management measures, giving priority to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users;
- travel plans that encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport;
- footpath and cycle routes;
- pedestrian and cycle priority measures, including secure cycle parking facilities and changing facilities;
- public transport improvements;
- the public realm, including street furniture, trees, cycle parking, seats/benches, improvements to footpaths and new/improved lighting;
- public art;
• open space and recreation, including amenity green space, commons (including allotments), housing green spaces, green corridors, parks, outdoor sport provision and children's play space (including equipment and outdoor youth facilities); and

• new or improved community facilities, which can include indoor and outdoor leisure and recreation facilities.

6.3.5 The SPD also directs development to provide for community facilities and other operational facilities within settlements, which in turn can reduce reliance upon the private car, depending upon the location of such facilities. New or improved community facilities can include community centres, meeting halls, youth centres, day nurseries and crèches (or similar), indoor and outdoor leisure and recreation facilities, facilities for emergency services and civic waste amenities.

6.3.6 Improvements to the pedestrian and cyclist environment (including in combination with public transport) and opportunities for physical activity encourage the uptake of a healthier lifestyle. Safety improvements to green space and children’s play facilities would provide users with greater confidence in these local facilities, with associated health benefits. Given the level of development expected in North East Derbyshire as envisaged by the adopted Local Plan, the opportunities are largely present within the Chesterfield sub-area, and would build up gradually as the capacity of allocations is fulfilled and potentially as windfall sites are developed. As such, it is considered that this effect becomes significant in the medium term, but it would be permanent and last into the long term.

6.3.7 However, the level of uptake of lifestyle opportunities and thus the effectiveness of the SPD is inevitably up to individual choice, and thus the influence of the SPD on indicators cannot be accurately predicted.

6.4 Sustainability Appraisal

6.4.1 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators, and thus SA Objective 1, the SPD will likely lead to some improvement, including to obesity and public opinion on the accessibility, quantity and quality of open space and recreation areas. It is considered that the measures will take time to be implemented in significant quantity, as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD. As such, the positive influence on indicators will likely be perceived in the medium term. The relevant baseline is considered relatively unhealthy, justifying a major positive influence.

6.4.2 Table 6-2 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

**Table 6-2: SA Summary for SA Objective 1 on Health and Fitness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.3 Uncertainties and Risks

As described in Section 2.6, Sustainability Appraisal is an inherently uncertain process that involves making predictions concerning environmental and sustainability conditions on the basis of often limited or possibly inadequate data. Most of the impact predictions made in this report are therefore subject to uncertainty and entail risks, which could be manifested in changes to indicators or the related baseline in a direction or to a degree different from that indicated. It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to health and fitness may not occur as assessed as a result of personal choice, and other aspects of lifestyle and opinion outside of the SPD’s influence. However, were health and fitness entirely up to development, the indicators would likely change as assessed.

6.5 Other Effects

6.5.1 North East Derbyshire is situated adjacent the market town of Chesterfield to the north, west and south, and the market town of Mansfield is within 10 kilometres to the east. The ‘county town’ of Matlock is well within 5 kilometres to the southeast of North East Derbyshire, and Bolsover is well within 5 kilometres to the east. South Normanton and Alfreton are located just to the south of the district, while conurbations of Sheffield are situated adjacent the district to the north. Other settlements surrounding the district are mainly villages and rural dwellings.

6.5.2 The SPD has limited potential to influence health and fitness in neighbouring local authorities, however through the transport network, it could have some positive influence on indicators. New or improved recreation facilities in North East Derbyshire, particularly where they might meet a high or even suppressed demand in the area more widely, could attract residents from outside of the district (as part of their catchment), and thus encourage physical activity of these residents. More likely, however, contributions towards the wider pedestrian and cycle network could increase the overall permeability of the district, and make medium- and long-distance rambling and cycling more attractive to residents of other local authorities. Such potential benefits would accumulate over time, as development occurs having been guided by the SPD.

6.6 Proposed Mitigation Measures

6.6.1 The SPD does not provide an exhaustive list as to which types of facilities could be provided for by development. Given that facilities guided for by the SPD do not include fresh food shops, it would do little to improve healthy eating. Directing for other local facilities such as post offices and GP surgeries would better encourage walking and cycling.

6.7 Recommended Monitoring

6.7.1 Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline above, while others considered relevant to SA Sub-Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. The following is the list of monitoring proposed for the Council to undertake in order to identify specific needs for facilities, or other health- and fitness-related issues for which a planning response may be warranted:
Sub-Objective 1A: To increase opportunities for people to access healthcare facilities, shops selling fresh fruit and vegetables and various types of open space and recreational areas by a choice means of transport;

Indicators:
- % of people without a car having difficulties travelling to their local hospital;
- % of people who say that they have missed, turned down, or chosen not to seek medical help over the past 12 months because of transport problems;
- % of population living within preferred walking distance of:
  - recreation and open space; and
  - a fresh food shop (grocer selling fresh vegetables);
- capacity of:
  - allotments;
  - green spaces;
  - outdoor sport provision;
  - children’s play areas;
  - youth facilities;
  - additional playing fields, used by schools only; and
- public opinion on the quantity of:
  - green spaces;
  - outdoor sports pitches;
  - children’s play areas;
  - youth facilities;
  - allotments;
  - additional playing fields, used by schools only;
- % of completed leisure development in town centres;

Sub-Objective 1B: To increase the number of journeys by walking, cycling, and public transport;

Indicators:
- preferred transport mode in accessing:
  - green spaces;
  - outdoor sport provision;
  - children’s play areas;
  - youth facilities;
  - allotments;
- % of all journeys by a walking, cycling or public transport; and

Sub-Objective 1C: To improve the quality of open space and recreational areas;

Indicators:
- public opinion on the quality of:
  - green spaces;
  - outdoor sport provision;
  - children’s play areas;
  - youth facilities;
  - allotments; and
  - additional playing fields, used by schools only.
7 SAFETY AND SECURITY

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme.

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-2)

and

The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-3)

7.1.2 Schedule 2-6 effectively defines ‘relevant aspects’ to include “human health”, as well as the interrelationships among human health and other issues (see paragraph 2.5.2). Safety from such things as crime and transport-related accidents is a key aspect of the interrelationship between human health and material assets, including in an English planning policy context (see Section 5.2 below).

7.1.3 The UK has adopted a set of shared sustainable development principles. Among others, this includes:

• “Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society” (Defra, 2005b, p.16).

7.1.4 As described in Section 2.2 of this report on the methodology, Stage A of the SA process has already been conducted, and a series of 15 SA Objectives have been established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD. Of these, the following SA Objective relates specifically to safety and security:

• SA Objective 2: To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime, including with regard to transport.

7.2 Environmental Context and Baseline Summary

7.2.1 The information provided in this section is a summary of that provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report (final draft of May 2007), which documents the work conducted during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

7.2.2 There are a number of key objectives, from the international to the local level, relevant to promoting safety and security through planning. Those identified during Stage A of this SA/SEA are:

• To address threats to public health and community safety;
• To ensure that town centres provide a safe environment for businesses, shoppers and residents; and
• To reduce the numbers of casualties on the roads, with emphasis on those most vulnerable, e.g. children, pedestrians and cyclists.

7.2.3 Table 7-1 below summarises indicators and targets relating to safety and security within North East Derbyshire, providing an assessment of the status of each indicator.
Table 7-1: Summary of Safety and Security Indicators for North East Derbyshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIME</td>
<td><em>Police-recorded crime as a proportion of population</em> Decrease of 7% compared to period October-December 2005. Small decrease comparing same period in 2005</td>
<td>January–March 2006: 1,270 reported incidents</td>
<td>NEDDC is below the most similar Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership family average for all recorded crime</td>
<td>Status: better than CDRP family average and decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>POLICE-RECORDED CRIME AS A PROPORTION OF POPULATION</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RELATIVELY HEALTHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>RELATIVELY HEALTHY</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>CONSIDER ACTION</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>RELATIVELY HEALTHY</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>CONSIDER ACTION</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INFORMATION GAP</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>INFORMATION GAP</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD CASUALTIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator | Relevant Trend(s) | Current Data | Comparator(s) | Target / Status
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---

**DESIGNING FOR SAFETY AND SECURITY**

Number of developments that have been awarded Secure by Design Award | 2004/05: 0 awarded | 2005-2006: 1 awarded (4 applications within this period will eventually include SBD award) | INFORMATION GAP | Status: increase in number

#### 7.2.4
The baseline for safety and security for North East Derbyshire shows that crime has increased recently in the district. Vandalism and anti-social behaviour are known issues for North East Derbyshire, with recent increases in calls to police in response to anti-social behaviour. What is more fear of crime is deterring people from using recreational facilities. It is considered likely that crime and fear of crime will increase without improvements to local recreational facilities or other intervention, despite a number of initiatives being already in place.

#### 7.2.5
Cyclist and motorcycle casualties have increased recently despite past declines. It is predicted that without intervening measures national targets will not be met.

#### 7.2.6
The key safety- and security-related sustainability issues facing the district are:

- there is a recent increase in police-recorded arson and criminal damage;
- there is a recent significant increase in the number of 'calls for service' in response to anti-social behaviour;
- vandalism and anti-social behaviour;
- fear of crime (and poor quality) deters people from using recreation facilities and open spaces;
- there is often a high fear of crime among gypsy communities due to racially motivated incidents;
the total number of fatal and serious road casualties is off-target with regard to reductions; and

the number of fatal and serious cyclist casualties is just on-target, but has experienced a recent increase.

7.3 Effects Upon Receptors Within North East Derbyshire

Other Relevant Elements of Planning Policy

7.3.1 As described in Section 1.1, the Developer Contributions SPD amplifies certain policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDDC, 2005). However, there are additionally other relevant aspects of the local planning framework that will act alongside the SPD in guiding development.

7.3.2 The SPD will apply to applications for new development (including redevelopment) of certain sites. As such, it is relevant that Policy H1 supported by Table 5.2 of the adopted Local Plan provides for land allocations and windfall sites of a capacity of 700 new dwellings to 2011 in the Chesterfield Sub-Area. Policies E1 through E5 of the adopted Local Plan are supported by a requirement for 95 hectares (ha) of employment land in the Chesterfield sub-area, and an additional 30 ha of employment land in the Northern Parishes sub-area.

Effects

7.3.3 Under the proposed SPD, the Council will seek to ensure that the negative impact of development on crime or fear of crime is mitigated by design of the proposed development or by the use of planning conditions. Contributions will usually be sought from:

- proposals of 200sq m or more for leisure and entertainment facilities, cafes/restaurants/takeaways, public houses and night clubs that are likely to operate beyond 8.00pm;
- town centre developments of 2,500sq m or more that will generate significant increases in visitor numbers, trip movements and use of public transport facilities;
- supermarkets and petrol filling stations that operate at night; and
- non-residential development of 2,500 sq m or more that will result in intensification of uses and activity in isolated areas, e.g. industrial estates.

7.3.4 Where developer contributions are required the Council will specify their use to ensure that they are applied towards specific local community safety needs. These may include:

- CCVT, whether supplementing existing systems or new schemes, including as appropriate, commuted sums for management and maintenance;
- provision of lighting particularly to established or proposed pedestrian and/or cycle routes serving the development;
- safety improvements to public transport interchanges, facilities and car parks;
- environmental improvements that contribute towards safer town centres and other areas affected by a development;
• enhanced night bus networks or specially created services to provide safe forms of travel to and from major new facilities and leisure uses; and/or
• community initiatives, which may contribute to crime prevention e.g. youth projects.

7.3.5 The type and level of contribution will be based on the location, nature and scale of the proposal, and the cost of implementation and subsequent operation/monitoring of the relevant element of the particular initiative to which contributions will be directed.

7.3.6 Given the above, the SPD directs clearly for the incorporation of security measures, which is likely to lead to a net improvement in levels of crime and fear of crime.

7.3.7 The SPD also guides for developer contributions that:

• alleviate any traffic problems on the highway network;
• provide for traffic management measures, including safety measures; and
• make walking and cycling safer, including secure cycle parking.

7.3.8 Alleviating traffic problems should maintain current safety on the road network, while providing for traffic management measures has the potential to impart improvements to safety on the existing road network. Additionally, improving the safety of walking and cycling will benefit both new and existing residents, as all developments are likely to be able to contribute towards the wider footpath and cycle network, and especially employment developments will be destinations to which everyone may walk or cycle. The SPD is therefore likely to lead to a net improvement in crime, fear of crime and road casualties as a result of developer contributions.

7.3.9 Given the level of development expected in North East Derbyshire as envisaged by the adopted Local Plan, the opportunities are largely present within the Chesterfield sub-area, and would build up gradually as the capacity of allocations is fulfilled and potentially as windfall sites are developed. As such, it is considered that the effect becomes significant in the medium term, and it would be permanent and last into the long term.

7.4 Sustainability Appraisal

7.4.1 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators, and thus SA Objective 2, the SPD will likely lead to some improvement, including to perception of safety of open spaces and recreation areas, police-recorded criminal damage, police ‘Calls for Service’, and road fatal and serious casualties (all categories). It is considered that the measures will take time to be implemented in significant quantity, as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD. As such, the positive influence on indicators will likely be perceived in the medium term. The relevant baseline is considered relatively unhealthy, justifying a major positive influence.

7.4.2 Table 7-2 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.
Table 7-2: SA Summary for SA Objective 2 on Safety and Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uncertainties and Risks**

7.4.3 As described in Section 2.6, Sustainability Appraisal is an inherently uncertain process that involves making predictions concerning environmental and sustainability conditions on the basis of often limited or possibly inadequate data. Most of the impact predictions made in this report are therefore subject to uncertainty and entail risks, which could be manifested in changes to indicators or the related baseline in a direction or to a degree different from that indicated. It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to safety and security may not occur as assessed as a result of the many factors that influence levels of crime, fear of crime and road casualties that are outside of the SPD’s influence. However, were safety and security entirely up to development, the indicators would likely change as assessed.

7.5 **Other Effects**

7.5.1 Reduction of crime and fear of crime is of benefit to all society and the environment. Therefore reduction in crime associated with sound planning can be considered positive within and beyond North East Derbyshire.

7.6 **Proposed Mitigation Measures**

7.6.1 No mitigation is proposed.

7.7 **Recommended Monitoring**

7.7.1 Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline above, while others considered relevant to SA Sub-Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. The following is the list of monitoring proposed for the Council to undertake in order to identify safety and security issues for which a planning response may be warranted:

- **Sub-Objective 2A**: To reduce crime and fear of crime through incorporating safety measures and safe design into communities;
  
  **Indicators**:
  - number of developments that have been awarded Secure by Design Award;
  - perception of safety of recreation facilities and open spaces (Fear of Crime);
  - police ‘Calls for Service’: police-recorded anti-social behaviour;
• **Sub-Objective 2B**: To improve safety on transport infrastructure, particularly on the road network, reducing in particular pedestrian, cyclist and child casualties;

  **Indicators**:
  - total number of fatal and serious casualties;
  - number of fatal and serious pedestrian casualties;
  - number of fatal and serious cyclist casualties; and
  - number of fatal and serious child casualties.
8 SOIL AND LAND RESOURCES

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as—

... (f) soil; ... and

... (m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (l).

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

8.1.2 The UK has adopted set of shared sustainable development principles. Among others, this includes:

- “Living within environmental limits” (Defra, 2005b, p.16).

8.1.3 In addition, the UK Shared Framework for Sustainable Development (Defra, 2005a) identifies the following relevant priority for immediate action:

- natural resource protection and environmental enhancement through a better understanding of environmental limits, environmental enhancement and recovery, and a more integrated policy framework.

8.1.4 As described in Section 2.2 of this report on the methodology, Stage A of the SA process has already been conducted, and a series of 15 SA Objectives have been established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD. Of these, the following SA Objective relates specifically to soil and land resources:

- **SA Objective 3**: To promote prudent and efficient use of land resources.

8.2 Environmental Context and Baseline Summary

8.2.1 The information provided in this section is a summary of that provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report (final draft of May 2007), which documents the work conducted during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

8.2.2 There are a number of key objectives, from the international to the local level, relevant to promoting soil and land resources through planning. Those identified during Stage A of this SA/SEA are:

- To manage natural resources more responsibly (including waste generation);
- To improve land use efficiency, including through opportunities allowed through well designed transport and taking advantage of synergies in land usage and management; and
- To protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.
8.2.3 Table 8-1 below summarises indicators and targets relating to soil and land resources within North East Derbyshire, providing an assessment of the status of each indicator.

Table 8-1: Summary of Soil and Land Resources Indicators for North East Derbyshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURAL LAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>1977: Grade 1: 0 ha Grade 2: 0 ha Grade 3: 7,215 ha (26.2%) Grade 4: 17,479 ha (63.4%) Grade 5: 1,870 (6.8%)</td>
<td>East Midlands 1977: Grade 1: 76,729 ha (4.9%) Grade 2: 288,336 ha (18.5%) Grade 3: 886,250 ha (56.7%) Grade 4: 154,836 ha (9.9%) Grade 5: 44,743 ha (2.9%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling rate</td>
<td>2004/05: 11.00%</td>
<td>2005/06: 12.72%</td>
<td>England, 2005/06: Recycled and composted: 26.7% (Target: 25%) Recycled: 17.6%</td>
<td>Target: 18% combined recycling and composting rate in 2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting rate</td>
<td>2004/05: 4.45%</td>
<td>2005/06: 7.74%</td>
<td>England, 2005/06: Recycled and composted: 26.7% (Target: 25%) Composted: 9.0%</td>
<td>Target: 18% combined recycling and composting rate in 2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste to Landfill, Per Capita</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Derbyshire, 2004-05: 1.57 tonnes (1.177 million tonnes / 747,520 estimated population [2005])</td>
<td>Status: significantly higher than the regional average, though data is at county level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill capacity</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Derbyshire, 2004: 17,560 million m³ (11 years remaining at current disposal rates)</td>
<td>Status: land for landfill is a finite resource</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.4 The baseline for waste disposal and management for North East Derbyshire shows that the district is meeting its combined recycling and composting targets, and is therefore on track to meet its long-term goals. However, the baseline also indicates that the average person in Derbyshire County sends more waste to landfill than the average person in other parts of the East Midlands. The rate of recycling and composting is predicted to increase in line with targets. Any increase in the amount of waste recycled should decrease the average amount of waste sent to landfill per person. However,
since waste will always be required to be sent to landfill, and the availability of land for waste disposal will continue to decline without more stringent measures.

8.2.5 Two issues highlighted by the sustainability baseline are:

- a significantly higher amount of waste to landfill per person than the regional average, although the data applies to Derbyshire County as a whole; and
- land available for landfill is a finite resource, with 11 years of landfill capacity remaining at current disposal rates.

8.2.6 In terms of soil- and land resources-related sustainability issues, indicators may not be entirely adequate to communicate the level of urgency for considering action. In particular, while the current target for the rate of recycling and composting is being met, space for landfill is a finite resource, and action should be considered until such time as a sustainable waste management solution has been found and implemented, or sustainable waste management situation reached.

8.3 Effects Upon Receptors Within North East Derbyshire

Other Relevant Elements of Planning Policy

8.3.1 As described in Section 1.1, the Developer Contributions SPD amplifies certain policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDDC, 2005). However, there are additionally other relevant aspects of the local planning framework that will act alongside the SPD in guiding development.

8.3.2 The SPD will apply to applications for new development (including redevelopment) of certain sites. As such, it is relevant that Policy H1 supported by Table 5.2 of the adopted Local Plan provides for land allocations and windfall sites of a capacity of 700 new dwellings to 2011 in the Chesterfield Sub-Area. Policies E1 through E5 of the adopted Local Plan are supported by a requirement for 95 hectares (ha) of employment land in the Chesterfield sub-area, and an additional 30 ha of employment land in the Northern Parishes sub-area. It is interpreted that at least 39.3 hectares of allocated employment sites, and 7.16 hectares of allocated housing sites are on greenfield land.

8.3.3 PPS23 states that previously developed Brownfield sites including those affected by contamination, should be reused in preference to Greenfield sites. Where contamination requires remediation this is the responsibility of the developer. The Local Plan encourages this.

8.3.4 PPS7 states that planning policies should provide a positive framework for facilitating sustainable development that supports traditional land-based activities and makes the most of new leisure and recreational opportunities that require a countryside location. The Local Plan intends for new development to be directed away from the countryside to existing settlements.

8.3.5 PPG2 states that Green Belt is designated to prevent urban sprawl of settlements into the countryside. This is supported by the Local Plan.

8.3.6 The Derby and Derbyshire Waste Local Plan has the aim of respecting the principles of sustainable development; and protecting people and communities, the countryside, natural resources and the built heritage from the adverse effects of waste management.
Effects

8.3.7 The SPD states that whilst all development should seek to improve the environmental quality of the area in which it is located, there may be circumstances where it is appropriate for that development to contribute to wider environmental improvements, referring to the public realm. The SPD also states that community facility provision may include civic waste amenities. This can be interpreted to include waste collection facilities, such as public recycling and composting bins.

8.3.8 Other contributions will be assessed on a site-by-site basis, which may include effects on soil and land resources, including improving the situation with regard to landfill waste, loss of land resources (including agricultural resources) to development and contamination of land resources.

8.3.9 However, the potential positive effects are based on assumption/interpretation regarding statements in the SPD. As such, it is unlikely that this assumption would be universally implemented (if implemented at all), and thus it is likely that any benefits would be quite limited.

8.3.10 The SPD states that the Council will seek to ensure that affordable housing provision remains affordable permanently. As such, this policy will help to alleviate any demand on new build for affordable housing into the future, thus helping to conserve land resources (including ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land that can be a trait of greenfield land).

8.3.11 However, conversely, the SPD is likely to indirectly lead to a limited amount of increased greenfield landtake through planning obligations for new facilities and infrastructure, which may include:

- education facilities;
- works necessary to alleviate traffic problems (e.g. road widening for cars, cycle lanes or bus stops, new access roads);
- other public transport infrastructure;
- footpath and cycle route improvements;
- public art (e.g. sculpture, fountains, and potentially any paved areas or paths linking into them);
- recreational facilities that warrant structures or pavement;
- community facilities (e.g. community centres, meeting halls, day nurseries and crèches, and facilities for emergency services); and
- parking at developments and facilities.

8.3.12 Although much of the requirement for such facilities and infrastructure will likely be met on-site, and in many cases, on brownfield sites, it is considered likely there will be some limited landtake from greenfield land, including agricultural land. The baseline is unclear as to the proportion of ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land in North East Derbyshire, and thus the probability of an adverse effect is uncertain.

8.3.13 It is considered that in terms of landtake, the potential adverse effects of the SPD on land resources is somewhat more significant than the potential benefits. However, the adverse effect on land resources would be very limited in the short and medium term, and may only accumulated into a significant adverse effect in the long term. This
assessment is subject to high uncertainty, as it depends on site-specific detail and the nature of any projects proposed as a result of the SPD.

8.3.14 The construction of new facilities and infrastructure is likely to be a waste-generating exercise, which will likely increase the overall amount of waste going to landfill. However, there are opportunities at the project level to maximise the amount of recycled and reused materials in construction. This could have a mixed influence on indicators, as it could lead to benefits in terms of percentage of waste recycled or reused, but detriments to per capita waste production.

8.3.15 Given the allocated development in the North East Derbyshire Local Plan, the potential opportunities and effects are largely present within the Chesterfield sub-area, and would build up gradually as the capacity of allocations is fulfilled and potentially as windfall sites are developed. Given the , it is considered that the effect becomes significant in the medium term, but it would be permanent and last into the long term.

8.4 Sustainability Appraisal

8.4.1 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators, and thus SA Objective 3, the SPD is considered most likely to have a negligible adverse effect on land and soil resources in the short and medium term, but a moderate negative effect in the long term as a result of accumulated greenfield landtake through facilities and infrastructure. It is considered that the measures will take time to be implemented in significant quantity, as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD.

8.4.2 Table 8-2 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

Table 8-2: SA Summary for SA Objective 3 on Soil and Land Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.3 Uncertainties and Risks

As described in Section 2.6, Sustainability Appraisal is an inherently uncertain process that involves making predictions concerning environmental and sustainability conditions on the basis of often limited or possibly inadequate data. Most of the impact predictions made in this report are therefore subject to uncertainty and entail risks, which could be manifested in changes to indicators or the related baseline in a direction or to a degree different from that indicated. It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to soil and land resources as a result of the SPD is highly uncertain, given the variety of options for provision of facilities and infrastructure and the lack of adequate baseline data on ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural resources. There is also the potential for positive effects to offset the potential adverse effects, should the SPD be interpreted differently than assumed.
8.5 Other Effects

8.5.1 It must be borne in mind that landfill capacity is a resource that can be, and often is, shared across districts, counties, regions, and even nations. Should the SPD lead to improved public recycling and composting collection facilities, the benefit would be shared by all who use common landfill sites with residents of North East Derbyshire. Similarly, should construction of facilities and infrastructure lead to increased waste to landfill, the detriment would be shared. As such, it is important that developers maximise the reuse and recycling of materials in construction.

8.6 Proposed Mitigation Measures

8.6.1 It is recommended that the SPD offset the potential long-term adverse effect of cumulative greenfield landtake secondarily as a result of new facilities and infrastructure, by stipulating for the specific developer contribution towards on-site recycling and composting collection facilities, which should aim to make recycling and composting convenient and attractive to users of developments. As a minimum, the SPD should elaborate upon civic waste amenities, and include separate landfill waste and recycling and/or composting bins.

8.7 Recommended Monitoring

8.7.1 Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline above, while others considered relevant to SA Sub-Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. The following is the list of monitoring proposed for the Council to undertake in order to identify soil and land resource issues for which a planning response may be warranted:

- **Sub-Objective 3A**: To contribute towards driving waste up the ‘waste hierarchy’, promoting reduction, reuse and recycling (including composting), and where relevant, recovery;
  
  **Indicators**:
  - recycling rate;
  - composting rate;
  - waste to landfill, per capita;
  - landfill capacity;

- **Sub-Objective 3B**: To protect the ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land;
  
  **Indicators**:
  - area of ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land;
  - % of development on brownfield land;
  - area of agricultural land managed under Environmental Stewardship Entry Level Schemes (ELSs);
  - area of agricultural land managed under Environmental Stewardship Higher Level Schemes (HLSs).
9 BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as—

…
(a) biodiversity; … and
…
(a) flora; … and
…
(a) fauna; … and
…
(m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (l).

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

9.1.2 The UK has adopted a set of shared sustainable development principles, including:

- “Living within environmental limits” (Defra, 2005b, p.16).

9.1.3 In addition, the UK Shared Framework for Sustainable Development (Defra, 2005a) identifies the following relevant priority for immediate action:

- Natural resource protection and environmental enhancement through a better understanding of environmental limits, environmental enhancement and recovery, and a more integrated policy framework.

9.1.4 As described in Section 2.2 of this report on the methodology, Stage A of the SA process has already been conducted, and a series of 15 SA Objectives have been established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD. Of these, the following SA Objectives relate specifically to biodiversity and geodiversity:

- **SA Objective 4:** To protect existing biodiversity and geodiversity resources.
- **SA Objective 5:** To enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, increasing management, accessibility and awareness.

9.2 Environmental Context and Baseline Summary

9.2.1 The information provided in this section is a summary of that provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report (final draft of May 2007), which documents the work conducted during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

9.2.2 There are a number of key objectives, from the international to the local level, relevant to promoting biodiversity and geodiversity through planning. Those identified during Stage A of this SA/SEA are:

- To halt biodiversity decline by 2010;
• To conserve, manage and make sustainable use of biological and geological diversity, enhancing the natural environment such as through incorporating features within the design of development, and supporting a net increase in quality and active management;
• To achieve a step change increase in the level of the region’s biodiversity;
• To support education, training and awareness of biodiversity issues;
• To promote access, education and tourism in the Peak District;
• To conserve wetlands and their resources;
• To protect designated Ramsar sites;
• To make wise use of wetlands and their resources, including for public benefit;
• To protect designated Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) from loss of area or other harm;
• To protect wild populations of certain species of plant and animal;
• To protect designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs);
• To prevent the spread of certain non-native species;
• To secure appropriate and sympathetic management of important local habitats;
• To expand the number/extent, and decrease fragmentation, of important local habitats;
• To restore non-native plantations to broadleaved woodland wherever possible;
• To improve the biodiversity value of important local habitats; and
• To maintain the population/distribution of priority species.

9.2.3 There are 1 SAC, 1 SPA, and no Ramsar sites in North East Derbyshire. The only SAC is the South Pennine Moors, of which approximately 1,600 hectares (or approximately 2.5% of the entire site) lie within North East Derbyshire. Coinciding with the South Pennine Moors SAC is the Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA (the approximately 1,600 hectares that are within North East Derbyshire being approximately 3.5% of the entire site).

9.2.4 There are 7 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), and no National Nature Reserves (NNRs) in North East Derbyshire. Of the 7 SSSIs within North East Derbyshire, the section of the Eastern Peak District Moors SSSI within North East Derbyshire coincides with the sections of both the South Pennine Moors SAC and the Peak District Moors SPA that lie within North East Derbyshire. This also lies within the Peak District National Park.

9.2.5 The condition of this part of the Eastern Peak District Moors SSSI (i.e. the SSSI units within North East Derbyshire) is described as 27.6% ‘favourable’, 72.4% ‘unfavourable recovering’ and 0% ‘unfavourable no change’, ‘unfavourable declining’ or ‘destroyed/part destroyed’.
9.2.6 The 7 SSSIs within North East Derbyshire are:

- Eastern Peak District Moors,
- Ogston Reservoir,
- Fall Hill Quarry,
- Duckmanton Railway Cutting,
- Moss Valley,
- Moss Valley Meadows, and
- Moss Valley Woods.

9.2.7 Table 9-1 below shows the condition of SSSIs by percentage land area within North East Derbyshire, the East Midlands Region and in England, as well as the current national Public Service Agreements (PSA) target. From this data, it is apparent that North East Derbyshire is on-target despite small areas of unfavourable site condition that are experiencing either decline or lack of change, and is better than both the East Midlands and England averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>North East Derbyshire</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>27.21%</td>
<td>44.60%</td>
<td>44.85%</td>
<td>74.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable Recovering</td>
<td>99.52%</td>
<td>25.15%</td>
<td>29.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable No Change</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>9.85%</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable Declining</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>20.39%</td>
<td>8.73%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroyed / Part Destroyed</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Natural England

Status in North East Derbyshire: RELATIVELY HEALTHY

9.2.8 There are 180 local Wildlife Sites and 1 Local Nature Reserve (LNR) within North East Derbyshire. These sites “contain important habitats or support BAP or locally uncommon or rare species” (Derbyshire Biodiversity, 2007). Comparatively, there are in excess of 1,200 Wildlife Sites in Derbyshire.

9.2.9 There are additionally 7 Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS) within North East Derbyshire.

9.2.10 North East Derbyshire lies within the remit of both the Peak District Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) and the Lowland Derbyshire LBAP. (Approximately 2,400 hectares of western North East Derbyshire overlaps with the Peak District National Park.) The Peak District LBAP was published in 1992, and the Lowland Derbyshire LBAP in 1997; both are subject to ongoing development in terms of Habitat Action Plans and Species Action Plans.
9.2.11 Some key LBAP indicators and targets relevant to habitats within North East Derbyshire are summarised in the Developer Contributions SPD SA/SEA Scoping Report (May 2007). These have not been reproduced here in the interest of being concise, and because the data does not present clear trends or indicator status. The following LAP habitats are addressed:

- semi-natural grassland / hay meadow;
- lead rakes;
- ponds, lakes and canals;
- hedgerows;
- rivers and streams;
- woodland: lowland broadleaved mixed, wet, wood pasture, parkland and veteran trees;
- lowland swamp, mire, fen and reedbed;
- floodplain grazing marsh;
- heathland; and
- blanket bog.

9.2.12 Due to data gaps, it is difficult to describe the status of indicators, however the relevant LBAPs report problems for all of the key relevant habitats for which there are indicators, and thus the status can be described as needing action (though no distinction is offered between priorities and those that should be considered).

9.2.13 Data on recent trends is largely incomplete, however it is thought that management of habitats has recently been increasing in tandem with various initiatives such as Environmental Stewardship. In terms of habitat area and quality, there is no reliable monitoring data for North East Derbyshire to gauge how individual habitat types are doing, or individual species.

9.2.14 The Peak District LBAP identifies the following key issues potentially relevant to North East Derbyshire:

- 50% loss of flower-rich hay meadows within the Peak District National Park, and a significant decline in conservation value of a further 26%, between the mid-1980s and mid-1990s (only approximately 410 flower-rich hay meadows remain);
- loss of up to 75% of lead rakes in parts of the National Park – the disappearance of a landscape that reflects one of the most important historical economic activities in the Peak District and one that supports special flower-rich grasslands of international importance;
- significant and continuing decline of ponds thought to be in the order of 33 - 50% since the 1960s; an estimated 50% loss of dewponds and their associated wildlife such as newts and dragonflies in the White Peak between 1970 and 1985 and with many others in a state of dereliction;
- loss of 42.1 km of hedgerows from the 1970s to the 1980s;
- loss of 270 ha of upland heath from the 1970s to the 1980s;
- declines of up to 75% in water vole populations in some parts of the Peak District; and
• the extinction of black grouse (Peak District National Park, 2001).

9.2.15 There is a significant area of hay meadow that extends into North East Derbyshire within the Peak District National Park. There are lead rakes around Ashover in North East Derbyshire, and there are features within North East Derbyshire common to most areas of the Peak District such as ponds, hedgerows and heath. Water vole was once common throughout Derbyshire, and black grouse once common throughout English moorland heath (as found in northern and western North East Derbyshire).

9.2.16 The Lower Derbyshire LBAP identifies the following key issues:

• estimated 97% loss of semi-natural lowland grassland in England and Wales between 1930 and 1984;
• historical decline both in extent and quality of ponds, lakes and canals, particularly in the second half of the twentieth century; evidence suggests both are still declining;
• loss of hedgerows at a rate potentially greater than the national average loss;
• the biodiversity value of woodlands in the LBAP area may be decreasing due to lack of management;
• historical decline of wet woodland, evidence suggesting continual decline;
• wood pasture, parkland and veteran trees are thought to be declining;
• likely decline of swamps, reedbeds, mires and fens due to agricultural intensification and urbanisation;
• past modification of the majority of rivers and streams, often severely, for land drainage, agriculture, flood defence and other reasons; and
• recent loss of floodplain grazing marsh due to development and mineral extraction, and decline in quality due to agricultural improvement or neglect of management.

9.3 Effects Upon Receptors Within North East Derbyshire

Other Relevant Elements of Planning Policy

9.3.1 As described in Section 1.1, the Developer Contributions SPD amplifies certain policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDDC, 2005). However, there are additionally other relevant aspects of the local planning framework that will act alongside the SPD in guiding development.

9.3.2 The SPD will apply to applications for new development (including redevelopment) of certain sites. As such, it is relevant that Policy H1 supported by Table 5.2 of the adopted Local Plan provides for land allocations and windfall sites of a capacity of 700 new dwellings to 2011 in the Chesterfield Sub-Area. Policies E1 through E5 of the adopted Local Plan are supported by a requirement for 95 hectares (ha) of employment land in the Chesterfield sub-area, and an additional 30 ha of employment land in the Northern Parishes sub-area.

9.3.3 The SPD amplifies Policies NE4, NE5 and NE6 of the Local Plan relating to the protection of designated sites and nationally rare species. Additionally, Policy NE3 of the Local Plan states:
Where a development would result in a loss of habitat, the Council will seek to maintain and enhance biodiversity within the District by securing the creation, enhancement and/or management of habitats in or adjacent to new development  

(NEDDC, 2005, Policy NE3)

9.3.4 The Council is in the process of producing a Recreation and Green Space SPD, which will provide guidance on the local recreation standard and explain the Council’s requirements for the provision of recreation facilities and open/green spaces in new developments. Once adopted, this will be implemented alongside the Developer Contributions SPD towards the protection of existing facilities, the provision of new recreation facilities and open spaces, or the enhancement of the quality of existing facilities. This may have important linkages with nature and geological conservation sites, as the green space concept is, among other things, about integrating habitat provision and the planting of native species with open space and recreation.

9.3.5 The North East Derbyshire Greenprint is a strategy applying to Local Strategic Partnerships, conservation groups, businesses and local communities that translates both UK and Local Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) to a district level. While it does not apply to planning applications directly, it sets out the habitats and targets that should be met across the district towards the end of guaranteeing the district’s future biodiversity.

**Effects**

9.3.6 The SPD states that contributions will be focused upon mitigating the potential impacts of development on wildlife sites identified in the adopted Local Plan. As such, the SPD certainly contributes towards the protection of existing biodiversity resources, though no specific mention is made of geodiversity.

9.3.7 The SPD is likely to indirectly lead to a limited amount of increased greenfield landtake through planning obligations for new facilities and infrastructure, which may include:

- education facilities;
- works necessary to alleviate traffic problems (e.g. road widening for cars, cycle lanes or bus stops, new access roads);
- other public transport infrastructure;
- footpath and cycle route improvements;
- public art (e.g. sculpture, fountains, and potentially any paved areas or paths linking into them);
- recreational facilities that warrant structures or pavement;
- community facilities (e.g. community centres, meeting halls, day nurseries and crèches, and facilities for emergency services); and
- parking at developments and facilities.

9.3.8 Any greenfield landtake as a result of facilities or infrastructure provided through planning obligations would lead to loss of habitat, some potentially of decent or good quality, indirectly as a result of the SPD.

9.3.9 The SPD states that the Council will proactively seek to improve biodiversity on all development sites, and this may involve low-cost provision of habitat (e.g. bird or bat
boxes). Additionally, the SPD directs development to contribute towards green space, green corridors and parks (among other outdoor recreation areas).

9.3.10 From the previous two paragraphs, it is difficult to weight the potential benefits and detriments of the SPD to local biodiversity, particularly as Policy NE3 of the Local Plan on creation, enhancement and management of habitats is not amplified by the SPD. Further to the assumption that facilities and infrastructure are likely to lead to some greenfield landtake, the degree of any potential adverse effects upon biodiversity can only be determined on a site-by-site basis, and depend upon such factors as the quality of existing habitat, and whether or not it provides an important or essential linkage between habitats.

9.3.11 The SPD directs development to incorporate measures that are likely to improve the accessibility of local sites to local residents. The measures include those relating to the safety of transport (including pedestrians and cyclists), the priority/attractiveness of walking, cycling and public transport, and ensuring good traffic flow. This is described in further detail in Chapter 6.

9.3.12 The accessibility measures may secondarily improve accessibility to wildlife sites in the district, however it must be recognised that this is not a clear objective of the SPD, and so opportunities may be missed.

9.3.13 As the SPD does not specifically mention geological conservation, referring (for example) to RIGS, the effect on such sites is relatively uncertain.

9.4 Sustainability Appraisal

9.4.1 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators, and thus SA Objective 4, the SPD makes a contributions towards maintaining the extent and quality of existing wildlife sites. It is considered that any measures to ensure conservation of sites will take effect immediately, and be implemented prior to any potential adverse effects occurring. As such, the positive influence on indicators (i.e. indicators on extent of sites remaining, as a minimum, unmoving) will likely be perceived in the short, medium and long terms. The relevant baseline is considered relatively healthy, justifying a moderate positive influence.

9.4.2 Table 9-2 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.4.3 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators linked with SA Objective 5, the SPD is most likely to influence the indicator on measurements of green infrastructure most significantly, and thus have a positive
influence. It is considered that green infrastructure will take time to be implemented in significant quantity, as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD. Additionally, it is likely to take significant time for green infrastructure (such as tree planting) to mature as habitats for local wildlife. As such, the positive influence on indicators will likely be perceived in the long term. The relevant baseline is considered relatively unhealthy, justifying a major positive influence.

9.4.4 However, it should be noted that there is potential for individual projects relating to the provision of infrastructure and facilities to reduce or limit indicators on the favourable management of key habitats. This would be determined on a project-by-project basis, and hopefully mitigated for by Policy NE3 of the adopted Local Plan.

9.4.5 Table 9-3 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.5 Other Effects

9.5.1 As biodiversity is a shared resource across the region, nation, and indeed the globe, it is considered that the benefits of the SPD to biodiversity appraised extend well beyond the boundaries of North East Derbyshire.

9.5.2 However, specific projects associated with the provision of infrastructure (or possibly even facilities) may span borders with neighbouring districts, and as such, greenfield
landtake could be implied indirectly by the SPD. Such potential habitat loss would be dealt with at the project level, should such projects occur.

9.6 Proposed Mitigation Measures

9.6.1 With biodiversity having experienced a dramatic decline in North East Derbyshire this century, it is urgent that declines are halted, and furthermore, that increases in biodiversity are experienced. The SPD’s commitment to only low-cost habitat provision is not likely adequate to make up for the potential secondary habitat losses of infrastructure and facilities, and any habitat fragmentation imparted by these losses and those by the developments themselves. It is therefore recommended that the SPD amplify Policy NE3 on the creation, enhancement and management of habitats. This would guarantee benefits across a range of indicators, rather than just the one on measurements of green infrastructure, and would likely lead to positive influences on indicators in the medium term.

9.6.2 In more descriptive terms, the SPD could require the creation, enhancement and/or management of habitats, the habitat types being determined by either existing native habitats or historic native habitats on or near to those sites.

9.7 Recommended Monitoring

9.7.1 Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline above, while others considered relevant to SA Sub-Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. The following is the list of monitoring proposed for the Council to undertake in order to identify biodiversity and geodiversity issues for which a planning response may be warranted:

- **Sub-Objective 4A**: To conserve habitats and geological features within designated sites for conservation (particularly SPAs, SACs and SSSIs);
  - Indicators:
    - total area of SPA, SAC and SSSI land in North East Derbyshire;
    - proportion of SSSI land in ‘favourable’ or ‘unfavourable recovering’ condition;

- **Sub-Objective 4B**: To conserve important local sites for nature or geological conservation;
  - Indicators:
    - total area of local Wildlife Sites within North East Derbyshire;
    - total area of Local Nature Reserve land within North East Derbyshire;
    - total area of Regionally Important Geological Sites within North East Derbyshire;

- **Sub-Objective 5A**: To improve the condition of designated sites for nature conservation, to expand them, and to create new sites;
  - Indicators:
    - total area of SPA, SAC and SSSI land in North East Derbyshire;
    - total area of local Wildlife Sites within North East Derbyshire;
    - total area of Local Nature Reserve land within North East Derbyshire;
    - total area of Regionally Important Geological Sites within North East Derbyshire;
• proportion of SSSI land in ‘favourable’ or ‘unfavourable recovering’ condition;
• proportion of Wildlife Site or Local Nature Reserve land in ‘favourable’ or ‘unfavourable recovering’ condition;
• proportion of Regionally Important Geological Sites in ‘favourable’ or ‘unfavourable recovering’ condition;

- **Sub-Objective 5B**: To increase the amount of habitat under favourable management;

**Indicators:**

- measurements of green infrastructure from an established baseline;
- units of the following habitats under favourable management;
  - area of semi-natural grassland / hay meadow;
  - number of ponds;
  - area of broadleaved woodland;
  - area of wet woodland;
  - number of veteran trees;
  - area of swamp, mire, fen and reedbed;
  - area of floodplain grazing marsh;
  - area of heathland;
  - area of blanket bog;
- units of the following habitats in favourable condition;
  - area of semi-natural grassland / hay meadow;
  - area of lead rakes;
  - number of ponds;
  - length of hedgerow (i.e. that are species-rich);
  - area of broadleaved woodland;
  - area of wet woodland;
  - number of veteran trees;
  - area of swamp, mire, fen and reedbed;
  - area of floodplain grazing marsh;
  - area of heathland;
  - area of blanket bog; and
- compliance with River Quality Objectives.
10 POPULATION, SOCIAL COHESION AND INCLUSION

10.1 Introduction

10.1.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as—

... (b) population; ... and

... (m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (l).

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

10.1.2 The UK has adopted a set of shared sustainable development principles, including:

- “Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society” (Defra, 2005b, p.16).

10.1.3 In addition, the UK Shared Framework for Sustainable Development (Defra, 2005a) identifies the following relevant priority for immediate action:

- Sustainable communities that embody the principles of sustainable development at the local level.

10.1.4 As described in Section 2.2 of this report on the methodology, Stage A of the SA process has already been conducted, and a series of 15 SA Objectives have been established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD. Of these, the following SA Objectives relate specifically to social cohesion and inclusion:

- **SA Objective 6**: To reduce social exclusion by reducing inequalities.
- **SA Objective 7**: To promote social cohesion and identity.

10.2 Environmental Context and Baseline Summary

10.2.1 The information provided in this section is a summary of that provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report (final draft of May 2007), which documents the work conducted during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

10.2.2 There are a number of key objectives, from the international to the local level, relevant to promoting population, social cohesion and inclusion through planning. Those identified during Stage A of this SA/SEA are:

- to combat poverty and social exclusion, ensuring access to a range of shopping, leisure and local services, and addressing gaps in provision (including with regard to gypsies and travellers)
- to improve access to essential services, being attentive to the needs of gypsies and travellers
to regenerate deprived areas, creating new and additional employment opportunities

to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population

to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas

to promote accessibility and overcome ‘peripherality’ in the Region’s rural areas

to deal with the economic and social implications of an ageing society

to attain social cohesion that leads to a strong sense of community, including through the involvement of citizens

to promote social identity, including through the provision of public art

to maintain the vitality of rural communities through meeting business and community needs

to create and support sustainable, respectful, and inclusive communities where gypsies and travellers have fair access to suitable accommodation, education, health and welfare provision

to increase the number of gypsy and traveller sites in appropriate locations, where demand exists

to prevent and improve the impact of traffic on deprived communities

to ensure that people have a choice as to who provides their telecommunications service

to achieve a wide choice of housing and meet the needs of all in the community, including those in need of affordable or special housing in both urban and rural areas

to expect housing developments in villages as well as towns to contribute to affordable and social housing provision

to meet housing requirements in rural areas

to use opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding

10.2.3 Table 10-1 below summarises indicators and targets relating to population and social cohesion and inclusion within North East Derbyshire, providing an assessment of the status of each indicator.

### Table 10-1: Summary of Social Cohesion and Inclusion Indicators for North East Derbyshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Educational Deprivation / Regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of 20% Most Deprived Super Output Areas (SOAs)</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2004: 9.5% (6 of 63) of SOAs are 20% most deprived</td>
<td>2004: East Midlands: 17.6% England: 20%</td>
<td>Status: lower than the regional average, in turn lower than the national average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Relevant Trend(s)</td>
<td>Current Data</td>
<td>Comparator(s)</td>
<td>Target / Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Acceptances as a Percentage of Total Households</td>
<td>2002-03: 5.6%&lt;br&gt;2003-04: 4.6%</td>
<td>2004-05: 4.0%</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2004-05: 6.6%&lt;br&gt;England, 2004-05: 7.8%</td>
<td>Status: less than regional and England averages and declining&lt;br&gt;RELATIVELY HEALTHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of New Dwellings that are ‘Affordable’</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2002-03: 3.3%&lt;br&gt;(8 / 245)</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2002-03: 7.8%&lt;br&gt;England, :</td>
<td>Status: significantly less than the regional average&lt;br&gt;CONSIDER ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE Achievement By Ethnicity</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>Derbyshire, 2003-04: White: 53.9%&lt;br&gt;Mixed: 53.0%&lt;br&gt;Asian: 71.1%</td>
<td>England, 2005: White: 50.3%&lt;br&gt;Mixed: 49.0%&lt;br&gt;Asian: 53.4%</td>
<td>Status: significant inequalities&lt;br&gt;CONSIDER ACTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Satisfaction and Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Population Satisfied with Location as a Place to Live</td>
<td>For Derbyshire: Unchanged since 1999</td>
<td>2002: Net Satisfied: +82</td>
<td>Derbyshire, 2002: Net Satisfied: +80&lt;br&gt;Satisfied: 88&lt;br&gt;Dissatisfied: 8</td>
<td>Status: better than Derbyshire average&lt;br&gt;RELATIVELY HEALTHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population (16+) volunteering in sport and active recreation for at least one hour a week</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2006: 5.5%</td>
<td>Derbyshire, 2006: 4.6%&lt;br&gt;England, 2006: 4.7%</td>
<td>Status: better than Derbyshire and England averages&lt;br&gt;RELATIVELY HEALTHY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.2.4 The population of North East Derbyshire was estimated to be 97,290 in 2005, and 18% of the population was aged 65 or over, as compared to 16% for England. Ethnically, the district is predominately of British origin, being 97.95% as compared to 86.99% for England. After ‘other white’, the most significant minority is ‘mixed ethnicity’, followed by Irish and Asian. Only 9.5% of North East Derbyshire’s Super Output Areas (SOAs) are considered deprived, as compared to 17.6% for the East Midlands and 20% for England.

10.2.5 The key population, social cohesion- and inclusion-related sustainability issues facing the district are:

- the age profile is changing, with the proportion of older people increasing and the proportion of children and young people slightly decreasing;
- a high proportion of the population does not have access to a car;
• with a changing age profile are specific needs that need to be addressed, including access for pedestrians and the disabled to services, facilities (including recreation facilities) and open spaces;
• a failure to deliver adequate sites for gypsies and travellers in many areas of England over the last 10 years;
• physical access to green spaces, children’s play areas and youth facilities is often problematic for disabled people due to motorbike barriers (etc.);
• gypsies and travellers are often marginalized and excluded, sometimes being subject to racially motivated incidents, having problems with literacy, difficulties with accessing healthcare, and problems with lack of enough suitable accommodation leading to problems with community cohesion;
• there are significant ethnic inequalities in educational attainment that could be reflective of inequalities in access to education, people of mixed ethnicity experiencing the lowest GCSE achievement levels, and people of white ethnicity also significantly lower than for those of Asian ethnicity – however, all are above national averages;
• 75% of the wards considered ‘most deprived’ experience lower-than-average life expectancies, suggesting a correlation between poverty and reduced health; and
• there has been a slightly lower proportion of voter turnout in general elections than the national average in 2001 and 2005, which may be broadly reflective of a lack of public participation / community involvement, however contrary to this, there is a higher-than-average proportion of the population volunteering in sport.

10.3 Effects Upon Receptors Within North East Derbyshire

Other Relevant Elements of Planning Policy

10.3.1 As described in Section 1.1, the Developer Contributions SPD amplifies certain policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDDC, 2005). However, there are additionally other relevant aspects of the local planning framework that will act alongside the SPD in guiding development.

10.3.2 The SPD will apply to applications for new development (including redevelopment) of certain sites. As such, it is relevant that Policy H1 supported by Table 5.2 of the adopted Local Plan provides for land allocations and windfall sites of a capacity of 700 new dwellings to 2011 in the Chesterfield Sub-Area. Policies E1 through E5 of the adopted Local Plan are supported by a requirement for 95 hectares (ha) of employment land in the Chesterfield sub-area, and an additional 30 ha of employment land in the Northern Parishes sub-area.

Effects

10.3.3 For developments of 15 or more dwellings or sites of 0.5 ha and over the SPD requires provision of affordable housing will be 40% of all units within the application, of which two thirds would be available for rent through a Registered Social Landlord and one third made available through a shared ownership scheme. Where on-site provision of affordable housing is not deemed appropriate (e.g. in more rural locations), developers will be required to make contributions to the local planning authority to address needs
in other parts of the district. The SPD also reinforces the use of planning obligations to secure the permanence of affordable housing.

10.3.4 Increases in affordable housing would serve to improve social inclusion. Furthermore, a mix of housing types could lead to improved social cohesion by promoting the interaction of a wider range of society.

10.3.5 The SPD directs development to incorporate measures that are likely to improve accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport. Contributions may be required towards:

- community safety measures, including to pedestrian and cyclists routes, public transport interchanges and town centres;
- traffic management measures, giving priority to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users;
- travel plans that encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport;
- footpath and cycle routes;
- pedestrian and cycle priority measures, including secure cycle parking facilities and changing facilities;
- public transport improvements;
- the public realm, including street furniture, trees, cycle parking, seats/benches, improvements to footpaths and new/improved lighting;
- public art;
- open space and recreation, including amenity green space, commons (including allotments), housing green spaces, green corridors, parks, outdoor sport provision and children’s play space (including equipment and outdoor youth facilities); and
- new or improved community facilities, which can include indoor and outdoor leisure and recreation facilities.

10.3.6 The SPD also directs development to provide for community facilities and other operational facilities within settlements, which in turn may be more accessible than existing facilities by non-car transport, depending upon the locations. New or improved community facilities can include community centres, meeting halls, youth centres, day nurseries and crèches (or similar), indoor and outdoor leisure and recreation facilities, facilities for emergency services and civic waste amenities.

10.3.7 Improvements in accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport allow a wider proportion of society to benefit from services and facilities. Safety measures are a big factor in ensuring accessibility and reducing social exclusion, helping to eliminate disadvantage to those who are inhibited from accessing services and facilities by crime or fear of crime. Such reductions in social exclusion are likely to equate to increases in social cohesion and identity, promoting greater interaction within communities, and potentially a greater sense of belonging or acceptance.

10.3.8 New or improved community facilities and improvements to the public realm also increase opportunities for people to convene, and thus have a more direct positive influence on social cohesion and identity.

10.3.9 The SPD guides for the provision of public art, which can both enhance awareness of local identity (e.g. by embodying local identity), and create it by forming common
references that people identify with their community. More generally, public art can add to the cultural facilities of an area and may include features such as: sculpture, water features, lighting schemes, mosaics, murals, engraving, carvings and street furniture, as well as temporary features such as festivals or other visual displays.

10.3.10 The SPD also guides for the conservation of historic assets, including through measures enhance the setting of Listed Buildings or improve access to historic parks and gardens (etc.). Historic assets are an important component of local culture and identity.

10.3.11 Given the level of development expected in North East Derbyshire as envisaged by the adopted Local Plan, the opportunities are largely present within the Chesterfield sub-area, and would build up gradually as the capacity of allocations is fulfilled and potentially as windfall sites are developed. As such, it is considered that this effect becomes significant in the medium term, but it would be permanent and last into the long term.

10.3.12 Additionally, most of these allocations are present within either the ‘most deprived 25%’ or ‘second most deprived 25%’ of wards in England. As such, infrastructure and facilities provided through planning obligations in these areas may help to correct inequalities in access significantly.

10.4 Sustainability Appraisal

10.4.1 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators associated with SA Objective 6, the SPD will likely lead to improvement to a number of indicators on accessibility such as satisfaction with location as a place to live, preferred walking distance to facilities and completions within town centres. It is considered that the measures will take time to be implemented in significant quantity, as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD. As such, the positive influence on indicators will likely be perceived in the medium term. The relevant baseline is considered relatively unhealthy due to the allocations being focused on the most deprived and second most deprived communities in North East Derbyshire, justifying a major positive influence.

10.4.2 Table 10-2 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

Table 10-2: SA Summary for SA Objective 6 on Social Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4.3 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators associated with SA Objective 7, the SPD will again likely lead to improvement to indicators on public participation and integration of cultural identity into places (e.g. expenditure on public art). It is considered that the measures will take time to be implemented in significant quantity, as developments receive planning permission
under the guidance of the SPD. It is also assumed that the development of social cohesion and identity is a time-consuming process. As such, the positive influence on indicators will likely be perceived in the long term. The relevant baseline is considered relatively healthy given a high rate of volunteerism, justifying a moderate positive influence.

10.4.4 Table 10-3 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

**Table 10-3: SA Summary for SA Objective 7 on Social Cohesion and Identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uncertainties and Risks**

10.4.5 As described in Section 2.6, Sustainability Appraisal is an inherently uncertain process that involves making predictions concerning environmental and sustainability conditions on the basis of often limited or possibly inadequate data. Most of the impact predictions made in this report are therefore subject to uncertainty and entail risks, which could be manifested in changes to indicators or the related baseline in a direction or to a degree different from that indicated. It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to social inclusion, and specifically proportion of people within preferred walking distance of facilities, may not occur as assessed as a result of changing opinion or cultural factors, or potentially other factors outside of the SPD's influence. However, were social inclusion entirely up to development, the indicators would likely change as assessed.

10.4.6 It is considered that the predicted change to certain indicators with regard to social cohesion and identity, including levels of volunteerism, may not occur as assessed as a result of such factors outside of the SPD's influence as lifestyle choice. However, the predicted change to indicators regarding public art and Listed Buildings 'at risk' is moderately likely to occur as assessed, and the net influence is thus considered highly likely to be positive (including negligible positive).

**10.5 Other Effects**

10.5.1 Measures to reduce social exclusion within North East Derbyshire may benefit neighbouring districts, such as through whereby improvements to the accessibility of the district lead to increased overall permeability, and thus accessibility of others to services and facilities in places within North East Derbyshire and in Chesterfield.

10.5.2 While North East Derbyshire has its own distinct identity, there are certainly sub-regional identities and cultures, as well as regional and national ones. The benefits of measures taken to enhance local social cohesion and identity are thus likely to extend into the sub-region and beyond, with public art and historic buildings that represent an important part of the cultural identity of these wider boundaries.
10.6 Proposed Mitigation Measures

10.6.1 Although the SPD amplified Policy H10 in the Local Plan, ‘Special Needs Housing’, there is apparently nothing within the SPD discussing the use of planning obligations for the provision of such housing, such as regarding dwellings designed to mobility standards. This should be included.

10.6.2 In response to the Department for Communities and Local Government publication ‘Local Authorities and Gipsies and Travellers: A Guide to responsibilities and Powers’, it is recommended that Gypsy and Traveller sites are recognised as affordable housing, and they should be considered eligible for provisions under Section 106 Agreements.

10.7 Recommended Monitoring

10.7.1 Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline above, while others considered relevant to SA Sub-Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. The following is the list of monitoring proposed for the Council to undertake in order to identify social cohesion and inclusion issues for which a planning response may be warranted:

- **Sub-Objective 6A**: To improve access to open space/recreation, the countryside, footpaths, cyclist and equestrian paths, public transport, education, and other facilities and services, and reduce inequalities;

  **Indicators:**
  - % of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centres;
  - proportion of population within preferred walking distance of:
    - PROWs leading into the countryside;
    - a high-frequency bus stop or train station;
    - local primary school;
    - local secondary school;
    - recreation and open space;
    - a fresh food shop;
    - a post office;
    - a GP surgery;
  - proportion of gypsy and traveller population within preferred walking distance of:
    - local primary school;
    - local secondary school;
    - a fresh food shop;
    - a post office;
    - a hospital;
    - a GP surgery;
  - proportion of ‘20% most deprived SOA’ population within preferred walking distance of:
    - PROWs leading into the countryside;
    - a high-frequency bus stop or train station;
    - local primary school;
    - local secondary school;
    - recreation and open space;
    - a fresh food shop;
- a post office;
- a GP surgery;

**Sub-Objective 6B:** To address the needs, including housing needs, of everyone in the community, reducing inequalities, including by disability, ethnicity, age group, or location, rural or urban;

**Indicators:**
- % of population satisfied with location as a place to live;
- ratio of gypsy and traveller population to caravan site area (people per hectare);
- homeless acceptances as a percentage of total households;
  - within/from rural location;
  - within/from urban location;
- GCSE achievement by ethnicity;

**Sub-Objective 7A:** To increase opportunities for people to join together in activities;

**Indicators:**
- % of population (16+) volunteering in sport and active recreation for at least one hour a week;
- % of population voting in elections;

**Sub-Objective 7B:** To increase the integration of local culture and identity into places, particularly places where people walk and convene;

**Indicators:**
- percentage of Listed Buildings 'At Risk';
  - Grades I and II*;
  - Grade II; and
- public art provision.
11 CULTURAL HERITAGE

11.1 Introduction

11.1.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

\[\text{The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as—}\]

\[\text{(k) cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological resources; … and}\]

\[\text{(m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (l).}\]

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

11.1.2 As described in Section 2.2 of this report on the methodology, Stage A of the SA process has already been conducted, and a series of 15 SA Objectives have been established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD. Of these, the following SA Objective relates specifically to health and fitness:

- **SA Objective 8**: To protect and enhance the historic environment.
- **SA Objective 9**: To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the district’s heritage.

11.2 Environmental Context and Baseline Summary

11.2.1 The information provided in this section is a summary of that provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report (final draft of May 2007), which documents the work conducted during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

11.2.2 There are a number of key objectives, from the international to the local level, relevant to promoting cultural heritage through planning. Those identified during Stage A of this SA/SEA are:

- To protect the historic environment and promote the management of cultural heritage;
- To achieve conservation in line with sustainable economic growth, putting historic buildings to good economic use in commercial or residential occupation;
- To enhance the historic environment where possible;
- To support a net increase in the quality and active management of historic assets; and
- To promote the role of archaeology in education, leisure and tourism.

11.2.3 Table 11-1 below summarises indicators and targets relating to cultural heritage within North East Derbyshire, providing an assessment of the status of each indicator.
### Table 11-1: Summary of Cultural Heritage Indicators for North East Derbyshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of Cultural Heritage Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Scheduled Monuments ‘At Risk’</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Status: significantly higher than the regional and national averages</td>
<td>English Heritage, 2007a, 2007b English Heritage 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Historic Buildings ‘At Risk’ Within Conservation Areas</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONSIDER ACTION</td>
<td>Derbyshire Historic Buildings Trust, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage land area that is Historic Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONSIDER ACTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* no data for total Grade II Listed Buildings in 1999 currently available. Less specific English Heritage data for 2002/03 checked, which concurs with the 2006 data – assumed to be constant since 1999.

11.2.4 North East Derbyshire has 29 designated Conservation Areas, 31 Grade I and II* Listed Buildings, 459 Grade II Listed Buildings and 1 Historic Park and Garden.

11.2.5 The key cultural heritage-related sustainability issues facing the district are:

- a likely abundant historic and archaeological heritage as a result of a long history of settlement in the district, which should be protected, including through designation where possible;
- a high proportion of Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) ‘at risk’;
- a high proportion of Grade II Listed Buildings ‘at risk’;
- a number of historic buildings ‘at risk’ within Conservation Areas; and
- opportunities for enhancement of, and improving access to, the historic environment.
11.3 Effects Upon Receptors Within North East Derbyshire

Other Relevant Elements of Planning Policy

11.3.1 As described in Section 1.1, the Developer Contributions SPD amplifies certain policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDDC, 2005). However, there are additionally other relevant aspects of the local planning framework that will act alongside the SPD in guiding development.

11.3.2 The SPD will apply to applications for new development (including redevelopment) of certain sites. As such, it is relevant that Policy H1 supported by Table 5.2 of the adopted Local Plan provides for land allocations and windfall sites of a capacity of 700 new dwellings to 2011 in the Chesterfield Sub-Area. Policies E1 through E5 of the adopted Local Plan are supported by a requirement for 95 hectares (ha) of employment land in the Chesterfield sub-area, and an additional 30 ha of employment land in the Northern Parishes sub-area.

Effects

11.3.3 The SPD requirements for contributions or undertaking of works for conservation of historic assets will be determined on a case-by-case basis and will take into account the impact that development may have and consideration as to the appropriate mitigation measures which may be required. Requirements may come in different forms (e.g. the retention and physical preservation of archaeological remains, or the provision of green infrastructure to enhance the setting of a listed building or improve the access between the development site and a nearby historic park or garden).

11.3.4 The SPD also guides for certain ‘tools’ that could be used to improve the setting of historic buildings, including the provision of street furniture and other elements of the public realm, public art (which can be used to compliment historic sites), green infrastructure (as mentioned above), and other outdoor open space and recreation. There are potential synergies, which may be considered on a site-by-site basis.

11.3.5 The SPD directs development to incorporate measures that are likely to improve accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport. Contributions may be required towards:

- community safety measures, including to pedestrian and cyclists routes, public transport interchanges and town centres;
- traffic management measures, giving priority to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users;
- travel plans that encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport;
- footpath and cycle routes;
- pedestrian and cycle priority measures, including secure cycle parking facilities and changing facilities;
- public transport improvements; and
- the public realm, including street furniture, trees, cycle parking, seats/benches, improvements to footpaths and new/improved lighting.

11.3.6 As such, the SPD may indirectly improve the opportunities present for people to enjoy the district’s cultural heritage resource. However, if key linkages directly to historic sites are not made, then such a potential positive effect would unlikely be realised.
11.3.7 Transport measures to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport may help to reduce or minimise the adverse effect that air pollution has on many historic buildings, however this effect is likely negligible.

11.4 **Sustainability Appraisal**

11.4.1 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators associated with SA Objective 8, the SPD could potentially contribute towards the protection and/or enhancement of certain cultural heritage features, the former being visible through a lack of change in indicators (i.e. no decline). Measures to enhance the setting or improve historic buildings would only be implemented as mitigation to adverse effects, and thus the net effect is dependent upon the nature of such adverse effects. It is considered that the protection afforded takes immediate effect, with any mitigation being implemented relatively immediately. The positive influence on indicators should extend into the medium and long term. The relevant baseline is considered relatively unhealthy, justifying a major positive influence.

11.4.2 **Table 11-2** summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med.</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.4.3 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators associated with SA Objective 9, the SPD could potentially contribute towards opportunities for people to value and enjoy cultural heritage. Measures to improve accessibility to historic assets would only be implemented as mitigation to adverse effects, and thus the net effect is dependent upon the nature of such adverse effects and site-specific detail. It is considered that any such measures would be rarely utilised a mitigation, and thus would take a long time to be implemented in significant quantity as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD. As such, the positive influence on indicators would only be perceived significantly in the long term. The relevant baseline is unclear, and so a moderate positive influence is assumed.

11.4.4 **Table 11-3** summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.
### Table 11-3: SA Summary for SA Objective 9 on Enjoyment of Cultural Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uncertainties and Risks**

11.4.5 As described in Section 2.6, Sustainability Appraisal is an inherently uncertain process that involves making predictions concerning environmental and sustainability conditions on the basis of often limited or possibly inadequate data. Most of the impact predictions made in this report are therefore subject to uncertainty and entail risks, which could be manifested in changes to indicators or the related baseline in a direction or to a degree different from that indicated. It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to SA Objective 8 may not occur as assessed as a result of factors influencing the status of Listed Buildings outside of the SPD’s influence, and as a result of site-specific detail that cannot be predicted at this stage of assessment.

11.4.6 It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to SA Objective 9 is moderately uncertain. This is as a result of site-specific detail that cannot be predicted at this stage of assessment, and how well access to historic features is improved.

11.5 **Other Effects**

11.5.1 The cultural heritage resource of North East Derbyshire holds historic value at a sub-regional, regional, national, or even international level. Measures to conserve and improve accessibility to this finite resource have beneficial effects to essentially everyone, including future generations.

11.6 **Proposed Mitigation Measures**

11.6.1 Appropriate mitigation to any potential adverse effects on cultural heritage should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

11.6.2 The SPD could state more clearly the types of impacts by which developer obligations may be sought for mitigation. These should include impacts on the setting of historic assets and accessibility to historic assets, as well as any impacts on the integrity of the historic feature itself.

11.7 **Recommended Monitoring**

11.7.1 Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline above, while others considered relevant to SA Sub-Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. The following is the list of monitoring proposed for the Council to undertake in order to identify cultural heritage issues for which a planning response may be warranted:
**Sub-Objective 8A**: To protect existing historic sites and archaeological resources;

*Indicators:*
- percentage of Grade I and II* Listed Buildings ‘At Risk’;
- percentage of Grade II Listed Buildings ‘At Risk’;
- percentage of Scheduled Monuments ‘At Risk’;
- status of the Historic Park / Garden (Renishaw Hall);
- status of locally significant parks and gardens (e.g. Victorian parks);
- number of historic buildings ‘At Risk’ within Conservation Areas;
- number of historic landscape character areas assessed as needing character creation or restoration;

**Sub-Objective 8B**: To promote the management and enhancement of cultural heritage resources;

*Indicators:*
- total number of:
  - Grade I and II* Listed Buildings;
  - Grade II Listed Buildings;
  - Scheduled Monuments;
  - Conservation Areas;
- extent of the Historic Park / Garden (Renishaw Hall);
- number of schemes that:
  - improve the setting of historic assets in the district, such as by replacing existing structures;
  - make use of historic assets for community purposes (e.g. as facilities or components of meeting or general amenity areas);
  - promote the management and enhancement of each of the above types of cultural heritage resources and their setting through planning obligations;

**Sub-Objective 9A**: To promote awareness of the district’s cultural heritage resources;

*Indicators:*
- percent of population within preferred walking distance of
  - the Historic Park / Garden (Renishaw Hall);
  - an information point describing the history of the area;
  - locally important historic parks and gardens with public access;
  and

**Sub-Objective 9B**: To increase the accessibility of cultural heritage resources;

*Indicators:*
- percent of population within preferred walking distance of
  - the Historic Park / Garden (Renishaw Hall);
  - an information point describing the history of the area;
  - locally important historic parks and gardens with public access.
12 EMISSIONS, AIR QUALITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

12.1 Introduction

12.1.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

\[\text{The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as—}\]

\[\ldots\]

\[(c) \text{ air; } \ldots \text{ and}\]

\[(i) \text{ climatic factors; } \ldots \text{ and}\]

\[(m) \text{ the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (l)}.\]

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

12.1.2 The UK has adopted a set of shared sustainable development principles, including:

- “Living within environmental limits” (Defra, 2005b, p.16).

12.1.3 In addition, the UK Shared Framework for Sustainable Development (Defra, 2005a) identifies the following relevant priority for immediate action:

- Climate change and energy – securing a profound change in energy generation and use, preparing for climate change and setting a good example.

12.1.4 As described in Section 2.2 of this report on the methodology, Stage A of the SA process has already been conducted, and a series of 15 SA Objectives have been established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD. Of these, the following SA Objective relates specifically to emissions:

- **SA Objective 10**: To reduce emissions of atmospheric pollutants, including greenhouse gases.

12.2 Environmental Context and Baseline Summary

12.2.1 The information provided in this section is a summary of that provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report (final draft of May 2007), which documents the work conducted during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

12.2.2 There are a number of key objectives, from the international to the local level, relevant to promoting emissions, air quality and climate change through planning. Those identified during Stage A of this SA/SEA are:

- To stabilise greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous man-made interference with the global climate system;
- To reduce the need to travel, especially by car;
• To promote a range of transport alternatives which assist in reducing dependency on the private car;
• To promote energy-efficient modes of transport;
• To make preference for increased rail freight where appropriate;
• To achieve levels of air quality that do not give rise to significant negative impacts on, and risks to human health and the environment;
• To (urgently) increase the use of clean/renewable energy;
• To promote the use of renewable energy technologies, but only where it is viable and not an undue burden; and
• To support the ‘polluters pay’ principle.

12.2.3 Table 12-1 below summarises indicators and targets relating to emissions and air quality within North East Derbyshire, providing an assessment of the status of each indicator.

**Table 12-1: Summary of Emissions and Air Quality Indicators for North East Derbyshire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kilotonnes CO₂ Emissions From Road Transport Per 1,000 Population</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2003: 2.555</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2003: 2.548 England, 2003: 2.156</td>
<td>Status: local and regional data are both significantly higher than the national average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual NO₂ Concentrations (µg/m³)</td>
<td>Future: Projections show levels decreasing with time</td>
<td>2004: 15.1</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2004: 30.4</td>
<td>Status: significantly better than the regional average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Travel to Work by Non-Car Modes (or Work From Home)</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>Derbyshire, 2001: 28.37%</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2001: 31.22% England, 2001: 37.34%</td>
<td>Status: below regional average, significantly below national average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2.4 In 2001, over 71% of the population travelled to work by car. The percent of travel to work by non-car modes is less than both the regional and national averages. The rate of road transport emissions is higher for North East Derbyshire than the regional and national averages.
12.2.5 The key emissions-related sustainability issues facing the district are:

- a relatively high per capita contribution towards greenhouse gas emissions (namely CO$_2$) as a result of road transport;
- a relatively low proportion of travel to work by non-car modes of transport, which may be reflective of a high level of dependency on the private car overall; and
- the district consumes a significantly lower proportion of its commercial and industrial energy demand from renewable resources than the regional average, which is likely indicative of the status for all energy consumption.

12.3 Effects Upon Receptors Within North East Derbyshire

Other Relevant Elements of Planning Policy

12.3.1 As described in Section 1.1, the Developer Contributions SPD amplifies certain policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDDC, 2005). However, there are additionally other relevant aspects of the local planning framework that will act alongside the SPD in guiding development.

12.3.2 The SPD will apply to applications for new development (including redevelopment) of certain sites. As such, it is relevant that Policy H1 supported by Table 5.2 of the adopted Local Plan provides for land allocations and windfall sites of a capacity of 700 new dwellings to 2011 in the Chesterfield Sub-Area. Policies E1 through E5 of the adopted Local Plan are supported by a requirement for 95 hectares (ha) of employment land in the Chesterfield sub-area, and an additional 30 ha of employment land in the Northern Parishes sub-area.

12.3.3 The Derbyshire Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 guides for developers to make contributions ‘to offset maintenance commitment’ and ‘ensure new developments provide for accessible public transport services…’.

12.3.4 The Council is in the process of producing a Recreation and Green Space SPD, which will provide guidance on the local recreation standard and explain the Council’s requirements for the provision of recreation facilities and open/green spaces in new developments. Once adopted, this will be implemented alongside the Developer Contributions SPD towards the protection of existing facilities, the provision of new recreation facilities and open spaces, or the enhancement of the quality of existing facilities.

Effects

12.3.5 The SPD directs development to incorporate measures that are likely to improve the pedestrian and cyclist environment, and to create opportunities for physical activity. Contributions may be required towards:

- community safety measures, including to pedestrian and cyclists routes, public transport interchanges and town centres;
- traffic management measures, giving priority to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users;
- travel plans that encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport;
- footpath and cycle routes;
• pedestrian and cycle priority measures, including secure cycle parking facilities and changing facilities;
• public transport improvements;
• the public realm, including street furniture, trees, cycle parking, seats/benches, improvements to footpaths and new/improved lighting;
• public art;
• open space and recreation, including amenity green space, commons (including allotments), housing green spaces, green corridors, parks, outdoor sport provision and children’s play space (including equipment and outdoor youth facilities); and
• new or improved community facilities, which can include indoor and outdoor leisure and recreation facilities.

12.3.6 The SPD also directs development to provide for community facilities and other operational facilities within settlements, which in turn can reduce reliance upon the private car, depending upon the location of such facilities. Travel plans are required for certain types of employment development and schools.

12.3.7 Pursuant to the measures thus far described, the SPD has a positive effect on emissions, in that decreasing dependence on the private car should reduce total emissions. (Other factors out of the SPD’s influence may, however, increase total emissions.)

12.3.8 Additionally, the SPD guides that where proposed development would be likely to worsen traffic problems on the highway network, developer contributions will be necessary to alleviate the problem. Traffic management measures may be geared towards reducing congestion and pollution and minimising the impact of traffic on the environment.

12.3.9 Traffic and congestion alleviation will help to maintain air quality status, and reduce emissions to a certain extent.

12.3.10 The SPD does, however, guide for the accommodation of the car through highway and parking provision. Transport-related schemes may be funded by individual developers, or more likely, cumulatively. As such, the opportunity for people to remain dependent on the car would not be significantly restricted.

12.4 Sustainability Appraisal

12.4.1 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators associated with SA Objective 10, the SPD will likely lead to some improvement, the proportion of trips made by non-car modes. It is considered that the measures will take time to be implemented in significant quantity, as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD. Effects are likely to be localised around areas of such development, and thus influences on indicators are likely to be negligible district-wide until the long term. The relevant baseline is considered relatively unhealthy, justifying a major positive influence.

12.4.2 However, additionally, the SPD contributes towards maintaining healthy levels of air quality, and it is therefore considered that potential non-movement of indicators relating to air quality can be attributed to the SPD. As the relevant baseline in terms of air
quality is considered relatively healthy, this is qualified as immediate (short-term) and medium-term moderate benefits.

12.4.3 Table 12-2 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

Table 12-2: SA Summary for SA Objective 10 on Emissions, Air Quality and Climate Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uncertainties and Risks**

12.4.4 As described in Section 2.6, Sustainability Appraisal is an inherently uncertain process that involves making predictions concerning environmental and sustainability conditions on the basis of often limited or possibly inadequate data. Most of the impact predictions made in this report are therefore subject to uncertainty and entail risks, which could be manifested in changes to indicators or the related baseline in a direction or to a degree different from that indicated. It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to emissions and air quality may not occur as assessed as a result of personal choice, and other aspects of lifestyle outside of the SPD’s influence. However, were travel choices entirely up to development, the indicators would likely change as assessed.

12.5 Other Effects

12.5.1 Reduced or minimised dependence on the car in North East Derbyshire would likely reduce the number of journeys made to neighbouring districts by residents of North East Derbyshire, and to destinations further afield. As such, benefits could be perceived within the sub-region, region, and to some (likely very small) degree, the nation. Like for North East Derbyshire, such potential positive influences on indicators would likely not become significant until the long term.

12.6 Proposed Mitigation Measures

12.6.1 It is suggested that the SPD include guidance on the location of community facilities secured through developer contributions, ensuring that contributions are adequate for facilities in locations well served by footpaths, cycle paths and/or public transport.

12.7 Recommended Monitoring

12.7.1 Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline above, while others considered relevant to SA Sub-Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. The following is
the list of monitoring proposed for the Council to undertake in order to identify emissions and air quality issues for which a planning response may be warranted:

- **Sub-Objective 10A**: To reduce the need to travel by car;
  
  **Indicators**:
  
  - % of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centres;
  - proportion of population within preferred walking distance of:
    - a high-frequency bus stop (e.g. bus every 15 minutes);
    - recreation and open space;
    - a fresh food shop;
    - a post office;
    - a GP surgery;
    - PROWs leading into the countryside;

- **Sub-Objective 10B**: To reduce dependence upon non-renewable energy resources;
  
  **Indicators**:
  
  - proportion of industrial and commercial energy consumption from renewable sources and waste;
  - proportion of domestic energy consumption from renewable sources and waste; and
  - number of developments incorporating renewable energy technologies.
13 LANDSCAPE AND TOWNSCAPE

13.1 Introduction

13.1.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as—

... (l) landscape; ... and ...

... (m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (l).

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

13.1.2 The UK has adopted a set of shared sustainable development principles, including:

- “Living within environmental limits” (Defra, 2005b, p.16).

13.1.3 In addition, the UK Shared Framework for Sustainable Development (Defra, 2005a) identifies the following relevant priority for immediate action:

- Natural resource protection and environmental enhancement through a better understanding of environmental limits, environmental enhancement and recovery, and a more integrated policy framework.

13.1.4 As described in Section 2.2 of this report on the methodology, Stage A of the SA process has already been conducted, and a series of 15 SA Objectives have been established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD. Of these, the following SA Objective relates specifically to landscape and townscape:

- **SA Objective 11**: To enhance (minimum protect) landscape/townscape character and local distinctiveness.

13.2 Environmental Context and Baseline Summary

13.2.1 The information provided in this section is a summary of that provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report (final draft of May 2007), which documents the work conducted during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

13.2.2 There are a number of key objectives, from the international to the local level, relevant to promoting a cultural heritage through planning. Those identified during Stage A of this SA/SEA are:

- To retain attractive landscapes, and enhance townscapes, near to where people live;
- To respect countryside character and the character of places;
- To promote ‘sense of place’;
- To enhance landscapes/countryside character, townscapes and local distinctiveness;
• To improve damaged and derelict land around towns;
• To facilitate the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems whilst keeping the environmental impact to a minimum;
• To promote good design of waste infrastructure, protecting the street scene and local landscape;
• To help everyone involved in the display of outdoor advertising to contribute positively to the appearance of an attractive and cared for environment in cities, towns and the countryside;
• To locate business requiring lorry access away from residential areas;
• To separate noise-generating and noise-sensitive land uses; and
• To promote high-quality design that will mitigate against noisy land uses.

13.2.3 North East Derbyshire experiences a varied landscape, overlapping in the west with the Peak District National Park and having in the east areas of attractive countryside mixed with evidence of an industrial past. The Peak District National Park is made up of a highly scenic landscape with rolling hills, river valleys and small attractive villages. The eastern part of the District contains larger settlements and large areas of attractive countryside where the landscape has a distinctive local character.

13.2.4 The western part of the District neighbouring the Peak District National Park contains designated Special Landscape Areas, which represent the finest Derbyshire landscape outside of the park and represent those areas of landscape most similar in character to the Peak District National Park. There are four distinct Special Landscape Areas within the district: one in the southwest, two west-central, and one north-central.

13.2.5 The names of the main character areas within which North East Derbyshire falls are:

• Dark Peak;
• Derbyshire Peak Fringe and Lower Derwent; and
• the Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Yorkshire Coalfield.

13.2.6 The relevant landscape character types are:

Dark Peak Character Area
• enclosed moorland;

Derbyshire Peak Fringe and Lower Derwent Character Area
• enclosed moors and heaths;
• wooded slopes and valleys;
• wooded farmlands;
• riverside meadows;

Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Yorkshire Coalfield Character Area
• wooded hills and valleys;
• estate farmlands;
• wooded farmlands;
• coalfield village farmlands; and
• riverside meadows (Derbyshire County Council, 2004).
13.2.7 The key landscape/townscape-related sustainability issue relevant to the SPD is the need to protect important landscape/townscape features, and enhance them where possible. This includes the factor of local distinctiveness.

13.3 Effects Upon Receptors Within North East Derbyshire

Other Relevant Elements of Planning Policy

13.3.1 As described in Section 1.1, the Developer Contributions SPD amplifies certain policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDDC, 2005). However, there are additionally other relevant aspects of the local planning framework that will act alongside the SPD in guiding development.

13.3.2 The SPD will apply to applications for new development (including redevelopment) of certain sites. As such, it is relevant that Policy H1 supported by Table 5.2 of the adopted Local Plan provides for land allocations and windfall sites of a capacity of 700 new dwellings to 2011 in the Chesterfield Sub-Area. Policies E1 through E5 of the adopted Local Plan are supported by a requirement for 95 hectares (ha) of employment land in the Chesterfield sub-area, and an additional 30 ha of employment land in the Northern Parishes sub-area.

Effects

13.3.3 The SPD states that public realm improvements may be appropriate in some circumstances, for example due to the scale or impact of the development. The SPD states that a goal is to have well-designed, attractive and well-maintained environments towards the benefits of residents and attracting businesses. The nature of the improvements can be varied and are dependant on factors such as location and existing provision. They may include:

- planting of street trees;
- provision of street furniture, including elements such as cycle parking and seats where residents can meet;
- improvements to footpaths; and/or
- new/improved lighting.

13.3.4 The SPD also guides for development to provide green space and green infrastructure, and for works for conservation of historic assets to include such measures as the use of green infrastructure to enhance the setting of Listed Buildings. Additionally, the SPD guides for the provision of public art through planning obligations.

13.3.5 Street improvements, public art and green infrastructure would contribute toward the local landscape and street scene, and could be used to integrate places better. In areas where new development is occurring, this may help the development to fit in with the existing landscape/townscape, and create a more cohesive landscape/townscape as a net benefit. Such measures, particularly public art, also have the potential benefit of contributing towards local distinctiveness.

13.4 Sustainability Appraisal

13.4.1 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators, and thus SA Objective 11, the SPD will likely lead to some improvement to
monetary investment in landscape-enhancing measures in the short, medium and long term, and to the number of character areas assessed as needing character creation or restoration in the long term. Regarding the latter effect, it is considered that the measures will take time to be implemented in significant quantity to make a significant contribution, as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD. This may additionally lead to increased resident satisfaction with their location as a place to live.

### 13.4.2 Table 13-1 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

**Table 13-1: SA Summary for SA Objective 11 on Landscape and Townscape**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uncertainties and Risks**

### 13.4.3 As described in Section 2.6, Sustainability Appraisal is an inherently uncertain process that involves making predictions concerning environmental and sustainability conditions on the basis of often limited or possibly inadequate data. Most of the impact predictions made in this report are therefore subject to uncertainty and entail risks, which could be manifested in changes to indicators or the related baseline in a direction or to a degree different from that indicated. It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to landscape and townscape are moderately certain to occur as assessed, meaning the benefits may be negligible or even major positive.

### 13.5 Other Effects

**13.5.1** Given existing land allocations in the adopted Local Plan, there are unlikely to be significant benefits to views of the district from neighbouring authorities, however windfall sites or future allocations that are located in areas where character areas or views of the landscape cross boundaries may lead to such benefits in the longer term.

### 13.6 Proposed Mitigation Measures

**13.6.1** As for biodiversity reasons, it is recommended that the SPD amplify Policy NE3 on the creation, enhancement and management of habitats. This would simply be one more tool that developers could use in order to enhance landscapes and views within the district.

**13.6.2** In more descriptive terms, the SPD could require the creation, enhancement and/or management of habitats. In keeping with the constraints of the SPD, developer contributions should be seeking a net improvement of biodiversity on sites where they would otherwise lead to greenfield landtake and/or potential habitat fragmentation.
13.7 Recommended Monitoring

13.7.1 Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline above, while others considered relevant to SA Sub-Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. The following is the list of monitoring proposed for the Council to undertake in order to identify safety and security issues for which a planning response may be warranted:

- **Sub-Objective 11A**: To increase the measures by which landscape/townscape character and local distinctiveness can be protected and enhanced by developers;
  
  **Potential Indicators:**
  - monetary investment into:
    - public open space / greenspace / green corridors;
    - other landscaping;
    - habitat management;

- **Sub-Objective 11B**: To promote infrastructure and facilities that integrate well into the character of the area;
  
  **Potential Indicators:**
  - number of landscape and townscape character areas assessed as needing character creation or restoration;
  - number of historic landscape character areas assessed as needing character creation or restoration;
  - % of population satisfied with location as a place to live.
14 WATER QUALITY AND FLOOD RISK

14.1 Introduction

14.1.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as—

... (g) water; ... and

... (m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub- paragraphs (a) to (l).

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

14.1.2 The UK has adopted a set of shared sustainable development principles, including:

- “Living within environmental limits” (Defra, 2005b, p.16).

14.1.3 In addition, the UK Shared Framework for Sustainable Development (Defra, 2005a) identifies the following relevant priority for immediate action:

- Natural resource protection and environmental enhancement through a better understanding of environmental limits, environmental enhancement and recovery, and a more integrated policy framework.

14.1.4 As described in Section 2.2 of this report on the methodology, Stage A of the SA process has already been conducted, and a series of 15 SA Objectives have been established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD. Of these, the following SA Objective relates specifically to health and fitness:

- **SA Objective 12**: To protect and enhance the quality of ground and surface waters.

- **SA Objective 13**: To protect people, the built environment and the natural environment against the adverse effects of flooding.

14.2 Environmental Context and Baseline Summary

14.2.1 The information provided in this section is a summary of that provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report (final draft of May 2007), which documents the work conducted during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

14.2.2 There are a number of key objectives, from the international to the local level, relevant to promoting water quality and reduced flood risk through planning. Those identified during Stage A of this SA/SEA are:

- To adapt to climate change, reducing the risk to flooding while incorporating drainage benefits with other sustainability benefits (e.g. biodiversity, regeneration);
To avoid flood risk to people, property, infrastructure, habitats and statutory sites where possible, and manage any residual risk, taking account of the impacts of climate change; and

To protect and manage natural resources, including surface and ground water.

### 14.2.3 Table 14-1 below summarises indicators and targets relating to water quality and flood risk within North East Derbyshire, providing an assessment of the status of each indicator.

#### Table 14-1: Water Quality and Flood Risk Indicators for North East Derbyshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve 91% compliance with River Quality Objectives by 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with River Quality Objectives</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>EA East Midlands, 2005: 76% compliant 14% marginal failure 10% significant failure</td>
<td>England, 2000: 89% compliant or marginal failure 11% significant failure</td>
<td>CONSIDER ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Water Quality of Rivers</td>
<td>1990: 12% Good 58% Fair 9% Poor 21% Bad 2002: 47% Good 36% Fair 16% Poor 0% Bad 2005: 44% Good 49% Fair 7% Poor 0% Bad</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2005: 60% Good 36% Fair 4% Poor 0% Bad</td>
<td>Status: somewhat worse than the regional average</td>
<td>CONSIDER ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Water Quality of Rivers</td>
<td>1990: 5% Good 54% Fair 29% Poor 11% Bad 2002: 28% Good 69% Fair 3% Poor 0% Bad 2005: 57% Good 39% Fair 3% Poor 1% Bad</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2005: 59% Good 35% Fair 5% Poor 1% Bad</td>
<td>Status: similar to the regional average, perhaps slightly better</td>
<td>RELATIVELY HEALTHY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.2.4 The East Midlands missed its 2005 target of 91% compliance with River Quality Objectives, although it achieved 90% compliant or marginal failure as compared to 89% compliant or marginal failure for England.

14.2.5 Within North East Derbyshire, the biological quality of rivers is somewhat worse than the average for the East Midlands, with 7% of river length of poor quality as compared to 4% for the region. Chemical quality, however, is perhaps slightly better than the regional average, having a lesser percentage of river length of poor quality, but also a slightly lesser percentage of good quality (as compared to fair).

14.2.6 There is currently no information available on flood risk for North East Derbyshire. The East Midlands has a lower percentage of properties at risk from flooding than England, but a significantly higher percentage of its land area at risk.

14.2.7 The key water quality- and flooding-related sustainability issues facing the district are:

- missed target for compliance with river quality objectives;
- somewhat worse biological water quality than the regional average; and
- a continual need to protect against flooding.
14.3 Effects Upon Receptors Within North East Derbyshire

Other Relevant Elements of Planning Policy

14.3.1 As described in Section 1.1, the Developer Contributions SPD amplifies certain policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDDC, 2005). However, there are additionally other relevant aspects of the local planning framework that will act alongside the SPD in guiding development.

14.3.2 The SPD will apply to applications for new development (including redevelopment) of certain sites. As such, it is relevant that Policy H1 supported by Table 5.2 of the adopted Local Plan provides for land allocations and windfall sites of a capacity of 700 new dwellings to 2011 in the Chesterfield Sub-Area. Policies E1 through E5 of the adopted Local Plan are supported by a requirement for 95 hectares (ha) of employment land in the Chesterfield sub-area, and an additional 30 ha of employment land in the Northern Parishes sub-area.

Effects

14.3.3 The SPD guides for requirements to be sought, where appropriate, for mitigation of fluvial flood risk and the provision of physical defences or other flood prevention measures. The extent and scope of works and/or financial contribution will be determined in accordance with Environment Agency. In addition, contributions for maintenance of physical defences, other flood risk measures and schemes deemed necessary for the proper management of surface water run off will be required. Such contributions will be assessed as the fair and reasonable costs for maintenance over the lifetime of the development, which is typically 50 years.

14.3.4 This policy would contribute toward the reduction of flood risk to people, property, infrastructure, habitats and statutory sites. It would enable adaptation to the increased risk of flooding due to climate change, whilst taking account of surface water management.

14.3.5 Depending upon whether nature conservation sites are dependent upon good water quality, or otherwise upon whether good water quality is considered important for the protection of such sites or nationally rare species, the SPD could contribute towards the protection of water quality through nature conservation measures.

14.4 Sustainability Appraisal

14.4.1 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators associated with SA Objective 12, the SPD will likely lead to some improvement to water quality and the proportion of new development incorporating Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), though this is not prescriptively guided for by the SPD. It is considered that the measures will take time to be implemented in significant quantity, as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD. As such, the positive influence on indicators will likely be perceived in the long term. The relevant baseline is considered relatively unhealthy, justifying a major positive influence.

14.4.2 Table 14-2 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.
Table 14-2: SA Summary for SA Objective 12 on Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.4.3 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators associated with SA Objective 13, the SPD will likely lead to some improvement to the percentage of properties at risk of flooding, and will likely at least maintain the percentage of land at risk (insofar as development is capable of doing so). However, the contributions section relating to flood risk does not clearly state that risk to other areas of land will be a factor in considering the measures deemed appropriate to the development (see mitigation). It is considered that the proportion of properties at risk of flooding will reduce as soon as developments receiving planning permission under the guidance of the SPD are implemented and in operation. A significant change in figures may not occur until new development accumulates. As such, the positive influence on indicators will likely be perceived in the medium term.

14.4.4 Table 14-3 summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

Table 14-3: SA Summary for SA Objective 13 on Flood Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uncertainties and Risks

14.4.5 As described in Section 2.6, Sustainability Appraisal is an inherently uncertain process that involves making predictions concerning environmental and sustainability conditions on the basis of often limited or possibly inadequate data. Most of the impact predictions made in this report are therefore subject to uncertainty and entail risks, which could be manifested in changes to indicators or the related baseline in a direction or to a degree different from that indicated. It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to water quality (SA Objective 12) is dependent upon the way in which the SPD is implemented, given that SUDS measures, or other water-quality-improving measures are not prescriptively encouraged.

14.4.6 It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to flood risk (SA Objective 13) is moderately certain, as the requirement for flood prevention measures are highly likely to lead to some benefit to land and properties at risk of flooding, including negligible benefits. However, the baseline for the district is missing, and as such, benefits are uncertain and depend upon the flooding potential of specific sites.
14.5 Other Effects

14.5.1 As surface waters are a shared resource that traverse boundaries, benefits to flood risk within North East Derbyshire are likely to extend into the sub-region, and to a lesser degree into the wider region. This is particularly the case where new developments on brownfield land lead to measures that maintain runoff at greenfield rates, or where SUDS is included as a measure.

14.6 Proposed Mitigation Measures

14.6.1 It is recommended that the SPD more prescriptively encourage the consideration of SUDS as a developer contribution, promoting it most strongly for large-scale developments in order to mitigate the detrimental impacts upon water quality and guarantee wider benefits to flood risk. It is also recommended that the SPD clearly state that risk to other areas of land will be a factor in considering the measures deemed appropriate to a development.

14.7 Recommended Monitoring

14.7.1 Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline above, while others considered relevant to SA Sub-Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. The following is the list of monitoring proposed for the Council to undertake in order to identify safety and security issues for which a planning response may be warranted:

- **Sub-Objective 12A**: To prevent or offset any significant harm to ground or surface water quality or dynamics;
  - Indicators:
    - compliance with river quality objectives;
    - biological water quality of rivers;
    - chemical water quality of rivers;
- **Sub-Objective 12B**: To take advantage of opportunities to improve the physical environment surrounding watercourses, such as through natural filtration of surface runoff;
  - Indicators:
    - percentage of new development incorporating SUDS;
- **Sub-Objective 13A**: To provide flood defences that protect development and associated infrastructure against flooding;
  - Indicators:
    - percentage of properties at risk of flooding;
- **Sub-Objective 13B**: To ensure flood defences or drainage measures for development do not lead to adverse effects in other locations;
  - Indicators:
    - percentage of land at risk of flooding.
15 **ECONOMY, SKILLS AND EMPLOYMENT**

15.1 **Introduction**

15.1.1 The SEA Regulations require that the ‘Environmental Report’ include a description of:

*The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long-term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects, and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as—*

…

(b) population;

…

(j) material assets; and

…

(m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) to (l).

(HM Government, 2004, Schedule 2-6)

15.1.2 As described in Section 2.2 of this report on the methodology, Stage A of the SA process has already been conducted, and a series of 15 SA Objectives have been established for appraising the Developer Contributions SPD. Of these, the following SA Objective relates specifically to economy, skills and employment:

- **SA Objective 14**: To maintain and improve levels of attainment in education and skills qualifications.
- **SA Objective 15**: To provide physical conditions for a modern economic structure.

15.2 **Environmental Context and Baseline Summary**

15.2.1 The information provided in this section is a summary of that provided in the SA/SEA of the North East Derbyshire Developer Contributions SPD Scoping Report (final draft of May 2007), which documents the work conducted during Stage A of the SA/SEA process.

15.2.2 There are a number of key objectives, from the international to the local level, relevant to promoting a sustainable economy through planning. Those identified during Stage A of this SA/SEA are:

- to combat poverty;
- to regenerate deprived areas, creating new and additional employment opportunities;
- to deal with the economic implications of an ageing society;
- to attain more balanced competitiveness;
- to improve the transport system;
- to improve international, inter and intra-regional connectivity;
- to make best use of rail infrastructure and the strategic road network;
- to develop new opportunities for local jobs in the storage and distribution sector;
• to improve public transport access to Robin Hood Airport near Doncaster;
• to secure economic prosperity, employment opportunities and competitiveness;
• to achieve a sustainable economy;
• to improve access to education and higher learning programmes;
• to support business innovation;
• to raise the economic performance of Chesterfield and Mansfield;
• to encourage the market to work for the environment;
• to support education, training and awareness of biodiversity issues;
• to support rural businesses;
• to maintain the vitality of rural communities through meeting business and community needs;
• to support sustainable tourism in delivering high-quality facilities to enjoy the countryside;
• to support market towns as comprehensive local service centres;
• to support Chesterfield and Mansfield as Sub-Regional Centres for economic activity;
• to support an efficient, competitive and innovative retail and leisure sector;
• to promote opportunities for the incorporation of beneficial biodiversity and geological features within the design of development;
• to facilitate the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems;
• to achieve conservation in line with sustainable economic growth, putting historic buildings to good economic use in commercial or residential occupation; and
• to promote the role of archaeology in education, leisure and tourism.

15.2.3 Table 15-1 below summarises indicators and targets relating to the economy, skills and employment within North East Derbyshire, providing an assessment of the status of each indicator.
## Table 15-1: Economic Indicators for North East Derbyshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Relevant Trend(s)</th>
<th>Current Data</th>
<th>Comparator(s)</th>
<th>Target / Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Activity Rate</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2004-05: 77.9%</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2004-05: 79.5% UK, 2004-05: 78.7%</td>
<td>Status: Less than the regional and national averages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Population Achieving 5 GCSE Grades C or Better</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>Derbyshire, 2003-04: 54.0%</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2005: 52.7% England, 2005: 57.1%</td>
<td>Status: better than regional average, worse than national average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the Working Population with at least an NVQ ‘Level 3’ Qualification</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2005: 38.8%</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2005: 43.6% England, 2005: 44.7%</td>
<td>Status: significantly worse than regional and national averages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>INFORMATION GAP</td>
<td>2005: 2.0% (1,164 people)</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2005: 2.1% UK, 2005: 2.3%</td>
<td>Status: better than the regional and national averages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Tourist Visitors</td>
<td>The Peak District and Derbyshire</td>
<td>2003: 36.58 million 2004: 36.25 million</td>
<td>The Peak District and Derbyshire, 2005: 35.83 million</td>
<td>Status: declining trend, opposite regional improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT Registered Businesses per 1,000 Population</td>
<td>2004: 27.7 2005: 28.1</td>
<td>East Midlands, 2005: 29.6 UK, 2005: 30.4</td>
<td>Status: less than the regional and national averages, but increasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.2.4 The key economy-, skills- and employment-related sustainability issues facing the district are:

- a lower economic activity rate than the national and regional averages;
- weak skills and qualifications profile of resident workforce, as demonstrated by a low percentage of the working population with qualifications of at least NVQ Level 3;
- recent declines in the number of tourist visitors, contrasting from increases in the East Midlands region;
- the proportion of VAT registered businesses relative to the population is lower than the regional and national averages, though increasing;
- competition for investment from locations with higher level of financial incentives (e.g. South Yorkshire);
- decline of smaller town centres;
• lack of quality serviced employment sites available for immediate development; and
• peak time traffic congestion on key routes around Chesterfield town centre, most traffic passing through rather than stopping.

15.2.5 The key tourism-specific issues facing North East Derbyshire and Chesterfield are:
• a persisting image of industrial decline, linked to highly visible brownfield site legacy on main routes;
• decline of smaller town centres;
• low tourism profile and the product is less developed than towns such as Matlock, Bakewell and Buxton, which are traditionally perceived as the area’s main tourist destinations; and
• peak time traffic congestion on key routes around Chesterfield town centre, most traffic passing through rather than stopping.

15.3 Effects Upon Receptors Within North East Derbyshire

Other Relevant Elements of Planning Policy

15.3.1 As described in Section 1.1, the Developer Contributions SPD amplifies certain policies of the adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan (NEDDC, 2005). However, there are additionally other relevant aspects of the local planning framework that will act alongside the SPD in guiding development.

15.3.2 The SPD will apply to applications for new development (including redevelopment) of certain sites. As such, it is relevant that Policy H1 supported by Table 5.2 of the adopted Local Plan provides for land allocations and windfall sites of a capacity of 700 new dwellings to 2011 in the Chesterfield Sub-Area. Policies E1 through E5 of the adopted Local Plan are supported by a requirement for 95 hectares (ha) of employment land in the Chesterfield sub-area, and an additional 30 ha of employment land in the Northern Parishes sub-area.

Effects

15.3.3 SA Sub-Objective 14B is “to improve the quality of education and training facilities”. The relevant statements within the SPD towards this objective are considered to be:
• “it might be acceptable for contributions to be sought towards additional provision [of additional or expanded community infrastructure, such as new classrooms] through a planning obligation”;
• in terms of schools, “contributions will be sought for development of 4 dwellings or more, and in cases where they are too small to provide part of all of the facility required, it will be pooled with other contributions until such time as the required works can be carried out”; and
• “for developments in excess of 500 dwellings, an assessment will be made of the need to secure additional accommodation for pupils with special educational needs”.

15.3.4 It is difficult to assess whether the net effect of such provision will be maintaining the ‘status quo’ in terms of provision of school capacity, or whether there potential
improvements in terms of newer classrooms being to a better design standard, or indeed redressing any current capacity issues. There is also no specific mention of funding school staff in terms of addressing capacity.

15.3.5 The SPD guides for developer contributions towards new or improved community facilities, encouraging multi-purpose buildings and use of buildings for learning.

15.3.6 The SPD guides for development to contribute towards training and workforce development, including employment and training initiatives, programmes to meet specific community and sector needs, apprentice schemes and work-based placement. This is to be accomplished through a partnership with organisation such as Jobcentre Plus, the Learning and Skills Council, Connexions and CHART LSP. This is likely to contribute towards the rate of skills qualifications in the district, as well as overall employment.

15.3.7 Particularly in the media, there is a reported linkage between the amount of affordable housing and economic opportunities, particularly as relates to the supply for key workers. Various industries can have difficulties acquiring and retaining staff as a result of the high cost of housing. The SPD states a requirement that 40% of all units on development of 15 or more dwelling (or minimum 0.5ha) be ‘affordable housing’, two-thirds through rent to a Registered Social Landlord, and one-third through a shared ownership scheme. This could help to maximise opportunities for economic growth as and when they occur, however this depends upon the nature and extent of opportunities, particularly as relates to the demand for staff, and the potential for needs to be met by commuters from other local authorities.

15.3.8 One important factor in the maximisation of opportunities for economic gains and the realisation of those gains is the capacity of transport infrastructure. As such, it is important that a suitable amount of spare capacity on transport infrastructure is allowed for in order to more readily accommodate economic opportunities and growth when they occur. The SPD provides a mechanism whereby the cumulative demand on infrastructure may be considered, including before all of the developments have come forward. Additionally, it sets the precedent that “spare capacity… will not be credited to developers.”

15.3.9 As such, the SPD contributes significantly towards the ability of decision-makers to plan for infrastructure ahead of development, helping to prevent deficits of capacity, particularly where such deficits could lead to the missing or ‘reduction’ of important economic opportunities.

15.4 Sustainability Appraisal

15.4.1 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators associated with SA Objective 14, the SPD will likely lead to some improvement to the accessibility of adult training facilities through the provision of community facilities that can be used for learning. However, the SPD is considered likely to maintain the ‘status quo’ with regard to schools and other educational facilities, with some potential for overall negligible benefits to average class size and pupil-teacher ratio district-wide. The SPD guides for contribution towards training and workforce development, for which there no have yet been established. It is considered that the measures will take time to be implemented in significant quantity, as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD. As such, the positive influence on indicators will likely be perceived in the long term. In addition, contribution towards training and workforce development are likely to make a
significant contribution towards levels of skills qualifications and employment as early as the medium term, which is appropriate to qualify here. The relevant baseline is considered relatively unhealthy, justifying a major positive influence.

15.4.2 **Table 15-2** summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

### Table 15-2: SA Summary for SA Objective 14 on Education and Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.4.3 In terms of the way in which the effects described in the previous section will influence indicators associated with SA Objective 15, the SPD will likely lead to some improvement to the number of completions of retail, office and leisure facilities in town centres, to monetary investment in transport infrastructure in 20% most deprived areas, to indicators on preferred walking distance to public transport and employment, and to opinion on travel time regarding employment. It is considered that the measures will take time to be implemented in significant quantity, as developments receive planning permission under the guidance of the SPD. As such, the positive influence on indicators will likely be perceived in the medium term. The relevant baseline is considered relatively unhealthy, justifying a major positive influence.

15.4.4 **Table 15-3** summarises the potential influence on indicators, as described above and in the following paragraphs on uncertainties and risks.

### Table 15-3: SA Summary for SA Objective 15 on the Physical Conditions for a Modern Economic Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Effects</th>
<th>Uncertainty (1 – 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Med.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uncertainties and Risks

15.4.5 As described in Section 2.6, Sustainability Appraisal is an inherently uncertain process that involves making predictions concerning environmental and sustainability conditions on the basis of often limited or possibly inadequate data. Most of the impact predictions made in this report are therefore subject to uncertainty and entail risks, which could be manifested in changes to indicators or the related baseline in a direction or to a degree different from that indicated. It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to education and skills (SA Objective 14) is moderately uncertain, as there is no guarantee that community facilities as a result of planning
obligations will be used towards learning and training, and indicators with regard to training and workforce development are yet to be established.

15.4.6 It is considered that the predicted change to indicators with regard to the physical conditions for a modern economic structure (SA Objective 15) may vary as a result of externally influencing factors on opinion with regard to accessibility and travel time. It is considered relatively certain that the SPD will lead to increased monetary investment in transport infrastructure in most deprived areas.

15.5 Other Effects

15.5.1 Measures to improve education, skills, employment and physical infrastructure provision in support of business growth are considered beneficial to the sub-region and region, as not only are businesses linked across local authority and indeed regional boundaries, but residents are likely to continue to cross boundaries in pursuit of various opportunities.

15.6 Proposed Mitigation Measures

15.6.1 It is considered possible that the SPD could address provision of adult training facilities specifically in areas where a relative lack of such facilities is experienced.

15.7 Recommended Monitoring

15.7.1 Certain indicators are already monitored by the district or other parties, some of which are included in the baseline above, while others considered relevant to SA Sub-Objectives have not yet been monitored or reported within the district. The following is the list of monitoring proposed for the Council to undertake in order to identify education, employment and economic issues for which a planning response may be warranted:

- **Sub-Objective 14A**: To improve access to education and training facilities;
  
  **Indicators**:
  
  - with regard to preferred transport mode, public opinion on the accessibility of:
    - primary schools;
    - secondary schools;
    - further education and adult training facilities;
  
- **Sub-Objective 14B**: To improve the quality of education and training facilities;
  
  **Indicators**:
  
  - average class size;
  - pupil/teacher ratio;
  - monetary investment in training and workforce development;
  
- **Sub-Objective 15A**: To support regeneration and business innovation through improved infrastructure, particularly in accessing local centres, and prioritising deprived areas;
  
  **Indicators**:
  
  - % of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centres;
• monetary investment in transport infrastructure in 20% most deprived Super Output Areas (SOAs)

• **Sub-Objective 15B:** To improve the efficiency of the transport network, reducing congestion and promoting ease of access using sustainable transport modes wherever possible;

  **Indicators:**
  - Proportion of Working Population Within Preferred Walking Distance of a High-Frequency Bus Service or Train Station;
  - Businesses Reporting Average Travel Time For Their Employees as ‘Good’ or ‘Very Good’;
  - Businesses Reporting Average Travel Time With Key Suppliers or Partners as ‘Good’ or ‘Very Good’; and
  - Tourists Reporting Travel Time To/From Transport Hubs as ‘Good’ or ‘Very Good’.


Derbyshire County Council (2004). *The Landscape Character of Derbyshire.*
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APPENDIX 2 – SA FRAMEWORK
The table below is the SA Framework by which the Developer Contributions SPD has been assessed. It is a set of ‘sustainability objectives’, also called ‘SA Objectives’, that addresses sustainability topics or issues, including those required by the SEA Regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEDDC Developer Contributions SPD SA Topic</th>
<th>SEA Regulations Schedule 2-6 Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>SA Sub-Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Fitness</td>
<td><em>(b) population; (c) human health</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 To improve levels of health and fitness</td>
<td>1A To increase opportunities for people to access healthcare facilities, shops selling fresh fruit and vegetables, and various types of open space and recreational areas by a choice means of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1B To increase the number of journeys by walking, cycling, and public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1C To improve the quality of open space and recreational areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td><em>(b) population; (c) human health</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime, including with regard to transport</td>
<td>2A To reduce crime and fear of crime through incorporating safety measures and safe design into communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B To improve safety on transport infrastructure, particularly on the road network, reducing in particular pedestrian, cyclist and child casualties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil and Land Resources</td>
<td><em>(f) soil:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 To promote prudent and efficient use of land resources</td>
<td>3A To contribute towards driving waste up the ‘waste hierarchy’, promoting reduction, reuse and recycling (including composting), and where relevant, recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3B To protect the ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td><em>(a) biodiversity; (d) fauna; (e) flora; (f) soil</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 To protect existing biodiversity and geodiversity resources</td>
<td>4A To conserve habitats and geological features within designated sites for conservation (particularly SPAs, SACs and SSSIs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4B To conserve important local sites for nature or geological conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5A To improve the condition of designated sites for nature conservation, to expand them, and to create new sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5B To increase the amount of habitat under favourable management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, Social Cohesion and Inclusion</td>
<td><em>(b) population; (i) material assets</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 To reduce social exclusion by reducing inequalities</td>
<td>6A To improve access to open space/recreation, the countryside, footpaths, cyclist and equestrian paths, public transport, education, and other facilities and services, and reduce inequalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6B To address the needs, including housing needs, of everyone in the community, reducing inequalities, including by disability, ethnicity, age group, or location, rural or urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 To promote social cohesion and identity</td>
<td>7A To increase opportunities for people to join together in activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7B To increase the integration of local culture and identity into places, particularly places where people walk and convene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEDDC Developer Contributions SPD SA Topic</td>
<td>SEA Regulations Schedule 2-6 Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SA Objective</strong></td>
<td><strong>SA Sub-Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Heritage</strong></td>
<td>&quot;(k) cultural heritage;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 To protect and enhance the historic environment</td>
<td>8A To protect existing historic sites and archaeological resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8B To promote the management and enhancement of cultural heritage resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the district’s heritage</td>
<td>9A To promote awareness of the district’s cultural heritage resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9B To increase the accessibility of cultural heritage resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emissions, Air Quality and Pollution</strong></td>
<td>&quot;(h) air; (i) climatic factors;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 To reduce emissions of atmospheric pollutants, including greenhouse gases</td>
<td>10A To reduce the need to travel by car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10B To reduce dependence upon non-renewable energy resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape and Townscape</strong></td>
<td>&quot;(l) landscape;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 To enhance (minimum protect) landscape/townscape character and local distinctiveness</td>
<td>11A To increase the measures by which landscape/townscape character and local distinctiveness can be protected and enhanced by developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11B To promote infrastructure and facilities that integrate well into the character of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Quality and Flood Risk</strong></td>
<td>&quot;(g) water;... (i) climatic factors;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 To protect and enhance the quality of ground and surface waters</td>
<td>12A To prevent or offset any significant harm to ground or surface water quality or dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12B To take advantage of opportunities to improve the physical environment surrounding watercourses, such as through natural filtration of surface runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 To protect people, the built environment and the natural environment against the adverse effects of flooding</td>
<td>13A To provide flood defences that protect development and associated infrastructure against flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13B To ensure flood defences or drainage measures for development do not lead to adverse effects in other locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy, Skills and Employment</strong></td>
<td>&quot;(j) material assets&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 To maintain and improve levels of attainment in education and skills qualifications</td>
<td>14A To improve access to education and training facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14B To improve the quality of education and training facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 To provide physical conditions for a modern economic structure</td>
<td>15A To support regeneration and business innovation through improved infrastructure, particularly in accessing local centres, and prioritising deprived areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15B To improve the efficiency of the transport network, reducing congestion and promoting ease of access using sustainable transport modes wherever possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Temporal Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To improve levels of health and fitness</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime, including with regard to transport</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To promote prudent and efficient use of land resources</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To protect existing biodiversity and geodiversity resources</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, increasing management, accessibility and awareness</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To reduced social exclusion by reducing inequalities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To promote social cohesion and identity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To protect and enhance the historic environment</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the district’s heritage</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To reduce emissions of atmospheric pollutant, including greenhouse gases</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To enhance (minimum protect) landscape/ townscape character and local distinctiveness</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To protect and enhance the quality of ground and surface waters</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To protect people, the built environment and the natural environment against the adverse effects of flooding</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To maintain and improve levels of attainment in education and skills qualifications</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV-F Cultural Heritage, page 14

As indicated in our letter of 25 May 2007, the data on Buildings ‘at Risk’ should distinguish between those on the national register (Grade I and II*), which is updated on an annual basis, and the data derived from the local data source, which includes Grade II listed buildings. It is possible to provide comparisons with regional and national data for the Grade I and II* buildings using data from the national register. The data sources should be made explicit. The number of registered parks and gardens in the East Midlands cannot easily be compared with other regions, as they vary greatly in size. Certainly, most districts in the East Midlands region have more than one. Reference could also be made to the number of scheduled monuments (32) in the district in the first paragraph.

**Action:** altered the paragraphs under Section IV-F in order to reflect the data sources, to remove the comparison made with regard to registered parks and gardens, and to identify scheduled monuments.

The distinction in data sources was not originally considered pertinent within the non-technical summary, however its value has been recognised. It is agreed that the indicator on Registered Parks and Gardens should refer to size (i.e. area of coverage) rather than number. However, this is not possible given the time and resources available, and as such, this indicator cannot effectively contribute to the SA/SEA. In future iterations of SA/SEA (i.e. for future SPDs), the indicator should be taken forward, in agreement with English Heritage, to an even more appropriate indicator, such as “area / population” or “proportion of total land area”.

### Table 11-1 Indicators for the historic environment

The same points as those raised above would apply to Table 11-1. For example, the current data for Grade I and II* should relate to the 2007 national register. It is assumed that the 2004 data for Grade II buildings at risk is derived from the RSS Annual Monitoring Report. English Heritage has considerable reservations about the reliability and completeness of this data and would prefer not to see the regional comparator included. % of scheduled monuments at risk – again it is not clear from where this information is derived. The BARs register only covers structural SAMs. Reference was made in our previous letter to the pilot survey of scheduled monuments at risk in the region. Data for NE Derbyshire can be provided on request. A monitoring system is being developed to update this data.

**Action:** modified Table 11-1 to include the most up-to-date local data, remove the regional comparator from the RSS Annual Monitoring Report, and reference all of the other data clearly.

Data on Scheduled Monuments obtained from English Heritage

The scope of work in an SA/SEA is always limited by time and resources, and as such, the most current or reliable data is not always found initially. As such, we appreciate the comments from English Heritage, and their assistance in obtaining the best, most recent data available. The referencing of data sources has been included for cultural heritage.

### Sub-indicators, page 105

The reference to the ‘state’ of Renishaw Hall could be extended to include locally significant parks and gardens, such as Victorian parks.

**Action:** added an indicator on the status of locally significant parks and gardens (e.g. Victorian parks) Agreed that such an indicator would be valuable to the Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Made</th>
<th>by</th>
<th>How the Comment has been Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In para 4.4.4, Natural England strongly support the additional SPD objective securing habitat creation and/or management on sites. NE considers the seeking of a net improvement of biodiversity on sites to be an important feature of this SPD. Table 5-1Column 5: Natural England supports the flexible approach of Option 4 where habitat opportunities specific to each site can be developed through developer contributions.</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>Comments welcomed – no action necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3.4 Natural England support the proposed linkages between this SPD and the forthcoming Recreation and Open Space SPD. These two SPDs will direct developers to contribute to green spaces which could also accomplish a biodiversity gain</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>Comments welcomed – no action necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4.3 Natural England concur with the assessment that the SPD will have a positive influence on green infrastructure and recognises that the SA has identified the potential for some projects to threaten key habitats which must be monitored for</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>Comments welcomed – no action necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6.2 Natural England would support the SPD to seek a net improvement of biodiversity on all sites, not just those which lead to greenfield landtake or habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>Action: Paragraph 9.6.2 altered – removed sentence referring to the constraints of the SPD and developments leading to Greenfield landtake or fragmentation. It was initially considered that per Circular 05/2005: Planning Obligations, which guides on the requirements of developer contributions, this link to greenfield landtake and habitat fragmentation would keep the recommendation “related in scale and kind” to the proposed development, and otherwise “reasonable” in planning terms. However, it is overall agreed that all sites should seek a net improvement in biodiversity, given the planning and environmental context as presented in the SA Report. Comment therefore also addresses the SPD (see comments on the SPD document from Natural England).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report identifies issues relevant to the SPD and appraises the strategic options with regard to their implications on sustainability. The likely effects of the document are assessed and measures proposed to maximise beneficial effects and mitigate adverse environmental impacts. It has already been considered by Cabinet prior to the submission of this SPD as part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment produced by the district.</td>
<td>Derbyshire County Council</td>
<td>No action necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Made</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>How the Comment has been Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive about the Cultural Heritage section of the document. In relation to para 11.7.1 the reference to information point describing the history of the area could be applied to other areas e.g Dronfield High Street. In relation to para. 13.3.5 the Dronfield Society is always concerned about new development and it’s fitting with the existing townscape.</td>
<td>Old Dronfield Society</td>
<td>Comments welcomed. Please note that such specific measures are beyond the scope of the SA/SEA of the Developer Contributions SPD, and are only relevant to the SPD in terms of any specific projects that may arise that could contribute towards Dronfield High Street. Para. 11 of the SA report deals with Cultural Heritage. Para. 11.7 sets out recommended indicators for monitoring in order to identify cultural heritage issues that may warrant a planning response in relation to a planning application. The indicators include the percent of population within preferred walking distance of an information point to increase the accessibility of cultural heritage resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>