Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Rotherham Borough Local Development Framework – Core Strategy

Sustainability Appraisal Report
This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client. It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filename</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1</td>
<td>14/12/06</td>
<td>Core Strategy-SA Report Rev1.doc</td>
<td>Work in progress draft for RMBC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing by: Ben Walmsley Checked by: Sara Bordoley/Nicole Roche Approved by: Justin Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>15/12/06</td>
<td>Core Strategy-SA Report Issue.doc</td>
<td>Final Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report for Issue with the Regulation 26 Consultation version of the Rotherham Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing by: Ben Walmsley Checked by: Sara Bordoley/Nicole Roche Approved by: Justin Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue2</td>
<td>02/01/07</td>
<td>Core Strategy-SA Report Issue2.doc</td>
<td>Final Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report for Issue with the Regulation 26 Consultation version of the Rotherham Core Strategy incorporating RMBC Comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing by: Ben Walmsley Checked by: Sara Bordoley/Nicole Roche Approved by: Justin Abbott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issue Document Verification with Document ✔
# Contents

Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations .......................... i

Non-Technical Summary ........................................ ii

1 Introduction .................................................. 1

1.1 The Rotherham Core Strategy ............................... 1

1.2 Purpose of the SA Report .................................. 1

2 Background – Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy .... 2

2.1 Rotherham Local Development Framework .................. 2

2.2 Sustainable Development and the LDF ....................... 2

2.3 Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment ... 3

3 Sustainability Appraisal Methodology .......................... 5

3.1 Sustainability Appraisal Process .............................. 5

3.2 Techniques used for Assessing Effect ......................... 7

3.3 Approach, Contents and Structure of the SA Report .......... 10

3.4 Stakeholder Involvement ..................................... 10

3.5 Compliance with the SEA Regulations ....................... 11

4 Plans Policies and Programmes ................................ 13

4.1 Requirement and Scope ...................................... 13

4.2 Refining the Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes for Different Local Development Documents .... 13

4.3 Document Review for Rotherham ............................ 13

4.4 Future Review ................................................ 13

5 Baseline Situation and Key Sustainability Issues ............... 14

5.1 Scope and Purpose of the Baseline and Key Issues ........... 14

5.2 Refining the Baseline and Sustainability Issues for Different Local Development Documents .................. 14

5.3 Collating the Baseline and Identifying Sustainability Issues for Rotherham ................................. 14

5.4 Baseline Situation in Rotherham .............................. 15

5.5 Key Sustainability Issues for Rotherham .................... 23

6 Sustainability Appraisal Framework ............................ 26

6.1 Purpose and Overview ....................................... 26

6.2 Refining the SA Framework for Different LDDs ............... 26

6.3 Incorporation of Key Links ................................... 26

6.4 Objectives and Decision Guiding Questions .................. 27

6.5 Indicators and Targets ....................................... 29

6.6 Appraisal Matrices ........................................... 30

7 Assessment of the Core Strategy Objectives and Options .... 31
### Tables

- Table 1 Purpose, Content and Initial Stages of Rotherham’s Development Framework
- Table 2 Sustainability Appraisal Significance Criteria
- Table 3 Summary compliance with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations
- Table 4 Summary of Key Sustainability Issues in Rotherham
- Table 5 SA Objectives for Rotherham
- Table 6 Core Strategy Objectives.
- Table 7 Sustainability Appraisal Significance Criteria
- Table 8 Summary and comparison of the Sustainability of Core Strategy Options
- Table 9 Preferred Option Policy Directions.

### Figures

- Figure 1 Guiding Principles in UK Strategy Securing the Future
- Figure 2 The Relationship Between Sustainability Appraisal Tasks (from ODPM SA Guidance 2005).
- Figure 3 Employment in Rotherham by Industrial Sector
- Figure 4 Rotherham Borough Transport Infrastructure
- Figure 5 Distribution of Education Facilities in the Borough of Rotherham
- Figure 6 Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder Areas
- Figure 7 Distribution of Key Healthcare Facilities
- Figure 8 Distribution of Historic Assets and areas of Landscape Value
- Figure 9 Distribution of Key Natural Resources
- Figure 10 Testing compatibility of the SA Objectives and Core Strategy Objectives
- Figure 11 Summary of the Core Strategy Options Sustainability Appraisal.
- Figure 12 Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 1 Sustainable Communities.
- Figure 13 Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 2 Housing.
- Figure 14 Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 3 Economy – Industry and Commerce.
Figure 15  Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 4 Economy – Retail and Leisure.
Figure 16  Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 5 Economy - Waste.
Figure 17  Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 6 Transportation.
Figure 18  Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 7 Local Heritage.
Figure 19  Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 8 Efficient Use of Resources.
Figure 20  Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 9 Community Safety and Well Being.
Figure 21  Appraisal of Core Strategy Policy Directions Prior to the Implementation of Mitigation and Enhancement Measures
Figure 22  Appraisal of Core Strategy Policy Directions Residual Effects After the Implementation of Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

Appendices
Appendix A
Policies, Plans and Programmes
Appendix B
Baseline for Rotherham
Appendix C
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Decision Guiding Questions
Appendix D
Core Strategy Options Sustainability Appraisal Matrix
Appendix E
Core Strategy Preferred Option Sustainability Appraisal Matrices
### Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Area Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>All living things including trees, plants, animals and insects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategy</td>
<td>Sets out the long-term spatial vision for the local planning authority area, the spatial objectives and strategic policies to deliver that vision. The core strategy will have the status of a development plan document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>Development Plan Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGQ</td>
<td>Decision Guiding Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front loading</td>
<td>Front loading encourages more active involvement of communities, stakeholders and commercial interests earlier in the LDF process than under the previous planning system. The aim is to seek consensus on essential issues early in the process. Where consensus is difficult to achieve, front loading allows the maximum opportunity for participants to understand each others’ positions and to negotiate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMR</td>
<td>Housing Market Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDD</td>
<td>Local Development Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF</td>
<td>Local Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (now Department for Communities and Local Government).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Policy Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSDF</td>
<td>Regional Sustainable Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>Regional Spatial Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Strategic Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Supplementary Planning Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>Site of Special Scientific Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYPTTE</td>
<td>South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDP</td>
<td>Unitary Development Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Non-Technical Summary

Introduction

The Rotherham Core Strategy

This report documents the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Rotherham Core Strategy. The Core Strategy will be the cornerstone of Rotherham’s Local Development Framework (LDF) and will provide a broad and long-term development strategy for the Borough that affects all our people as well as generations to come. It will help Rotherham to become more competitive, to meet our housing needs and to address our environmental and transport pressures. The Core Strategy will also reflect the policies and objectives from other strategic documents including the Community Strategy, the Local Transport Plan and the Regional Spatial Strategy. In short, it will set out the overall vision, objectives and spatial strategy for Rotherham over the next 15 years to 2021.

Purpose of the SA Report

As described above this report documents the combined SA and SEA of the Rotherham Core Strategy. An SA framework was developed to appraise the overall Rotherham Local Development Framework (LDF), and is presented in the “Sustainability Appraisal of Rotherham’s Local Development Framework General SA Scoping Report, March 2006”. The SA Framework documented in the Rotherham LDF General Scoping Report has been used to appraise the alternative and preferred options for the Core Strategy. This SA Reports should be read in conjunction with the SA Scoping Report.

Briefly, this report contains the following:

- A review of international, national, regional, sub regional and local plans, policies and programmes;
- The current environmental, social and economic baseline of Rotherham and key sustainability issues;
- A summary of the consultation process to date and how the SA has taken these comments into account;
- A Sustainability Appraisal Framework for the Core Strategy, including Sustainability Appraisal Objectives, Decision Guiding Questions, indicators and targets and Appraisal Matrices;
- The appraisal of alternative options and the preferred Policy Directions for the Core Strategy.
- The monitoring proposals for the SA and a summary of how the SA report complies with the SEA Directive.

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is an iterative process that identifies and reports on the likely significant effects of a plan. It achieves this by testing the performance of the plan against a series of environmental, social and economic objectives which together define sustainable development. This process can identify issues to be addressed as well as enhancement opportunities. It is a systematic and transparent process for informing decision making and for improving the performance of plans.
In the context of the Local Development Framework:

‘Planning authorities should ensure that sustainable development is treated in an integrated way in their development plans. In particular, they should carefully consider the inter-relationship between social inclusion, protecting and enhancing the environment, the prudent use of natural resources and economic development.’ Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM, 2005).

The 2004 Act makes SA mandatory for all Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents to enable planning authorities to fulfil the objective to promote sustainable development in the preparation of plans.

**Strategic Environmental Assessment**

The European Directive 2001/42/EC (SEA Directive) came into effect in the UK from the 21 July 2004 in the form of ‘The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004’ (SI2004/1633). These regulations require that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is undertaken on a range of plans and programmes, including certain planning documents. The objective of the SEA Directive is:

‘to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans … with a view to promoting sustainable development’ (Article 1, SEA Directive).

The SEA Directive, Annex II suggests the significance of effects of a plan relates to the characteristics of the plan as well as its implications. Annex II defines the criteria for determining the likely significance of a plan in regard to the following characteristics:

- the degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources;
- the degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy;
- the relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development;
- environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme;
- the relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment (e.g. plans and programmes linked to waste-management or water protection).

In relation to these characteristics it is clear the Local Development Framework can have a significant impact and influence.

When preparing Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents planning authorities must conduct an environmental assessment in accordance to the SEA Directive.

**Sustainability Appraisal Framework**

The SA process as defined in the ODPM SA Guidance 2005 must be applied to all Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents. The SA process as set out in this document is outlined below:

- **Stage A:** Set the context and objectives, establish the baseline and decide on the scope produce Scoping Report;
- **Stage B:** Appraising the effects of the plan (options, preferred options (draft policies) and draft plan);
• Stage C: Preparing the SA Report to document the appraisal process;
• Stage D: Consulting on the draft plan and the SA Report; and
• Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the plan.

A General Scoping Report was produced covering all of the relevant information required under Stage A of the SA process was issued for the standard five week consultation period ending on 13th January 2006. Responses were received from the ‘statutory consultation bodies’ (Environment Agency, English Heritage, Countryside Agency and English Heritage) as well as council departments and other interested parties. In the light of these comments the scope of the SA was altered and documented in a revised version of the Scoping Report that was made publicly available on the Council’s website. The Scoping Report also set out the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives that were to be used to assess the Core Strategy. These are listed below.

Rotherham Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the Sustainability Appraisal Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Support, maintain or enhance the provision of quality local or easily accessible employment opportunities for all, in stable or competitive growth sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maintain or enhance conditions that enable sustainable economic growth and investment without environmental damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Facilitate sustainable transport and movement patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Improve the level of education and skills for all, reducing disparities across Rotherham and strengthening its position regionally and nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Encourage creativity, innovation and the effective use of sound science and appropriate technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Promote awareness of sustainable development and encourage sustainable lifestyles and business practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Improve the health of the people of Rotherham, reduce disparities in health and encourage healthy living for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Improve access to quality cultural, leisure and recreational activities available to everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Enhance the function and vibrancy of town or district centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Enhance safety, and reduce crime and fear of crime for everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Conserve and enhance Rotherham’s habitats, biodiversity and geodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Efficient consumption of natural resources and optimises the use of renewable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Minimise local and global pollution including greenhouse gases and protect or enhance environmental quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Reduce Rotherham’s vulnerability to flooding and to the impacts of climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal and minimise the use of non re-usable materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Enhance the built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Encourage integrated and efficient land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in decent affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Conserve and where appropriate enhance the landscape quality and historic assets of Rotherham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Build community cohesion, involvement and encourage a pride in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Enhance internal and external images and perceptions of Rotherham and make Rotherham a good place to live, work or visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Enables and enhances equality and tackles prejudice and discrimination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainability Appraisal Methodology

Following the Scoping Stage of the SA the process of assessing the likely significant sustainability effects of the Rotherham Core Strategy was split into three steps.

- The first step involved the appraisal of the Core Strategy Objectives against the SA Objectives to identify any potential areas of conflict or major opportunities for enhancement. This information was then used to inform the assessment of the Core Strategy Options during the second step of the sustainability appraisal.

- The second step of the sustainability appraisal assessed the likely significant effects of four alternative options. One was based on the current UDP and three other alternative options for the new Core Strategy. The results of this appraisal, along with a public consultation exercise, led to the selection of preferred option based on a hybrid version of the three options that were assessed.

- The third and final step of the assessment involved the appraisal of nine Policy Directions that combine to make up the preferred option for Core Strategy. As well as determining the effects of each of the Policy Directions the assessment also identified potential mitigation measures and opportunities for enhancement.

The appraisal process primarily involved the use of expert opinion supported by evidence gathered during the scoping stage of the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment processes.

Likely Significant Effects of the Rotherham Borough Core Strategy

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Objectives can be divided into three interlinked categories; economic, environmental/natural resources and social. The Core Strategy’s contribution towards these three categories is discussed below.

Economic – Sustainability Objectives 1 to 6

Key Sustainability Contributions

Securing sustainable economic growth is a key element of the Core Strategy and is likely to achieve this by directing economic development towards town and district centres where the greatest number of people can access the jobs and services offered by this type of development. Concentrating economic development on central locations or sector specific clusters means that growth is more likely to gain critical mass and create the conditions required to stimulate competition for jobs and markets. By doing so the Core Strategy will contribute towards the conditions required for sustainable economic growth.

Another important element of the Core Strategy, for the economy of the Borough, is the creation of a hierarchy of settlements. The Core Strategy supports the role and function of the different levels of settlement in the hierarchy. It should also help to ensure that services in the key town centres do not detract and draw people away from the shops and services offered in the local and district centres and vice versa.

Key Sustainability Enhancement Opportunities

The economic performance of the Core Strategy could be improved by extending its scope to address movement and accessibility within the district centres and key town centres, rather than concentrating solely on transportation between them. This will help to enhance the way that town and district centres function by reducing physical and psychological barriers that could otherwise hinder the development of areas within district and town centres.

The Core Strategy should also aim to ensure that all development proposals meet the needs of the surrounding area and population. It should attempt to identify these needs in advance so that development can be planned and respond proactively rather than reactively. This will support the
different roles and functions of local, district and town centres and should make them more viable over the medium to long term. It is important to note that achieving beneficial residual effects is highly dependent upon securing and implementing the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures.

*Environment and Natural Resources – Sustainability Objectives 7 to 19*

**Key Sustainability Contributions**

The Policy Directions within the Core Strategy provide numerous safeguards to protect environmental and natural resource assets. These include; ecology, ‘geodiversity’, air quality, water quality and ground quality, heritage features, landscape character and quality and finally the built environment. In addition to this it raises issues such as flood risk and anticipating future impacts of climate change.

The Core Strategy also raises the issue of sustainable design. It promotes the sustainable use of land by directing development towards urban areas and previously developed sites. It also encourages the re-use or refurbishment of existing buildings rather than demolition. The use of sustainable and renewable resources during construction is highlighted as the minimisation of waste during construction activities as is the use of renewable sources of energy.

**Key Sustainability Enhancement Opportunities**

The performance of the Core Strategy against the environmental and natural resource SA Objectives can be improved in a number of ways. The concept of sustainable design could be given a higher profile. In its current format the Core Strategy contains some of the elements of sustainable development but they do not appear as a key cross cutting issue. This could be addressed by including sustainable design as an element in its own right within the Policy Directions and would be particularly powerful if it was included under the Sustainable Communities Policy Direction. To deliver truly sustainable communities developments need to take account of all the sustainability issues addressed by the SA process and in particular sustainable design. References could also be made to sustainable development in the ‘spatial’ Policy Directions that direct the type and distribution of development within the borough. The Council could also consider setting a high level target to become a flagship authority for developing truly sustainable communities.

Flood Risk is an important issue for the Borough, through which the Rivers Don and Rother flow. In urban areas these rivers are adjacent to brownfield sites and sites that are currently in use, both of which could be developed as a consequence of the Core Strategy Policy Directions. As a result flood risk could be a significant issue. The easiest way to manage flood risk is to avoid areas that are at risk by developing outside of the floodplain. The Core Strategy could be enhanced by referring to this within each of the spatial Policy Directions, (PD1 to PD6).

The Core Strategy makes reference in PD 9 Community Safety and Well Being to mitigating the effects of climate change. This is likely to become an increasingly important issue as the behaviour of our climate begins to change. As a result the Core Strategy presents a major opportunity to ensure that all future development in the Borough can counteract the impacts of climate change or can be designed so that enhancements can be retrofitted in the future. The Core Strategy would benefit by reiterating the importance of making references to climate change resilience across all of the spatial development Policy Directions (PD1 to PD6).

Safeguarding valuable biodiversity assets and areas of greenspace is addressed by the Core Strategy under Policy Direction 7 Local Heritage. However there is a major opportunity, under this Policy Direction, to promote the wider incorporation of biodiversity and ecological enhancements within developments that can provide an opportunity for this sort of enhancement. This could include small scale enhancements such as providing bat boxes, bird boxes, the use of ecologically friendly public realm design and the specification of native planting species and other enhancements. The Policy Direction could also be enhanced by promoting the role of strategic transport corridors as green corridors linking disparate habitats together and providing an amenity to
local communities. As was the case for the economic objectives, it is important to note that achieving beneficial residual effects is highly dependant upon securing and implementing the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures.

**Social – Sustainability Objectives 20 to 22**

**Key Sustainability Contributions**

The most significant social contribution from the Core Strategy is the aim to create ‘sustainable communities’ by ensuring that new developments can access community infrastructure and services via a range of transport modes. The Core Strategy also addresses, to a certain extent, the role and function of settlements within a settlement hierarchy. By doing so the Core Strategy ensures that the types and level of development is appropriate to the type and size of the development. It also provides a framework for addressing other social issues, such as the type and quality of housing provision in the borough. This should help to address issues such as low demand for housing.

**Key Sustainability Enhancement Opportunities**

The Core Strategy makes significant contributions towards equality and social cohesion by addressing accessibility to services, transportation, jobs and amenities. It also makes significant contributions to equality and social cohesion by addressing crime and safety at the design stage of developments. The profile of these contributions towards equality and community cohesion could be raised within the Core Strategy document making them more prominent.

At the implementation stage of the Core Strategy and during the development of the other plans within the LDF there is a significant opportunity to encourage and facilitate further community involvement and cohesion. Successful engagement with the communities that will be affected by, or benefit from, the proposals in DPDs, AAPs and SPDs can give those communities ownership of the proposals for their area. It can also give people a sense of pride in their area and can provide the basis for bringing the community together and building community cohesion. The delivery of beneficial residual effects is highly dependant upon the successful implementation of the proposed enhancement and mitigation measures.

**Difference that the Sustainability Appraisal has made towards the Core Strategy**

The SA has made a number of contributions towards the development of the Core Strategy. From a process point of view it has helped to make the development of the Core Strategy a more transparent process as a result of the statutory requirement for consultation during the scoping stage of the SA. This early consultation provided a starting point for all of the ‘front-loading’ consultation activities that RMBC has carried out during the development and selection of a preferred Core Strategy Option.

The SA process has also ensured that the selection of the preferred option is robust and that an audit trail is created documenting how the Core Strategy has evolved. Likewise, the SA process provides a means of determining whether all of the relevant sustainability issues have been addressed in the Core Strategy.

Finally the SA Framework provides the indicators and targets that allow the effects of the Core Strategy to be monitored once it is implemented. This information allows the effectiveness of the SA process to be monitored and can help to indicate whether the effects that were predicted during the SA actually occur and whether the magnitude of those effects was predicted accurately.

**Next Steps**

This Sustainability Appraisal Report will be issued for public consultation along side the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report.

Following consideration of comments received, a final draft of the Core Strategy will be prepared for submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination. The Sustainability Appraisal
Report will also be submitted to the Secretary of State as part of the evidence base accompanying the Core Strategy.

If there are significant changes or new additions to the final draft of the Core Strategy which could have sustainability impacts then these will be appraised and the results documented in an amended Sustainability Appraisal Report, prior to submission to the Secretary of State. However if the final draft document is simply a refinement of the Preferred Option Draft, further sustainability appraisal may not be necessary.

**How to Comment**

Comments on this Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report can be forwarded to Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council as detailed below: Copies of this Report, and the Core Strategy document itself, can be viewed or downloaded from the Council's website at:

www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning

Copies are also available by contacting the Forward Planning Team:

Tel: 01709 823869
Fax: 01709 823865
E-Mail: forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk
Post: Forward Planning (SA)
RMBC Planning and Transportation Service
2nd Floor, Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham
S60 1TD

If you need any further information, the Forward Planning Team can be contacted by:

Tel: 01709 823824 or 01709 823888 or 01709 823834 or 01709 823869
1 Introduction

1.1 The Rotherham Core Strategy

This report documents the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Rotherham Core Strategy. The Core Strategy will be the cornerstone of Rotherham’s Local Development Framework (LDF) and will provide a broad and long-term development strategy for the Borough that affects all our people as well as generations to come. It will help Rotherham to become more competitive, to meet our housing needs and to address our environmental and transport pressures. The Core Strategy will also reflect the policies and objectives from other strategic documents including the Community Strategy, the Local Transport Plan and the Regional Spatial Strategy. In short, it will set out the overall vision, objectives and spatial strategy for Rotherham over the next 15 years to 2021.

1.2 Purpose of the SA Report

As described above this report documents the combined SA and SEA of the Rotherham Core Strategy. An SA framework was developed to appraise the overall Rotherham Local Development Framework (LDF), and is presented in the “Sustainability Appraisal of Rotherham's Local Development Framework General SA Scoping Report, March 2006”. The SA Framework documented in the Rotherham LDF General Scoping Report has been used to appraise the alternative and preferred options for the Core Strategy. This SA Reports should be read in conjunction with the SA Scoping Report.

Briefly, this report contains the following:

- A review of international, national, regional, sub regional and local plans, policies and programmes;
- The current environmental, social and economic baseline of Rotherham and key sustainability issues;
- A summary of the consultation process to date and how the SA has taken these comments into account;
- A Sustainability Appraisal Framework for the Core Strategy, including Sustainability Appraisal Objectives, Decision Making Criteria, indicators and targets and Appraisal Matrices;
- The appraisal of alternative options and the preferred Policy Directions for the Core Strategy.
- The monitoring proposals for the SA and a summary of how the SA report complies with the SEA Directive.
2 Background – Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy

2.1 Rotherham Local Development Framework

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the 2004 Act) makes a number of significant changes to the planning system including the introduction of a new development plans system.

As part of the current development plan Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) has a Unitary Development Plan (UDP). This was adopted in 1999 and consists of:

- a Written Statement (including Plan Strategy and 150+ policies and proposals);
- a Proposals Map; and
- Supplementary Planning Guidance.

However, under the new 2004 Act, all UDPs will be replaced with Local Development Frameworks (LDFs). Unlike the current UDP, Rotherham’s new LDF will be comprised of a number of Local Development Documents (LDDs), which include development plan documents, that are part of the statutory development plan, and supplementary planning documents which expand policies set out in a development plan document or provide additional detail.

The purpose, contents and initial stages of the LDF for Rotherham are outlined in Table 1.

All LDDs (and their accompanying sustainability appraisals) will be subject to a test of ‘soundness’ at an Independent Examination, in terms of their content and the process by which they are produced. The result of the Public Examination will be contained in a binding Inspector’s Report. One of the key tests of soundness is whether the plan has been subjected to sustainability appraisal.

2.2 Sustainable Development and the LDF

Sustainable development is a key global and local issue. A commonly used definition of sustainable development is:

‘Development that meets the needs of the present without comprising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.’ Bruntland Commission, 1987.

In March 2005 the UK Government updated its Sustainable Development Strategy by publishing ‘Securing the Future’ which sets out five key principles for sustainable development as illustrated in Figure 1.

The 2004 Act requires planning bodies, in preparing plans, to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Therefore, spatial plans, such as the LDF, can have a significant role in achieving the objectives of sustainable development.

Table 1 Purpose, Content and Initial Stages of Rotherham’s Development Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Local Development Framework for Rotherham will:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a framework for assessing planning applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regulate the development and use of land in the public interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reconcile demand for development and protection of the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Play a key role in promoting new development and regeneration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contents of Rotherham’s LDF will be:
Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

2.3.1 Sustainability Appraisal
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is an iterative process that identifies and reports on the likely significant effects of a plan. It achieves this by testing the performance of the plan against a series of environmental, social and economic objectives which together define sustainable development. This process can identify issues to be addressed as well as enhancement.
opportunities. It is a systematic and transparent process for informing decision making and for improving the performance of plans.

In the context of the Local Development Framework:

‘Planning authorities should ensure that sustainable development is treated in an integrated way in their development plans. In particular, they should carefully consider the inter-relationship between social inclusion, protecting and enhancing the environment, the prudent use of natural resources and economic development.’ Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM, 2005).

The 2004 Act makes SA mandatory for all Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents to enable planning authorities to fulfil the objective to promote sustainable development in the preparation of plans.

2.3.2 Strategic Environmental Assessment

The European Directive 2001/42/EC (SEA Directive) came into effect in the UK from the 21 July 2004 in the form of 'The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004' (SI2004/1633). These regulations require that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is undertaken on a range of plans and programmes, including certain planning documents. The objective of the SEA Directive is:

'to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans … with a view to promoting sustainable development' (Article 1, SEA Directive).

The SEA Directive, Annex II suggests the significance of effects of a plan relates to the characteristics of the plan as well as its implications. Annex II defines the criteria for determining the likely significance of a plan in regard to the following characteristics:

- the degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources;
- the degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy;
- the relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development;
- environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme;
- the relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment (e.g. plans and programmes linked to waste-management or water protection).

In relation to these characteristics it is clear the Local Development Framework can have a significant impact and influence.

When preparing Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents planning authorities must conduct an environmental assessment in accordance to the SEA Directive.
3 Sustainability Appraisal Methodology

3.1 Sustainability Appraisal Process

3.1.1 A Combined Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Process

Although the requirements to carry out SA and SEA are distinct the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) proposes that both can be satisfied through a single appraisal process. They have produced guidance to ensure SAs meet the requirements of the SEA Directive whilst widening the Directive’s approach to include economic and social issues as well as environmental. This process is outlined in ODPM SA Guidance (2005). Guidance proposes that where reference is made to SA [in the application to LDFs] it should be taken to include the requirements of the SEA Directive.

The ODPM SA Guidance 2005 proposes the key areas of emphasis for this approach are:

- collecting and presenting baseline information;
- predicting the significant effects of the plan and addressing them during its preparation;
- identifying reasonable plan options and their effects;
- involving the public and authorities with social, environmental and economic responsibilities as part of the assessment process; and
- monitoring the actual effects of the plan during its implementation.

3.1.2 Key Stages of the Sustainability Appraisal Process

The SA process as defined in the ODPM SA Guidance 2005 must be applied to all Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents. The SA process as set out in this document is outlined below:

- Stage A: Set the context and objectives, establish the baseline and decide on the scope produce Scoping Report);
- Stage B: Appraising the effects of the plan (options, preferred options (draft policies) and draft plan);
- Stage C: Preparing the SA Report to document the appraisal process;
- Stage D: Consulting on the draft plan and the SA Report; and
- Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the plan.

A number of defined tasks are involved in each of these stages, which are illustrated in Figure 2 overleaf.
Figure 2  The Relationship Between Sustainability Appraisal Tasks (from ODPM SA Guidance 2005).

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

- A1 Identifying other relevant PPPs and sustainability objectives
- A2 Collecting Baseline Information
- A3 Identifying Sustainability Issues and problems
- A4 Developing the SA Framework
- A5 Consulting on the scope of the SA

Stage B. Developing and refining options and assessing effects

- B1 Testing the plan objectives against the SA objectives
- B2 Developing the plan options
- B3 Predicting the effects of the plan, including options.
- B4 Evaluating the effects of the plan including the options
- B5 Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects
- B6 Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of the plans implementation.

Stage C Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report

- C1 Preparing the SA Report

Stage D Consulting on the draft AAP and the SA report

- D1 Consulting on the draft AAP and SA report
- D2 Appraising significant changes
- D3 Decision-making and providing information

Stage E Monitoring implementation of the plan

- E1 Finalising aims and methods for monitoring
- E2 Responding to adverse effects
3.2 Techniques used for Assessing Effect

Expert Judgement was primarily the method used to assess the effects of both the Core Strategy Issues and Options Report and the Preferred Option Draft. To minimise subjectivity, Decision Guiding Questions (which accompany the SA Objectives) act as prompts and the baseline for Rotherham help inform the process. The baseline also provides the evidence base to support the expert judgements. It was also important to consider how the SA Objectives interact with each other. Set out below are some of the issues which were considered when undertaking the appraisals.

3.2.1 Type of Effect
The SA considered the nature of the effect e.g.:
- Positive or negative;
- Direct or indirect;
- Cumulative (this is expanded in section 8.5); and
- Temporary or permanent.

3.2.2 Magnitude and Spatial Extent
The SA considered the magnitude and spatial extent of an impact e.g.:
- Where will it impact? Will it be within the Borough or outside of the Borough? Will it cause transboundary issues and impact on adjacent areas or regionally, nationally or internationally?
- What is the geographical area and size of population likely to be affected?

3.2.3 Who it will Affect
The impact on human health and population is a key consideration of the SEA Directive. The SA Matrices have therefore been designed to encourage the impacts on different groups and communities to be considered. This is in order to avoid direct or indirect negative impacts on different communities and to promote equality, optimise positive impacts and identify enhancement opportunities. Key groups or communities considered include:
- Asylum seekers and refugees;
- Black and ethnic minority people (including Gypsy and Traveller communities);
- Disabled people;
- Faith communities;
- Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people;
- Older people;
- Socio economic groups (variable);
- Women and men; and
- Younger people.

3.2.4 What it will Affect
The SA also considered the aspects of the environment that could be affected by proposals in the Core Strategy. Where an individual receptor is likely to be affected it will be highlighted.

3.2.5 Value and Vulnerability of Effected Areas
In considering the significance of the impact it was important to consider the value and vulnerability of affected areas e.g.
• Sensitive receptors;
• Special natural characteristics/areas or cultural heritage;
• Protected areas; and
• Relative importance of the site, whether it is a nationally or internationally important feature or of local significance.

3.2.6 When it will Cause an Effect
It was also important to consider when it will cause an effect. The ODPM SA Guidance 2005 notes: ‘the timescales will vary depending on the plan or options being considered. For instance, for air pollution the short, medium and long terms cold be 3, 10, 25 years, while for climate change they could be 5, 20 and 100 years.’

We used the following timescales:
• Short term - 0 - 4 years
• Medium - 5 - 9 years
• Long term -10+ years

3.2.7 Significance of Effects
Following the prediction of effects, SEA requires an assessment of effects. For the purposes of this SA the proposed scale of effects used are listed in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance of effect</th>
<th>Description of effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Major Positive</td>
<td>Likely to benefit a large area of the Borough or a large number of people and receptors. The effects are likely to be direct and permanent and the magnitude will be major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Minor Positive</td>
<td>The extent of predicted beneficial effects is likely to be limited to small areas within the borough, or small groups of people and receptors. The effects can be direct or indirect, temporary or reversible. The magnitude of the predicted effects will be minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral effects are predicted where the option being assessed is unlikely to alter the present or future baseline situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Minor Negative</td>
<td>Minor negative effects are likely to be limited to small areas within the Borough, or limited to small groups of people and receptors. The effects can be direct or indirect, temporary or reversible. The importance of the receptor that is effect is likely to be minor as is the magnitude of the predicted effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Major Negative</td>
<td>Likely to affect the whole, or large areas of, the Borough. Also applies to effects on nationally or internationally important assets. The effects are likely to be direct, irreversible and permanent. The magnitude of the predicted effects will also be major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Unknown</td>
<td>This significance criterion is applied to effects where there is insufficient information to make a robust assessment. It is also applied to the assessment of options or Policy Directions that can have both positive and negative effects. In this kind of situation it is not clear whether the positive or negative effects will outweigh each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.8 Assessing Cumulative and Synergistic Impacts
The SEA Directive insists that appraisals should consider these impacts and the purpose of this is described in the ODPM SA Guidance, 2005.

“Many sustainability problems result from the accumulation of multiple small and often indirect effects, rather than a few large and obvious ones. The SEA Directive requires an assessment of secondary, cumulative, and synergistic effects, which should be incorporated in the SA.”

Examples include loss of tranquillity, changes in the landscape, economic decline, and climate change. These effects are very hard to deal with on a project-by-project basis through Environmental Impact Assessment. It is at the SA level that they are most effectively identified and addressed.” Annex 13 ODPM SA Guidance 2005

The Matrices developed for appraisal enable the cumulative and synergistic effects to be considered in the appraisal process.

Definition of Secondary, Indirect, Cumulative and Synergistic Impacts
Secondary or indirect effects are effects that are not a direct result of the plan, but occur away from the original effect or as a result of a complex pathway. Examples of secondary effects are 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.

Cumulative effects arise, for instance, where several developments each have insignificant effects but together have a significant effect; or where several individual effects of the plan (e.g. noise, dust and visual) have a combined effect.

Synergistic effects interact to produce a total effect greater than the sum of the individual effects. Synergistic effects often happen as habitats, resources or human communities get close to capacity. For instance a wildlife habitat can become progressively fragmented with limited effects on a particular species until the last fragmentation makes the areas too small to support the species at all.

These terms are not mutually exclusive. Often the term cumulative effect is taken to include secondary and synergistic effects.

3.2.9 Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities
Following the assessment of the effect of an Option or Policy Direction, mitigation and enhancement opportunities were identified. These should ‘prevent, reduce or offset any adverse effects and enhance positive effects’ (ODPM SA Guidance 2005). They should seek to improve positive impacts as well as negative impacts.

Paragraph 3.3.21 of the ODPM SA Guidance 2005 suggests that the following mitigation measures: could be considered

- ‘Changes to the DPD as a whole or options concerned, including bringing forward new options, or adding or deleting options;
- Refining options, in order to improve the likelihood of positive effects and to minimise adverse effects (e.g. by strengthening policy criteria);
- Technical measures to be applied during the implementation stage, e.g. buffer zones, application of design principles; and
3.3 Approach, Contents and Structure of the SA Report

The main purpose of this SA report is to document the SA process from the earliest stages, of baseline collection, through the setting of SA objectives to the assessment of the alternative and preferred options. This is recorded under the following sections:

- Section 4 – Policies, Plans and Programmes. Review of relevant policies, plans and programme;
- Section 5 – Baseline Situation and Key Sustainability Issues. Summary of the main baseline issues and the key sustainability issues;
- Section 6 – Sustainability Appraisal Framework. Sets out how the sustainability appraisal objectives, decision guiding questions, indicators and targets were developed;
- Section 7 – Assessment of the Core Strategy Objectives and Options. Summarises the results of the appraisal of the Core Strategy Objectives and the Strategic Options.
- Section 8 – Assessment of the Preferred Core Strategy Option. Summary of the significant effects of the Policy Directions, mitigation measures, enhancement measures and cumulative effects.
- Section 9 – Implementation and Monitoring – Identifies the framework for monitoring the significant effects of the Core Strategy.

3.4 Stakeholder Involvement

3.4.1 Scoping

Stakeholder involvement has been integral to the production of this General Scoping Report. RMBC has established a SA Technical Appraisal Panel to consult with throughout the SA process for all Local Development Documents in the LDF. A list of organisations invited to participate in this panel is provided in Appendix B. All four statutory SEA consultation bodies were invited to sit on the Panel which includes a range of organisations representing social, economic and environmental issues in Rotherham or the Yorkshire and Humber Region.

RMBC recognises the need for the SA Panel to have balanced membership between the social, environmental and economic aspects of sustainable development and will endeavour to attract balanced attendance from these three interests.

An inception workshop was held in August 2005, where facilitated discussions took place, followed by the receipt of further written responses regarding the:

- SA process for the LDF;
- Draft baseline for Rotherham;
- Key sustainability issues for Rotherham; and
- Draft SA Objectives and Decision Guiding Questions (DGQ);

A further workshop was held in January 2006 as part of the consultation process for the General Scoping Report.

In line with statutory requirements the General Scoping Report, Subsidiary Scoping Reports and the SA Report were subjected to consultation with not just the four consultation bodies as required by the SEA Regulations (i.e. Countryside Agency, Environment Agency, English Heritage and English Nature) but any interested body or individual as well as the wider public.
3.4.2 Assessment of Alternative Options

As part of the process of selecting a preferred option a ‘frontloading’ consultation exercise was undertaken during the options appraisal stage of the SA process. Questionnaires were available via the internet and over 400 hardcopies were made available to key interest groups and the statutory consultees between 15th May – 16th June 2006. A number of workshops were also held involving community groups, statutory consultees, council members and other departments within RMBC.

The results of this assessment process are documented in ‘Have your say Feedback on the consultation to decide the vision for the Rotherham of tomorrow. Consultation Statement July 2006’. The Core Strategy document also sets out how the results of the consultation process were used to inform the selection and development of the Preferred Core Strategy Option.

3.5 Compliance with the SEA Regulations

The dual purpose of this report is to document the SA process and the elements of the SA process that fulfil the requirements of the SEA Regulations and the SEA Directive. To avoid producing a separate SEA report and a SA report they have been combined.

What the SEA Directive says:

“The environmental report shall include information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, [and] its stage in the decision-making process” (Article 5.2).

Information to be provided in the Environmental Report includes:

• “the likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects” (Annex I (f) and footnote)

• “an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with” (Annex I (h))

• “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” (Annex I (g))

The following table sets out which sections of this report correspond with requirements of Article 5.2 and Annex I of the SEA Directive and Regulation 12(3), Schedule 2 of the SEA regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of the SA Report</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Compliance with the SEA Directive and Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-technical summary</td>
<td>Non-technical summary of the SA and SEA.</td>
<td>Annex I (j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 and 1.2</td>
<td>Sets out the main objectives of the SA and SEA and the main purpose of the Core Strategy.</td>
<td>Annex I (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 and 2.2.</td>
<td>Describes the planning and decision-making hierarchy in which the Core Strategy sits.</td>
<td>Article 5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section of the SA Report</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Compliance with the SEA Directive and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Summary of the consultation process to date with the statutory consultation bodies and the public.</td>
<td>Article 5 (4) as defined by Article 6 (3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A review of plans and programmes has been carried out as part of the SA/SEA process and is summarised in this section. Full details of the plans that have been reviewed and the key objectives that are relevant to Rotherham are listed in Appendix A.</td>
<td>Annex I (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>This section describes the baseline data collected. Full details can be found in Appendix B.</td>
<td>Annex I (b) (c) (d) (e) (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and 6</td>
<td>This section summarises the key sustainability issues and problems identified in the review of baseline data, other plans and programmes and consultation. The summary includes environmental issues amongst the sustainability issues.</td>
<td>Annex I (d) (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This chapter describes the SA and SEA appraisal of alternative options for the Core Strategy. It also describes the main justification for the selection of the various options. Full details of the appraisal matrices can be found in Appendix D.</td>
<td>Article 5 (1) Annex I (h) (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and 8</td>
<td>This section and Appendix E sets out the mitigation measures and enhancement measures required to reduce or avoid adverse effects and improve neutral or beneficial effects further.</td>
<td>Article 5 (1), Annex I (g).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The whole of section 8 deals with the appraisal of the preferred policies for the Core Strategy and identifies suitable mitigation and enhancement measures.</td>
<td>Article 5 (1) Annex I (h) (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>This chapter sets out the links between the Core Strategy and the known plans to be produced as part of the LDF for Rotherham. It also states the proposed monitoring requirements of the significant effects of the Core Strategy, identified in the SA.</td>
<td>Article 10 and Annex I (i)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Plans Policies and Programmes

4.1 Requirement and Scope

Local Development Documents (LDDs) and the SA itself will be influenced by many different plans and programmes. This is recognised by the SEA Directive which requires a review of relevant plans and programmes to be completed in the preparation of documents such as those included in the LDDs and the SA:

‘the plan’s relationship with other relevant plans and programmes’ and ‘the environmental protection objectives, established at international, (European) Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan…and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation’ Directive 2001/42/EC - SEA Annex 1 (a), (e)

The first stage of completing the SA is therefore to review relevant international, national, regional and local, policy guidance, plans and strategies to:

- ensure LDDs and the SA are in line with the requirements of relevant plans and policies and identify inconsistencies or constraints to be dealt with;
- identify sustainability objectives, and key targets and indicators that should be reflected in the SA; and
- provide baseline data.

4.2 Refining the Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes for Different Local Development Documents

At this stage the plans, policies and programmes reviewed have been completed for Rotherham as a whole. While this provides the context for all documents contained within the LDF, more area based or specific Local Development Documents, such as Area Action Plans or Supplementary Planning Documents, may require additional and more relevant documents to be reviewed as part of Subsidiary Scoping Reports.

4.3 Document Review for Rotherham

A comprehensive list of key international, national, regional and local documents was reviewed and these are listed in Appendix A1 and reviewed in Appendix A2.

The review process provided a valuable source of information and a framework for developing different components of the LDF and the SA. In particular:

- at a high level, key national policies, the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and sub regional plans, provided the planning context for Rotherham;
- local documents provided a valuable source of baseline information, and identified local priorities and objectives as well as conditions that the LDF and SA should adhere to; and
- several documents, including existing appraisals, provided sustainability objectives and indicators and guided the development of the SA Framework.

4.4 Future Review

As new plans, policies or programmes, or alterations to existing ones, come on board further review will be required to ensure the process is up to date.
5 Baseline Situation and Key Sustainability Issues

5.1 Scope and Purpose of the Baseline and Key Issues

The SEA Directive requires a discussion of the ‘relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme’ (Annex 1 (b)). To meet SA requirements the baseline and identification of key issues must also consider social and economic aspects.

The baseline provides the basis for predicting and monitoring the effects of the Local Development Documents. The sustainability issues identify positive or negative issues for Rotherham relevant to the LDF which have the capacity to influence, optimise enhancement opportunities and minimise detrimental impacts.

The collation of baseline data and identification of sustainability issues has been completed for Rotherham as a whole and is therefore relevant to all documents in the LDF. However, the baseline situation and key issues for Rotherham will inevitably change over time and it is important that these are monitored and regularly revised.

5.2 Refining the Baseline and Sustainability Issues for Different Local Development Documents

For certain more area based or specific Local Development Documents, such as Area Action Plans or Supplementary Planning Documents, additional and more locally relevant baseline information may need to be collated and local issues identified. This should be completed as part of a Subsidiary Scoping Report for an individual LDD as required.

5.3 Collating the Baseline and Identifying Sustainability Issues for Rotherham

5.3.1 Approach and Format

The baseline for Rotherham was collated in a number of iterative stages:

The review of plans and policies listed in Appendix A1, along with some baseline documents listed in Appendix B1, provided an initial understanding of the current situation in Rotherham (baseline and issues) and subsequently helped to inform the development of the SA Framework. At the SA Technical Panel Inception Workshop stakeholders were invited to comment on this, adding to and amending the baseline and informing the selection of key sustainability issues. This was used to develop a greater understanding of Rotherham and refine initial outline SA Objectives and ‘Decision Guiding Questions’ (DGQ) - the 22 Objectives and DGQ are listed in Appendix C1.

Indicators were subsequently developed for each SA Objective which is further discussed in Section 5. This provided a framework allowing both qualitative and (readily available) quantitative information to be collected for each of the 22 SA Objectives. It should be recognised that due to interrelationships between SA Objectives, the baseline data is often relevant to more than one objective.

In addition, as RMBC stores a substantial amount of data on a spatial database using a Geographic Information System (GIS), maps illustrating spatial and geographic dimensions of Rotherham’s baseline were also produced.

Data collection focused on identifying:

- the current situation in Rotherham;
- the trend for Rotherham; and
- regional and national comparisons.
From this information and through discussions with stakeholders key sustainability issues for Rotherham were identified.

5.3.2 **Data Sources**
Data was collected from a number of sources:

- Plan, Policy and Programme Review;
- Baseline Documents;
- Census;
- Various websites; and
- Data held by RMBC.

5.3.3 **Limitations**
Every effort has been made to provide an accurate baseline review. It has been effective at providing an understanding of current issues, and there is generally enough information available to enable an informed and detailed appraisal. However, some problems were encountered and there are some limitations with the data collected.

- As the scope of the information required is wide, data has not been available for a number of indicators. While it is preferable that the selection of indicators has data available, it is important that data does not dictate what is measured. Therefore, alternative indicators have been sought or potential indicators have been left in even where no data is currently available to allow collection in due course;
- Consistency between data sources;
- Availability of historic data;
- Availability of up to date information;
- Due to the format of data or small numbers involved it has not always been possible to analyse information in a way which optimises its value e.g. by geographic area or by different communities or groups. For example, environmental data is often collected at national or regional level and it has not always been possible to collate at a more localised level; or as the population of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups is relatively small in Rotherham, it has not always been possible to analyse data by different groups e.g. on housing tenure;
- Rotherham is interlinked socially, economically and physically to adjacent areas and while transboundary issues are important and need to be considered in the appraisal process, it was not possible to represent such complex issues in the baseline data collation; and
- As the baseline situation in Rotherham is ever changing data can quickly go out of date - including information contained in this Report.

5.3.4 **Future Baseline**
Further consideration should be given to how data could be made available for the ongoing data collection required during the implementation and monitoring of the LDF. This should include further developing a central computerised resource for Rotherham linked to GIS, ensuring consistency of data type, alignment of indicators across Rotherham and where possible in the Region and other areas, as well as the collation of new or evolving indicators.

5.4 **Baseline Situation in Rotherham**
The baseline review is contained within Appendix B A summary of the baseline is outlined below.
5.4.1 Demographics
Rotherham Borough has a population of around 249,500 (Rotherham Trends 2004). In common with the rest of the UK, Rotherham has an ageing population with a similar number of people now aged 60 and over as children under 16. This is particularly apparent in the very elderly with the number of people over 85 increasing from 2,844 in 1991 to 4,092 in 2001.

There is also a fall in the working age population. The 20-29 age group within Rotherham represent 11% of the total population compared to the UK average of 12.6%. Outward migration is occurring within this age group.

Rotherham’s ethnic population is 3.1% which is below the national average of 8.7%. The largest ethnic group within Rotherham is Pakistani, representing 1.9% of the population (2001 Census).

5.4.2 Employment
The employment rate has improved significantly in Rotherham and is now less than 1% below the national average. However, some parts of the Borough have a high unemployment rate and a high proportion of benefit claimants. This is particularly apparent in neighbourhoods close to Rotherham Town Centre. The unemployment rate ranges from as low as 1% to as high as 5.7% throughout the Borough depending upon the settlement or neighbourhood.

As well as geographical disparities there are also disparities between different groups in Rotherham. Employment rate in males is higher than that of females (79.4% for males compared to 66% for females). The unemployment rate for ‘non white’ residents is much higher at 7.5% compared to 4% for white residents.

The overall rate of economic inactivity has reduced since 2002 (25.9% in 2002 to 23.4% in 2005) and the aim is to reduce this further over the next 5 years. However, economic inactivity is higher in the 50 years plus age group and the reasons for this are often linked to high incidences of poor health and illness in this age group.

5.4.3 Economic Trends and Performance
The proportion of Rotherham’s working population employed in manufacturing and construction is higher than the national average and those employed in financial and business sectors in Rotherham is lower than the national average, see Figure 3. Regional modelling (Yorkshire Futures) projects jobs in traditional sectors are likely to decrease in Rotherham over the next 10 years alongside jobs in hotels and catering and business, while jobs in construction and public services are likely to increase.

The proportion of managers, senior officials and professionals is lower in Rotherham than both the regional and national average. The proportion of process plant and machine operatives is higher than both the regional and national average.

During 2003 Rotherham had 555 new VAT registered and 415 de-registered businesses which is a net gain of 140 businesses. In the last few years the number of new businesses in Rotherham has been increasing by more than the national average, but the stocks remain low (186 per 10,000 population at the end of 2003 compared to 303 for the country as a whole). Almost three quarters of all new businesses had survived for three years or more in 2004 and it is hoped that this will increase to 85% by 2010.

Almost 10% of all commercial and industrial property in Rotherham was vacant in 2004/5 which is a slight improvement from 10.5% the previous year.
**5.4.4 Transport and Commuting**

The majority of Rotherham’s settlements have good access to the strategic road network (Figure 4). The 2001 census reveals that 24% of Rotherham’s residents travel over 10km to their place of work. The majority of people travel to work by car (69.3%) while 13.1% travel to work by bus and 9.2% walk to work.

Rotherham is a net exporter of employees as the 2001 Census shows that 41,785 people commute out of the Borough to work, which is an increase since the 1991 census, while 29,015 people commute into the Borough for work. Just under two thirds of Rotherham’s residents (61%) actually live and work within the Borough.

Sheffield is the most popular workplace destination for those who commute out of the Borough to work, which is an increase since the 1991 census, while 29,015 people commute into the Borough for work. Just under two thirds of Rotherham’s residents (61%) actually live and work within the Borough.

Sheffield is the most popular workplace destination for those who commute out of the Borough (receiving 21.6% of Rotherham’s workforce). While 10.5% of those who commute into Rotherham to work come from Sheffield. This indicates there are strong links between Rotherham and Sheffield.

The 2001 Census reveals that almost 30% of households in Rotherham do not have access to a car. This figure has fallen since the 1991 Census and is now slightly below the regional average. Quality Bus Corridors serve key routes and there are interchange facilities in Maltby and Dinnington enabling more remote settlements to make connections to key destinations.
5.4.5 Deprivation
20 Super Output Areas in Rotherham, fall within the top 10% most deprived nationally, which is equivalent to 12% of the Borough. These areas include parts of Maltby and Dinnington, much of Rotherham Urban Area and the Dearne Valley. The average weekly gross salary in Rotherham was £439.40 in 2004 which is 87% of the UK average.

5.4.6 Education and Skills
Attainment at school and the number of young adults remaining in education and training has improved in Rotherham over recent years. In 2004, 46% of pupils in Rotherham achieved 5 or more GCSEs at Grade A* to C, which is still below the national average of 53.7% but over the past two years the gap between the Rotherham and England average has narrowed. The number of school leavers entering education, employment or work based learning in 2004 was 88.7% which is an increase in recent years and close to the national average. The number of 19 year olds entering higher education has also increased significantly in Rotherham from 4.3 entrants per 1,000 population in 1994 to 8.7 entrants per 1,000 population in 2002. This is a good improvement but the number remains below both the regional and national average.

The level of skills in adults (those achieving NVQ level 2 and 3) in Rotherham is lower than both the regional and national average, although this is improving at the national rate, if not faster every year. There is a skills gap in Rotherham, particularity in terms of the existing
skills of the population and those required by potential employers. There is also low graduate retention. Figure 5 illustrates the current distribution of educational facilities within the Borough.

Figure 5 Distribution of Education Facilities in the Borough of Rotherham
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5.4.7 Crime and Safety
Rotherham has the lowest crime rate in South Yorkshire, but there are some hotspots of activity, including Rotherham Town Centre, The Valley (eastern Herringthorpe, Rotherham) and Clifton, Maltby and Swinton. The number of burglaries has decreased by 32% in 2004/5 and almost halved in the previous 2 years, so the figure is significantly below both the regional and national average. The number of violent crimes is equivalent to the regional and national average but the number of vehicle crime was below the regional and national average.

The number of racial incidents was higher in Rotherham than the average for Yorkshire and the Humber but has reduced from 135 per 10,000 population in 2003/4 to 99.8 per 100,000 population in 2004/5.

The latest survey undertaken in 2004 found that 27% of residents in Rotherham were ‘very concerned about being a victim of crime’. This is an improvement on the 2002 survey when at that time 51% were very concerned about being a victim of crime.

5.4.8 Housing
In 2003 there were approximately 107,000 people (43% of Rotherham’s population) living within the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder area (Figure 6). In the 2004/5 stock survey,
78% of RMBC’s housing stock was classed as ‘non-decent’ and 8,000 private sector pre-twentieth century dwellings gave ‘cause for concern’.

Over 65% of households in Rotherham are owner occupied with just over 23% rented from the Council. House prices have risen in Rotherham but remain below the average for England and Wales. For the quarter ending June 2005 the average house price was £113,303 which was equivalent to 61% of the England and Wales average. However, house price inflation has outstripped wage inflation in Rotherham, which means that home ownership is becoming more difficult and demand for council housing remains high. In 2005 there were 13,903 people on the Housing Register when an additional 2,414 had requested transfers.

Figure 6 Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder Areas

5.4.9 Town Centres
Perceptions of Rotherham Town Centre are generally poor, with 50% of respondents to a recent survey highlighting the need to revive the Town Centre as very important. Footfall in the primary shopping streets of Rotherham Town Centre was 27 million in 2005. The vacancy rate in Rotherham Town Centre has increased slightly since 2003/4 (9.7%) to 10.2% in 2004/5. The vacancy rate for all town centres in Rotherham Borough has increased very slightly since 2003/04.

5.4.10 Health
Life expectancy in Rotherham is slightly lower than the national average (due to lifestyle, diet and history of occupational illnesses from mining and heavy industry) but this has improved in recent years, narrowing the gap to the national average. However, this hides large discrepancies between different wards in Rotherham where life expectancy can be up
to 9 years below the national average. The 2004 Index of Multiple Deprivation shows that 34 of Rotherham’s Super Output Area’s fall within the top 10% most deprived nationally on the health domain.

Rotherham has more permanently sick and disabled people than the national average and two thirds of these people are men in the 40 to 64 age groups. In 2005, just under a quarter of the adult population smoked in Rotherham which is a 3% decrease from 1998 and now below the national average. However, adult obesity in Rotherham is above both the regional and national average. Figure 7 illustrates the distribution of health facilities within the Borough.

Figure 7  Distribution of Key Healthcare Facilities
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5.4.11  Cultural Heritage
Rotherham has large areas of high quality countryside and open space and several cultural and historic attractions including Magna Science Adventure Park, Roche Abbey and Clifton Park Museum. In 2004/5 Rotherham received 6.8 million day visitors. There are 25 Conservation Areas, 60% of which are covered by up to date conservation area character appraisals. There are 37 Scheduled Monuments, 5 registered historic parks and gardens, 16 Grade I Listed Buildings, 35 Grade II* Listed Buildings and 465 Grade II Listed Buildings. English Heritage note that 3 of the Grade I and II* Listed Buildings are at risk (Figure 8).

5.4.12  Landscape and Biodiversity
Rotherham is over 70% Rural with 10% of the Borough covered by trees. There are 7 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and 6 Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) (Figure 9).
5.4.13 Natural Resources

Domestic electricity sales per customer in Rotherham are lower in Rotherham than the regional and national average but domestic gas sales are similar to the regional and national average.

The quality of rivers in Rotherham has improved greatly since 1990, when only 44% of Rotherham’s rivers were classed as fair or good. In 2002 this figure has risen to 92.6%, which is just below the national average.

In 2004/05, 46.9% of all new homes were built on previously developed land. This is a decrease from 2004/05 and below both the regional and nation average of around 70%.
5.5 **Key Sustainability Issues for Rotherham**

The review of relevant policies, plans and programmes and the analysis of baseline data provided the basis for the identification of the key sustainability issues for the Core Strategy. This was supported by the formal scoping consultation that was carried out during the scoping stage of the SA/SEA process. Table 4 below identifies the key sustainability issues and the sources of these issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Sustainability Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Rotherham has a low number of business start ups compared to other towns. There is a need to attract inward investment, indigenous investment and encourage business growth.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, Baseline and Plans, Policies and Programmes (PPP) review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>There is a need to reduce and manage the reliance on vulnerable employment sectors in Rotherham and ensure Rotherham can attract business in regional growth sectors such as business and finance.</td>
<td>Baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment and Economic Activity</td>
<td>There are disparities in unemployment and low levels of economic activity in certain groups of the population and locations in Rotherham.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Sustainability Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting and Travel</td>
<td>Overall, there is an aim to reduce car dependency for all in Rotherham. Rotherham is well located in terms of the strategic road network and many residents travel by car. Travel patterns indicate that there are strong links between Rotherham and Sheffield. However, it is important that public transport services are sufficient to provide access to facilities and employment for those without access to a car. Access to facilities and resources (such as the countryside) should be promoted and encouraged by sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop baseline and PPP review. Countryside Agency consultation response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation</td>
<td>Rotherham is a diverse Borough and there are inequalities and disparities in deprivation across Rotherham. Many of these areas are the focus for intervention and there is a need to ensure that these interventions are well co-ordinated, provide opportunities for residents and reduce social exclusion.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill Health</td>
<td>Life expectancy is lower than the national average in Rotherham and the numbers of permanently sick and disabled is also high. This has an effect on economic activity and reduces the size of the working age population. This issue is exacerbated in certain parts of the Borough. Therefore, there is a need to reduce the overall incidences of ill health and the numbers of permanently sick or disabled in Rotherham and to address disparities in health and life expectancy.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Educational attainment is below the national average in Rotherham but is improving every year and the gap is narrowing. The number of 19 year olds entering higher education is also increasing, but it is suspected that many graduates do not return to Rotherham (to contribute to the skills base of the workforce) after finishing University.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>The level of skills and qualifications in the adult population of Rotherham is below the national average. A lack of an appropriately skilled workforce could affect an employer’s desire to invest in Rotherham (particularly in the future growth sectors of business and finance) or alternatively result in the workforce ‘commuting in’ from other authority areas to bridge the skills gap in the local workforce.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Just over 40% of Rotherham’s population live within an area designated as a Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder. There is a need to improve the quality and range of housing stock in the Borough to meet the lifetime needs of the population both within and outside of the Pathfinder area. There is also potential to increase opportunities for home ownership, particularly in Rotherham Urban Area.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of Rotherham</td>
<td>There is a need to challenge the negative and stereotypical perceptions of Rotherham and promote the positive aspects of the Borough, including Rotherham as a good place to live and visit.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Cohesion and Equality</td>
<td>There is a desire to get more people to participate in decisions affecting their community. It is also important that Rotherham is an inclusive Borough where all residents have access to services and facilities and communities interact positively with each other.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Sustainability Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centres</td>
<td>There is a need to support the vitality and viability of the Rotherham’s town centres and strengthen the role they play as a focus for community activity. This is also a key aspect for strengthening Rotherham’s local economy.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environment and historic heritage.</td>
<td>Rotherham has a diverse built environment. There is a desire to maximise positive aspects of Rotherham’s built environment and address areas in need of improvement. There is a need to protect and enhance sites and areas (including rural sites and areas) of national, regional and local architectural and archaeological importance.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review and English Heritage consultation response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Land Use</td>
<td>There is a policy drive to minimise the amount of development that occurs on greenfield land in Rotherham and ensure that development is directed to previously developed sites in sustainable locations which support regeneration objectives such as the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder taking into account impact on traffic generation and pollution. This issue also highlights the need to address land contamination and water resource efficiency.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review and Environment Agency consultation response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and Recycling</td>
<td>There is a national need to reduce the amount of waste produced as a first principle and to also recover value from waste though recycling and energy production. Rotherham has as part to play in achieving regional and national targets.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change and Flood Risk</td>
<td>There is a national need to consider the impact of climate change and manage the risk of flooding. Rotherham has a part to play in achieving regional and national targets.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>There is a need to encourage landscape enhancement and protection, including townscapes and improvements to urban fringe.</td>
<td>Countryside Agency consultation response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>There is a need to protect and enhance sites and species of national, regional and local importance and minimise the loss of biodiversity in Rotherham.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop and PPP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways</td>
<td>There is potential to enhance and protect Rotherham’s waterways for both their recreational and ecological value.</td>
<td>Panel Workshop, baseline and PPP review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Sustainability Appraisal Framework

6.1 Purpose and Overview

The SA Framework provides the tool for considering, assessing and comparing the sustainability effects of a given Local Development Document (LDD) in the LDF. It includes a series of SA Objectives and ‘Decision Guiding Questions’ (DGQ), which have been developed specifically for Rotherham. These are supported by a range of indicators and targets. Through a series of appraisal procedures a given LDD can be compared or tested against these SA Objectives and DGQ to allow potential effects to be predicted and assessed. To aid the appraisal process and ensure all the requirements of the SEA Directive are met a series of appraisal matrices have been developed. These provide a structure for completing and documenting the process and correspond to its different stages.

6.2 Refining the SA Framework for Different LDDs

The current SA Framework provides SA Objectives and DGQ for Rotherham as a whole. For more localised, or specific LDDs, such as Area Action Plans or Supplementary Planning Documents, more relevant DGQs, indicators and targets may need to be developed building on those in the overall SA Framework.

6.3 Incorporation of Key Links

6.3.1 Links to the Community Strategy

The new planning system requires the LDF to be linked with Rotherham’s Community Strategy. In addition to this, RMBC’s Guidance on Policy Strategy Development requires all policies to add value to the Community Strategy by clearly linking to its themes. The SA Framework should therefore support this.

The Community Strategy consists of 5 Core Themes and 2 Cross Cutting Themes as listed below:

- Achieving
- Learning
- Alive
- Safe
- Proud

Cross Cutting Themes

- Fairness
- Sustainable Development

In order to clearly show how the SA Framework and the Local Development Document being appraised link to and support the Community Strategy, the SA Objectives are grouped under the themes of the Community Strategy (apart from the theme Sustainable Development as this is overarching to all). It is acknowledged that several of the SA Objectives could be grouped and this is discussed in Section 6.4.2.

6.3.2 Links to the Equalities Appraisal and Health Impact Assessment

The SA Framework for the LDF is required to incorporate as far as possible:

- the requirements of statutory Equalities Appraisal, for which RMBC has developed a tool called ‘Equality Impact and Needs Requirements Assessment Toolkit’ (INRA).
key aspects of the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) used by Rotherham Primary Care Trust.

Therefore, it was also considered sensible to consider the key requirements and aspects of these two appraisals during the development of the SA Framework. Both appraisals were reviewed and consultation was undertaken with the RMBC Equalities Unit and the Primary Care Trust.

Equalities and health issues have been integrated into the development of the SA Objectives and the appraisal process.

6.4 Objectives and Decision Guiding Questions

6.4.1 Development

As well as integration of the Community Strategy, Equalities Appraisal and Health Impact Assessment objectives, there were a number of other key starting points for developing SA Objectives and Decision Guiding Questions. These are outlined below:

Key Sustainability Issues for Rotherham – The SA framework needs to ensure that these issues are assessed within the appraisals to ensure that the significant sustainability issues are considered.

Strategic Environmental Assessment Requirements - It is essential that the SA Framework includes the topics required by the SEA Directive. These are:

‘the likely significant effects on the environment including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors.’ EU Directive 2001/42/EC (Annex 1)

These aspects therefore form the starting point for the SA Framework.

UK Sustainable Development Objectives - The UK Government has recently revised its Sustainable Development Strategy by publishing ‘Securing the Future’ (2005). In this, it revised its core objectives as outlined in Figure 1. The SA Framework should support and incorporate these.

Established Objectives and Locally Relevant Issues and Parameters - The sustainability objectives and DGQ must incorporate objectives of key existing plans, policies and programmes and be relevant to Rotherham. Therefore, the findings of the relevant plans, policies and programmes review, baseline review and identification of key issues outlined in Sections 3 and 4, formed one of the core foundations for developing SA Objectives and DGQ.

Utilising Existing SA Frameworks - There are two SA Frameworks currently in use in RMBC. The first framework the ‘SA for Rural Regeneration of Rotherham’ was especially developed by Arup for RMBC and the Countryside Agency in 2001. It involved substantial amounts of work, identifies key issues and established objectives and criteria. The second appraisal framework is a Corporate Appraisal Tool, which is, in practice, the same as the Regional Sustainable Development Framework (RSDF). It therefore seemed appropriate to use these Frameworks as a starting point for developing SA Objectives and DGQ. In addition to this as the LDF has to conform to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), it also seemed appropriate to consider the SA for the RSS as another key starting point.

These existing frameworks were cross referenced against each other and against SEA requirements and key issues in Rotherham.
6.4.2 **Proposed Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Decision Guiding Questions**

A series of 22 Sustainability Objectives and supporting Decision Guiding Questions have been developed for Rotherham. The SA Objectives are listed in Table 5 Below, and the SA Objectives and DGQ are contained in Appendix C. The SA Objectives are grouped under 6 of the 7 themes of the Borough’s Community Strategy - given its inherent sustainability, the 7th theme (Sustainable Development) has not been used. While it is acknowledged that some objectives could fit under a number of themes this is not considered to be a problem in relation to the appraisal process because:

- the impact on the SA Objectives is assessed individually as a whole rather than by theme. Therefore, the division does not impact on the appraisal process or its outcomes; and
- it must be recognised that the themes and SA Objectives are inextricably interlinked, contributing and impacting upon each other. Therefore, any number of different divisions could have been made. Thus, again it does not matter how the SA Objectives are divided.

It is important to consider the links between the SA Objectives when completing the appraisal.

When undertaking appraisals prime focus should be given to assessing impact upon the objectives. The DGQ are only intended to be a guide to impact assessment – they are not an exhaustive list of questions that could be asked and not all will be relevant to all appraisals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5 SA Objectives for Rotherham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROtherham Achieving</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Support, maintain or enhance the provision of quality local or easily accessible employment opportunities for all, in stable or competitive growth sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintain or enhance conditions that enable sustainable economic growth and investment without environmental damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Facilitate sustainable transport and movement patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve the level of education and skills for all, reducing disparities across Rotherham and strengthening its position regionally and nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Encourage creativity, innovation and the effective use of sound science and appropriate technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promote awareness of sustainable development and encourage sustainable lifestyles and business practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham Alive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Improve the health of the people of Rotherham, reduce disparities in health and encourage healthy living for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Improve access to quality cultural, leisure and recreational activities available to everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enhance the function and vibrancy of town or district centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham Safe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Enhance safety, and reduce crime and fear of crime for everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Conserve and enhance Rotherham’s habitats, biodiversity and geodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Efficient consumption of natural resources and optimises the use of renewable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Minimise local and global pollution including greenhouse gases and protect or enhance environmental quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Reduce Rotherham’s vulnerability to flooding and to the impacts of climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5 Indicators and Targets

#### 6.5.1 Development

Indicators and targets have been developed for each SA Objective. These enable the baseline situation to be assessed and easily updated to facilitate monitoring.

When selecting indicators and targets a number of issues were taken into consideration:

Indicators had to be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time bound and useful:

- A wide range of indicators have already been collected in Rotherham and nationally and it was considered important to align indicators with these as far as possible;
- While it is preferable that the selection of indicators has available data it is important that data does not dictate what is measured. Therefore, some indicators which are new or are known to be problematic in relation to data collection have been included (where no alternative indicators are available) and gaps have been left in the baseline until data either becomes available or new methods for collecting such data have been established.
- In order to make the best use out of these indicators and time spent collecting data, consideration was given to whether the indicators were also suitable for monitoring sustainability impacts of Local Development Documents (Stage E) as well as for LDF monitoring.

Core sources indicators were:

- Rotherham Best Value Performance Plan;
- Rotherham Community Strategy;
- Rotherham Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy;
- Rotherham Regeneration Plan;
- Sustainable Development Indicators in Your Pocket 2005, National Statistics;
- Census.

#### 6.5.2 Proposed Indicators and Targets

The proposed indicators and targets with sources are contained in Appendix B.
6.6 **Appraisal Matrices**

### 6.6.1 Development

A series of Appraisal Matrices have been developed to guide the SA process. In developing these it was important to ensure they considered the scope and requirements of an appraisal. This included the following key aspects:

### 6.6.2 Stages of Appraisal

The SA Framework must be applicable to all stages of the appraisal process. The key stages of the appraisal, as outlined in the SA Guidance (2005), are known as Stage B and include:

- testing plan objectives against SA Objectives;
- appraisal of the alternative strategic options;
- appraisal of preferred options (Policy Directions); and
- consideration of the impacts of the plan as a whole.

#### Requirements of SEA

The appraisal process also has to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive. These include:

- “the likely significant effects…. These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects” (Annex I (f) and footnote)

- “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…” (Annex I (g))

### 6.6.3 Appraisal Matrices

A series of appraisal matrices have been developed for each stage of the appraisal.

- Testing Core Strategy Objectives Against SA Objectives;
- Predicting and Assessing the Impacts of Options;
- Predicting and Assessing the Impacts of a Preferred Option (Draft Policy);

Each matrix guided the process for:

- predicting and assessing the effects including cumulative and synergistic (not relevant for assessing Core Strategy Objectives against the SA Objectives);
- identifying mitigation and enhancement opportunities; and
- drawing conclusions on the option, policy or plan.

The appraisal matrices were developed in spreadsheet format to enable flexibility and ease of use and to allow any quantitative aspects of the appraisals to be automated.

It is important to stress that the Appraisal Matrices’ use of calculations (in terms of scoring and quantification of effect) is not a tool to be used in assessing sustainability but solely an internal working technique to allow representation of the more qualitative assessment process. The matrices use of scoring does not imply scientific quantification of effect but allows broad trends, towards or away from sustainability to be identified. As decisions taken are based upon individual “expert” judgement (which it is acknowledged can vary between person to person and upon assumptions), it is the explanatory text, and summaries of assessment, which are more important than the apparent “scores”.

---
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7 Assessment of the Core Strategy Objectives and Options

7.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the assessment of the Core Strategy Objectives, Core Strategy Alternative Options and establishes how the Preferred Core Strategy Option was developed.

7.2 Assessment of the Core Strategy Objectives

7.2.1 Core Strategy objectives

Sustainable development is the core principle underpinning planning and as a result RMBC ensured that the preparation of the Core Strategy was underpinned by a set of high level objectives. These Core Strategy Objectives (not to be confused with the Sustainability Assessment Objectives) set, at a high level, the main aspirations that the Core Strategy will attempt to achieve or contribute to - Table 6 Core Strategy Objectives (for full working see Appendix 1 of the Core Strategy Report).

In developing these objectives a variety of sources were used – planning policy guidance and planning policy statements issued by Central Government, the draft Regional Spatial Strategy, Rotherham’s Community Strategy and other partners’ strategies.

This was further assisted by a review of ‘plans, policies and programmes’ undertaken as part of the SA process. These issues were then organised into 30 Objectives under four sustainability aims developed from the current and previous UK Government’s Sustainable Development Strategy. The objectives were also aligned to the Vision of Rotherham’s Community Strategy (Achieving, Learning, Alive, Safe, Proud, Fairness and Sustainable Development themes).

Table 6 Core Strategy Objectives (for full working see Appendix 1 of the Core Strategy Report).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim 1: Protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment</th>
<th>Aim 2: Building a prosperous, diverse and enduring economy</th>
<th>Aim 3: The prudent management of natural resources and minimising climate change (using science wisely)</th>
<th>Aim 4: Creating cohesive and inclusive communities (and promoting effective governance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
7.2.2 Results from the Assessment of Core Strategy Objectives

The first stage of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) assessed the sustainability of the Core Strategy Objectives that were being used as the starting point for developing the Core Strategy. The main purpose of this assessment was to identify potential conflicts which might have to be addressed during the later stages of the Sustainability Appraisal. It also provided the plan makers with an early indication of potentially significant sustainability issues.

The results of the appraisal are documented in a matrix (Figure 10) which records whether the predicted effects of the Core Strategy Objectives would have a positive, negative, neutral or unknown effect on the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives. Given the high-level nature of the Core Strategy Objectives any observations are inherently strategic in nature.

Positive Effects

- The greatest proportion of the predicted effects were either positive or neutral. This indicates that in general terms the Core Strategy Objectives do not hinder sustainable development and in some cases actively promote sustainability. It is likely that this occurred because the Core Strategy Objectives were developed with sustainability in mind. The environmental, social and natural resource management Core Strategy Objectives performed particularly well.

Uncertain Effects

- Uncertainty appeared as a key issue during the assessment of some of the economic Core Strategy Objectives. This uncertainty occurred because it is difficult to predict the effects of economic growth and development on the availability of land, consumption of resources, emissions of pollution, waste generation, biodiversity and heritage assets.

Negative Effects

- On the whole there were few potentially negative effects predicted. Those that were identified arose as a result of the economic Core Strategy Objectives, especially improvements to strategic transport infrastructure and infrastructure development and minerals extraction. The SA objectives most affected were the environmental ones, such as biodiversity, geodiversity, landscape, cultural heritage, consumption of resources and emissions of greenhouse gases.
### Figure 10  Testing compatibility of the SA Objectives and Core Strategy Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Objectives</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** See Table 6 (page 31) for the definition of Core Strategy Objectives and Table 5 (page 28) for the Sustainability Objectives.
7.3 Core Strategy Alternative Options

Alternative Scenarios

Core Strategy preparation needs to demonstrate ‘general conformity’ with the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Development of RSS was informed by three alternative scenarios. Together with the existing Unitary Development Plan ‘baseline’, we translated these into similar scenarios for Rotherham’s Core Strategy, focussing upon locally relevant matters identified by the Core Strategy Objectives. The following three options were developed:

- **Option A**: Responding to Market Forces.
- **Option B**: Matching Needs with Opportunities.
- **Option C**: Managing the Environment as a Key Resource.

While presenting alternative options for the future development of Rotherham, these three scenarios still had to be broadly within the context of current planning and environmental policy and legislation. Extreme approaches were not considered. Options were provided as a device for debate – they did not represent Council policy.

A fourth baseline option, based upon the existing Unitary Development Plan (UDP), was included in the assessment to allow comparisons between the likely future baseline condition with the proposed options. The options have been summarised below. A more detailed explanation of these options alongside illustrative maps can be found in the main Core Strategy Report.

Baseline Position: Unitary Development Plan

Role of Settlements – new housing and industrial development has been spread throughout the Borough but often on the edge of settlements. Some shops have been developed away from the main town centres for example at Bramley, Cortonwood, Catcliffe and Retail World. Major improvements have happened in the town centres of Rotherham, Wath, Dinnington, Thurcroft, and Maltby.

Housing – major housing built at Bramley, Swallownest, Maltby, Dinnington and at the Cortonwood and Treeton former colliery sites. These have been mainly larger family houses with ample car parking. A lot of greenfield sites (those sites that have not been used before) have been built on.

New industrial development – has been spread around the Borough at Manvers (including the former Cortonwood Colliery site), Dinnington and Templeborough. Nearly all industrial development is on reclaimed "brownfield" land (that has been used before). Waste disposal relies on landfill sites. Sites at Waverley and Aldwarke also identified.

Shopping – some of the big name shops have moved away from Rotherham to Retail World and Meadowhall. Rotherham town centre has suffered because of this but new shops have been built at the Rotherham Interchange and Effingham Street.

Travel and Transport – there has been a growth in car use and rail continues to be popular, however despite improvements to buses (including quality bus corridors) less people are using them. Some new road schemes have been developed namely, the A57 Aston to Sheffield, the Dinnington bypass and the Manvers Spine Road. The UDP does not promote traffic and parking controls to any great extent.

Environment – Protection of the Green Belt, landscape, and wildlife habitats.
Option A Responding to Market Forces

Role of settlements – major new development likely at Manvers, Retail World, Waverley and Dinnington.

Housing – spread throughout the Borough. Possible use of Green Belt sites for new housing. Largely build on greenfield sites (those sites that have not been used before). Small number of affordable houses provided. Public funding needed to encourage private sector to get involved in areas such as town centres and the housing market renewal areas – where people haven’t traditionally lived or where house prices are falling. New housing at Waverley is highly likely.

New industrial development – develop out-of-town centre sites, near to motorway junctions and close to major transport routes that are attractive to industry. New high technology industries may be encouraged through public funding. Some employment land may be used for housing. Quarries likely to be extended.

Shopping and Leisure – Retail World, Meadowhall and other retail parks with plenty of parking continue to be attractive to the big name stores. Major leisure activities will not necessarily be in town centres.

Travel and Transport – goods will continue to be carried by heavy goods vehicles. Support for the most profitable bus services. Rising congestion may lead to motorway widening and tolls, longer journey times are likely. Rely on the car to get to work and to be used for most other purposes.

Environment – some Green Belt sites may be built on in the most desirable areas. Protection of the environment is not a priority. There is little commercial value in protecting wildlife for its own sake. Renewable energy schemes funded by grants.

Option B Matching Needs with Opportunities

Role of Settlements – the South Yorkshire Settlement Study identifies the most sustainable communities – those that are viable (support a range of activities: schools, shops and public services) and accessible (close to major transport interchanges) but it is unlikely that all settlements will grow. The priority is to develop in the main urban areas.

Housing – new housing in main centres, such as Rotherham urban area, where vacant or under used sites could be built on. Also some new housing is expected in Dinnington, Maltby and Wath. Development of a new community at Waverley will be looked at but the number of new houses built will be carefully managed over a number of years. Deliver housing market renewal schemes in the most suitable areas.

New industrial development – industry, shops and offices will be in the most sustainable communities. New high technology industries will be targeted, such as at the Advanced Manufacturing Park at Waverley. Waste recycling rather than landfill sites will be encouraged. Limited extensions to quarries may be considered.

Shopping and leisure – Rotherham town centre and other key town centres such as Wath, Swinton, Maltby and Dinnington will include shopping and leisure activities. Leisure facilities will be supported in the most sustainable communities. Local shops to meet daily needs will also be encouraged.

Travel and Transport – provide park and ride sites on the edge of centres and other suitable places, along with traffic management schemes in central areas. Funding for public transport and the development of other rapid public transport solutions such as guided buses will be looked at.

Environment – some Green Belt sites may be built on but only to support sustainable communities. Protection of valuable wildlife sites and habitats. Land that has been used before will be a priority but the most important thing is to support sustainable communities. Renewable energy schemes will be supported to meet local need.
Option C Managing the Environment as a Key Resource

Role of Settlements – focus new development in all urban centres and most local communities. No clear focus on specific communities as proposed in Option B.

Housing – new houses will be built to high density (the number of houses on a given piece of land) within the main urban centres and near to good public transport facilities. New communities (such as Waverley). Sites in the Green Belt or greenfield sites will not be developed. Housing renewal schemes will be considered in all areas.

New industrial development – this option will provide local jobs for people and reduce the need to travel to work. All brownfield sites to be used. New industries reusing waste and recycling rubbish will be promoted. Quarries will not be extended.

Travel and Transport – major investment in public transport and managing traffic to reduce car use. Possibly introduce road tolls and provide fewer parking spaces to encourage less car use and more travel by public transport. Encourage use of the car for a number of different tasks in one journey.

Shopping and leisure – will be supported in all town and local centres close to transport interchanges. No more retail parks or their expansion.

Environment – no development on Green Belt or greenfield sites, look at expanding the Green Belt. Protection of Green Belt, the countryside and wildlife for its own sake. Try to reduce pollution by having less development. Have more renewable energy schemes.

7.4 Sustainability Assessment of the Alternative Options

7.4.1 Assessment Methodology

Using the Sustainability Appraisal Framework each Core Strategy Option, as well as the existing Unitary Development Plan baseline, were assessed against the 22 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Objectives. Using, as necessary, the Sustainability Appraisal Framework’s ‘Decision Guiding Questions’, each interaction between Core Strategy Option and Sustainability Appraisal Objective was considered for its “direction of travel” towards or from sustainable development according to the significance criteria listed in Table 7 below using the appraisal criteria discussed in Section 3.2 (page 7).

As each of the options were assessed against the SA objectives the effects were split into general effects, spatial effects and then mitigation measures and were recorded in the options appraisal matrix in Appendix D. Each interaction was summarised according to effects, main spatial effects and proposed mitigation (or enhancement) opportunities. An attempt to identify, short term (0-4 years), medium term (5-9 years) and long term (10+) effects was made. Assessment of cumulative effects was considered for long term effects only (as per the Scoping Report’s methodology).

It should be stressed that it was the explanation of assessment commentary, and not the use of scoring and apparent quantification of effect, that has been used as the main tool in assessing relative sustainability. The use of scoring is not intended to imply scientific quantification of effect. As decisions were based upon individual “expert judgement” (which it is acknowledged can vary between person to person and upon assumptions), it is the explanatory text, and summaries of assessment, which are more important that the apparent scores.
Table 7 Sustainability Appraisal Significance Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance of effect</th>
<th>Description of effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Major Positive</td>
<td>Likely to benefit a large area of the Borough or a large number of people and receptors. The effects are likely to be direct and permanent and the magnitude will be major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Minor Positive</td>
<td>The extent of predicted beneficial effects is likely to be limited to small areas within the borough, or small groups of people and receptors. The effects can be direct or indirect, temporary or reversible. The magnitude of the predicted effects will be minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral effects are predicted where the option being assessed is unlikely to alter the present or future baseline situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Minor Negative</td>
<td>Minor negative effects are likely to be limited to small areas within the Borough, or limited to small groups of people and receptors. The effects can be direct or indirect, temporary or reversible. The importance of the receptor that is effect is likely to be minor as is the magnitude of the predicted effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Major Negative</td>
<td>Likely to affect the whole, or large areas of, the Borough. Also applies to effects on nationally or internationally important assets. The effects are likely to be direct, irreversible and permanent. The magnitude of the predicted effects will also be major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Unknown</td>
<td>This significance criterion is applied to effects where there is insufficient information to make a robust assessment. It is also applied to the assessment of options or Policy Directions that can have both positive and negative effects. In this kind of situation it is not clear whether the positive or negative effects will outweigh each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described above the results of the appraisal have been documented in a matrix which allows the effects of the different options to be assessed. This matrix is summarised in Figure 11. (Page 38) which shows the overall significance of the sustainability effects of each option. The key findings of the appraisal are discussed below and recorded in more detail in Appendix D.

7.4.2 UDP Baseline

The appraisal of the UDP considered the effects of implementing the UDP in isolation. As a result the predicted effects of the UDP were quite varied. Some of the particularly adverse effects would in fact be avoided or mitigated by current planning policy and guidance. If the UDP were updated to incorporate these changes long term sustainability could be enhanced. The long term cumulative effect of the UDP using cumulative counts of effects is neutral over the long term.
### Figure 11  Summary of the Core Strategy Options Sustainability Appraisal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives (see Appendix 2 for full text)</th>
<th>Baseline: Unitary Development Plan</th>
<th>Option A: Responding to Market Forces</th>
<th>Option B: Matching Needs with Opportunities</th>
<th>Option C: Managing the Environment as a Key Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Employment opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economic growth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Creativity, innovation, sound science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Awareness / encouragement of sustainability</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Culture and recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Town/ district centre function and vibrancy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Safety and crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Biodiversity and geodiversity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Natural resource consumption / renewable energy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pollution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Flooding and climate change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Waste</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Settlement / neighbourhood built quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Integrated / efficient land use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Affordable housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Landscape quality / historic assets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Community cohesion / involvement / pride</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Rotherham external image and perceptions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Equality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Assessment (Sum of all impacts added together)</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of Rating (Count of occurrence)</strong></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>(Major Negative)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>(Minor Negative)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(Neutral)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Minor Positive)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Major Positive)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(Unknown)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment of Effect**

*ST = Short Term (0-4 years)  MT = Medium Term (5-9 years)  LT = Long Term (10+ years)*

### 7.4.3 Pro-Market Option A

- A cumulative score of -24, identified a significant negative long term impact.

- Significant number of 'major negative (-2)' scores contribute to this impact. Certain aspects of this Option perform well.
Under this option economic growth is encouraged with minimal controls and safeguards. As a result pressure would be put on existing transport infrastructure, increasing congestion and delays. This option would also help to stimulate development. However without any environmental and social safeguards the medium to long term effects could be significantly adverse. For example, the effectiveness of the planning system to protect and enhance biodiversity would be constrained; likewise there would be no control of housing development which would be more likely to select easy to develop greenfield sites instead of using brownfield site and addressing the quality of existing housing in the Borough.

7.4.4 Needs & Opportunities Option B
- A cumulative score of 26, identified a significant positive long term impact.
- No negative long term scores.

This option is particularly beneficial for employment opportunities over the short to long term by promoting economic growth in locations where they can be accessed by the greatest number of people. It also addresses the needs of the market and the economy whilst at the same time providing the necessary environmental and sustainability safeguards.

Although no negative effects were identified a number of uncertain effects were. For example, by trying to balance the economic and environmental needs of the Borough it is difficult to assess whether the environmental objectives are likely to be adversely affected.

7.4.5 Pro-Environment Option C
- A cumulative score of 22, identifies a significant positive long term impact.
- Marginally poorer long term performance than Option B, with identification of some long term negative impacts.

By making the environment the main issue, this option provides major safeguards and enhancements, benefiting the environmental and sustainability SA Objectives in particular. Despite these safeguards there are three long term adverse effects. The long term effect on education and skills occurs because the option is unlikely to create the ‘step change’ in the South Yorkshire economy because it does not attempt to attract the larger entrepreneurs and industrialists. Although the option addresses environmental and developmental sustainability it could adversely affect the establishment of a sustainable local economy. This could have knock-on effects for the sustainability of local communities.

7.5 Selection of the Preferred Option

The final outcome of this assessment was the identification of the most sustainable option for achieving each of the SA Objectives. In some cases one of the options was clearly the most sustainable of the three being assessed. However in other cases two or all of the options provided the most sustainable option. In these situations the potential for hybrid options were highlighted. This is documented in Table 8 below.

Table 8 Summary and comparison of the Sustainability of Core Strategy Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective (full description)</th>
<th>Summary Comparison of Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– to identify which option or combination of options meet Sustainability Appraisal Objective the best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ‘employment opportunities’</td>
<td><strong>Option B</strong> most beneficial and realistic. Option A could deliver some competitive targeted opportunities but is unlikely to maximise local accessibility. Option C aims to address accessibility issues by safeguarding most local opportunities but this may not be realistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ‘economic growth’</td>
<td><strong>No one Option</strong> particularly favoured above the other options. <strong>Hybrid</strong> of Options suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ‘transport’</td>
<td>UDP too weak. Option C likely to be unachievable. Option A likely to bring rapid deterioration. <strong>Option B</strong> would appear to be most realistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective (full description)</td>
<td>Summary Comparison of Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— to identify which option or combination of options meet Sustainability Appraisal Objective the best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 'education and skills'</td>
<td>Spatial planning has limited influence on Objective. Difficult to assess which option most beneficial. Option A too selective and opportunistic. Option C too broad. <strong>Option B</strong> most likely to achieve Objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 'creativity, innovation, sound science'</td>
<td><strong>Elements of all Options</strong> have potential role to play. UDP baseline has encouraged movement away from declining traditional industries. Option A focussing on less risky innovation (such as the Waverley Advanced Manufacturing Park and the growth of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT)). Option B would seek to consolidate clusters with a portfolio of land responsive to modern requirements. Option C is likely to seek to promote environmental industries in particular. <strong>Option B is supported by elements of Option A and C.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 'awareness / encouragement of sustainability'</td>
<td><strong>Option B</strong> and <strong>Option C</strong> likely to meet the Sustainability Appraisal Objective the best. However, Option C may have a longer term detrimental effect. As such, <strong>Option B</strong> considered most realistic Option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 'health'</td>
<td>UDP supports health issues and facilities of general (but not of explicitly spatial) benefit to health. Option A most likely to increase health risks and disparities. <strong>Option C</strong> likely to be of most benefit but subject to public resource limits. <strong>Option B</strong> would represent compromise between linking resource limitations to health risks (which may not be publicly acceptable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 'culture and recreation'</td>
<td>UDP relatively weak. Option A would focus on commercially viable development and be less interested in culture and ‘needs of everyone’. <strong>Option B and Pro-Environment Option C</strong> fair best with Option C most sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 'town/ district centre function and vibrancy'</td>
<td><strong>Option B</strong> offers best prospects. Option A perpetuates disadvantages and weaknesses of existing UDP. Option C, however desirable, likely to be unrealistic. <strong>Option B</strong> likely to be more desirable over time. Option C wouldn’t take long to ‘break down’ and Option A could see a gradual run down of centres in medium term. If Option B is selected, <strong>elements of Option C</strong> should also be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 'safety and crime'</td>
<td>Limited contribution to Objective from Development Plan System. Assessment of Options is challenging. Option A least likely (although perhaps only marginally) to achieve Objective. UDP would need developing further and be best achieved in <strong>Option B and Option C.</strong> Arguably Option C’s focus upon a need for better quality and managed public realm would best help to discourage crime and deterioration in local amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 'biodiversity and geodiversity'</td>
<td><strong>Option C</strong> most beneficial. Option (A), even with mitigation, will generally undermine Objective. <strong>Option B</strong> continues to witness current difficulties experienced under UDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 'natural resource consumption / renewable energy'</td>
<td>UDP too weak to achieve long term benefits. Option A too dependant upon incentives. Voluntary action stimulated by some incentives and general promotional policies will see some gradual benefits under <strong>Option B</strong> but will require the greater intervention and regulation characterised by <strong>Option C</strong> to bring about the degree and pace of change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 'pollution'</td>
<td><strong>Option C</strong> most desirable in short to medium term. However, in longer term, tight controls severely limiting new development, together with tight restrictions on the movement of goods and people will lead to deprivation. <strong>Option B</strong> may be more realistic. Option A is unlikely to achieve Objective and, indeed, will undermine it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective (full description)</td>
<td>Summary Comparison of Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 'floodling and climate change'</td>
<td>Only <strong>Option C</strong> likely to combat current trends and plan ahead to reduce the medium and longer term vulnerability of the Borough to climate change and flooding. It would, however, ultimately be dependant on Government intervention so <strong>Option B</strong> may be only realistic course of action in the short and medium term. UDP continuation or Option A unlikely to achieve quick enough results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 'waste'</td>
<td>Option A could assist achievement of European Union and Government targets but with little concessions to local interests. UDP baseline needs to be developed further along the lines of Option B and Option C if suitable sites can be found, justified and supported politically. <strong>Option C</strong> likely to be marginally more likely to meet this Sustainability Appraisal Objective than Option B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 'settlement/ neighbourhood built quality'</td>
<td>UDP affords some general recognition of issue but generally deficient. Option A too selective. Option B would over-emphasise highest profile public interventions. <strong>Option C</strong> offers greatest contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 'integrated / efficient land use'</td>
<td>UDP not sufficiently comprehensive. Option A tends to favour low density greenfield and less well integrated development. <strong>Option C</strong> more in line with Objective but may not produce the kind of places and development people choose to live in. <strong>Option B</strong> most flexible and realistic to achieve gradual benefits and public acceptance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 'affordable housing'</td>
<td>UDP approach requires updating. Option A likely to perpetuate UDP 'status quo'. <strong>Option B</strong> would promote a more varied offer with an enhanced but flexible affordable policy and is likely to focus the delivery of decent affordable housing in those areas of greatest need, i.e. the Borough’s Housing Market Renewal areas. Option C considered most desirable in policy terms but Option B probably more realistic in the short term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 'landscape quality / historic assets'</td>
<td>All three options would make limited contribution. Option A unlikely to be sufficiently supportive. UDP baseline requires updating under both Option B and Option C. <strong>Option C</strong> likely to be more desirable with a more comprehensive policy framework leading to additional designations and more resource commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 'community cohesion / involvement / pride'</td>
<td>Limited contribution to Objective from Development Plan System. Issues not well covered in UDP or Option A. Option B likely to be most realistic in targeting communities in greatest need for selective public intervention. <strong>Option C</strong> could potentially have greatest impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 'Rotherham external image and perceptions'</td>
<td>Objective could be promoted to varying extents under each of the three Options. <strong>Option B</strong> is considered most likely to produce the right kind of living conditions and places to visit. Option A and Option C demonstrate both kinds of extreme which may not achieve ideal appeal. Some aspects of Option A could give Rotherham wider publicity and image boost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 'equality'</td>
<td>Limited contribution to Objective from Development Plan System. <strong>Option B and Option C</strong> likely to produce most benefit. The former may be most realistic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison of the relative sustainability of the options was used, in conjunction with the results of a public consultation exercise on the options, to select the preferred options. From this nine Policy Directions (PDs) were drafted to implement the preferred option. This process is explained and discussed in the main Core Strategy Document.
8 SA of the Preferred Core Strategy Option

8.1 Introduction to Core Strategy Preferred Option

The Core Strategy Preferred Option has been developed on the basis of the preceding stages of the SA and Core Strategy Development Processes. Of particular importance was the assessment of the Core Strategy Options described in chapter 7 (page 31). The Draft Core Strategy Document that has been assessed comprises nine Policy Directions which set a framework for the detailed policies that will ultimately form the Core Strategy and the Policies and Allocations DPD (Table 9).

This chapter records the likely significant effects of the Preferred Option that was developed on the basis of the preceding stages of the Sustainability Appraisal and Core Strategy development processes. The completed assessment matrices can be found in Appendix E.

Table 9 Preferred Option Policy Directions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Direction Reference No.</th>
<th>Name of Policy Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD1</td>
<td>Sustainable Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD2</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD3</td>
<td>Economy – Industry and Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD4</td>
<td>Economy – Retail and Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD5</td>
<td>Economy – Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD6</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD7</td>
<td>Local Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD8</td>
<td>Efficient use of Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD9</td>
<td>Community Safety and Well Being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Assessment of Individual Core Strategy Policy Directions

The following section summarises the appraisals of each of the Core Strategy Policy Directions. Appendix E contains the detailed appraisal matrices on which the summaries are based.

8.2.1 Policy Direction 1 Sustainable Communities

A summary appraisal matrix for Policy Direction 1 can be found in Figure 12. The full appraisal can be found in Appendix E. A detailed description of the Policy Direction can be found in the Core Strategy Document.

Strengths

Matching the needs of communities with the appropriate type and scale of social infrastructure is a key strength of this Policy Direction (Figure 12). This ensures that local centres provide local services, e.g. GPs surgeries located in local centres. Whereas the town centres provide high-level services e.g. clinics and hospitals. Another key strength of this Policy Direction is the way that it promotes accessibility to transport infrastructure and communities and reduces exclusion and poor access. The Policy Direction also cuts across all types of development ensuring that they do not conflict with the concept of Sustainable Communities and the Settlement Hierarchy.

Weaknesses

The main weakness of this Policy Direction is the fact that it only focuses on sustainability in terms of the hierarchy and relationship of settlements and how they can be accessed. It does not highlight the importance of having settlements that are designed using sustainable principles in order to create the basis for sustainable communities. Some of the aspects of sustainable design are covered under other Policy Directions, such as PD5 Economy – Waste and PD8 Efficient Use of Resources; however it is not clear how these contribute...
towards the creation of sustainable communities. Without any form of mitigation, such as the environmental safeguards provided by PD7, this Policy Direction could have major adverse effects over the long term.

**Enhancement Opportunities**

There is a significant opportunity, under this Policy Direction, to include a reference to Sustainable Design explaining how this is vital to delivering communities that are sustainable in every aspect over the long term. This would send a clear and unambiguous message to potential developers that RMBC expect high quality development. It would also be possible to add further enhancements by introducing the concept of integrated design, which considers the wider environmental, social and economic effects of a development during the design and construction process. This could help to enable people to adopt more sustainable lifestyles and could be facilitated by a sustainable design SPD and DPD policies at some stage in the future.

In addition to these enhancements the scope of the Policy Direction could be enhanced so that developer contributions could be used to fund ecological, heritage, green space or landscape enhancements. The idea of creating ‘places for people’ could also be included within the Policy Direction to ensure that the sustainable communities really do meet the needs of residents.

**Figure 12 Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 1 Sustainable Communities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective (abbreviated)</th>
<th>Initial PD1</th>
<th>Residual PD1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST MT LT</td>
<td>ST MT LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Employment opportunities</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Economic Growth</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transport</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education and skills</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Creativity, innovation and sound science</td>
<td>0 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Awareness / encouragement of sustainability</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Health</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Culture and recreation</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Town / district centre function and vibrancy</td>
<td>0 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Safety and Crime</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 -1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td>-2 -2 -2</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Natural Resource consumption / renewable energy</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pollution</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Flooding and climate change</td>
<td>-1 -1 -2</td>
<td>0 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Waste</td>
<td>0 0 0 2</td>
<td>2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Settlement / neighbourhood built quality</td>
<td>1 1 1 2</td>
<td>1 1 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Integrated / efficient land use</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Landscape quality / historic assets</td>
<td>0 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Community Cohesion / involvement / pride</td>
<td>0 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Rotherham’s external image and perceptions</td>
<td>0 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Equality</td>
<td>0 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of all effects added together: 38 8 21 27 39

**Frequency of Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of occurrence</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a full definition of the SA Objectives see Table 6 (page 31). An explanation of the significance criteria can be found in Table 7 (page 37).
8.2.2 Policy Direction 2 Housing

A summary appraisal matrix for Policy Direction 2 can be found in Figure 13. The full appraisal can be found in Appendix E. A detailed description of the Policy Direction can be found in the Core Strategy Document.

Strengths

This Policy Direction clearly sets out the need to provide housing within the Borough that is affordable and decent. It also considers the issues that are particularly relevant to some areas of the Borough, such as low demand. The spatial distribution of housing complements the sustainable communities' hierarchy ensuring that residential developments can access social facilities, amenities and transport infrastructure.

Weaknesses

The Policy Direction does not recognise the importance of sustainable design for delivering good quality residential developments that people will want to live in. Furthermore the Policy Direction does not reflect the importance of giving residential developments access to gardens, green spaces, allotments and good quality public realm to create desirable and usable housing. It also does not highlight the importance of ensuring there is a mix of housing type to meet lifelong housing needs in the Borough.

If it was implemented in isolation from any of the rest of the Core Strategy this Policy Direction would increase the quantity of waste generated in the Borough. This could occur, either as a result of waste generated from the construction of new dwellings and as a result of a higher total number of homes generating waste. On its own, the Policy Direction could also result in development occurring within the floodplain putting new developments at risk from flooding. Without any environmental safeguards the Policy Direction could also have significant adverse effects on features of landscape and heritage importance which could have a long term permanent detrimental effect.

Enhancement Opportunities

The potentially adverse effects on waste are mitigated by Policy Directions 5 and 8. The adverse effects on flood risk are mitigated by Policy Direction 9.

Including references to sustainable design and access to gardens and green space would significantly enhance the Policy Direction and would help to highlight the importance of these issues to potential developers. DPDs or SPDs could also be used to set out these requirements in more detail, for example requiring EcoHomes standards for large scale residential developments, and specifying the need for certain types of housing in specific areas i.e. housing for the elderly or large families.

There is a further opportunity, within this Policy Direction, to encourage innovative approaches to working and employment by providing IT infrastructure or communal workspaces close to residential areas, avoiding the need for people to commute long distances and indirectly improving their quality of life and reducing environmental impacts.
8.2.3 Policy Direction 3 Economy – Industry and Commerce

A summary appraisal matrix for Policy Direction 3 can be found in Figure 14. The full appraisal can be found in Appendix E. A detailed description of the Policy Direction can be found in the Core Strategy Document.

Strengths

This Policy Direction has clear benefits for the economy and employment by supporting growth and directing to the most appropriate locations i.e. distribution developments to the urban fringe, close to strategic transport links or in the centre of the key towns in the Borough. By directing development towards the town centres the Policy Direction enhances the function and vibrancy of town and district centres, which should also contribute to economic growth. Focussing industrial and commercial development towards the key centres could also help to encourage a shift in transport usage away from cars towards public transport.

Weaknesses

As with some of the other Policy Directions, this one does not promote the principles of sustainable design in commercial and industrial development. Likewise, it does not promote the development of sustainable supply chains. As a result it could result in developments that are designed in such away that use more material and consume more energy and...
water than if they had been designed with sustainability as a consideration throughout the design and construction process.

If the Policy Direction was implemented on its own it has the potential to have a significant adverse effect on ecology, heritage, landscape assets along with pollution, flood risk and waste management. This is described under section 8.2.2 (page 44).

**Enhancement Opportunities**

There is an opportunity, within this Policy Direction, to set out a requirement for commercial and industrial developments to take greater account of sustainable design principles. The Policy Direction could also identify partnerships that will be required to ensure that commercial and industrial development meets the needs of industry, employees and customers.

The Policy Direction could also be enhanced by making references to innovative or novel working practices, such as the provision of Wireless networks, communal workspaces and mixed/flexible use developments. This type of approach may also help to attract a wider variety of business sectors not currently present in the Borough.

The adverse affects that were identified are either mitigated or enhanced by other Policy Directions within the Core Strategy.

**Figure 14 Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 3 Economy – Industry and Commerce.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective (abbreviated)</th>
<th>PD3 Initial</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST MT LT</td>
<td>ST MT LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Employment opportunities</td>
<td>-1 -1 2</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Economic Growth</td>
<td>-1 -1 1</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transport</td>
<td>-1 -1 1</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education and skills</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Creativity, innovation and sound science</td>
<td>0 -1 2</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Awareness / encouragement of sustainability</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Health</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Culture and recreation</td>
<td>-1 -1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Town / district centre function and vibrancy</td>
<td>0 -1 1</td>
<td>1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Safety and Crime</td>
<td>? ? ?</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td>-2 -2 2</td>
<td>-2 -2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Natural Resource consumption / renewable energy</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pollution</td>
<td>? ? ?</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Flooding and climate change</td>
<td>-1 -1 -2</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Waste</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Settlement / neighbourhood built quality</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1</td>
<td>1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Integrated / efficient land use</td>
<td>1 -1 1</td>
<td>1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Landscape quality / historic assets</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Community Cohesion / involvement / pride</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Rotherham’s external image and perceptions</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Equality</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of all effects added together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-2 Major Negative</th>
<th>-1 Minor Negative</th>
<th>0 Neutral</th>
<th>1 Minor Positive</th>
<th>2 Major Positive</th>
<th>? Unknown/uncertain effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1 1 2</td>
<td>0 5 4</td>
<td>9 4 2 3 1</td>
<td>5 10 10 18 14 5</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a full definition of the SA Objectives see Table 6 (page 31). An explanation of the significance criteria can be found in Table 7 (page 37).
8.2.4 Policy Direction 4 Economy – Retail and Leisure

A summary appraisal matrix for Policy Direction 4 can be found in Figure 15. The full appraisal can be found in Appendix E. A detailed description of the Policy Direction can be found in the Core Strategy Document.

Strengths

As with PD3 (Economy – Industry and Commerce) this Policy Direction contributes to economic growth and the vibrancy and function of town and district centres. In particular, it is the latter that the Policy Direction is likely to have a significant effect on. By using a clear hierarchy to focus the appropriate level type of retail and leisure developments towards either town or district centres the Policy Direction helps to support their function. It also provides an opportunity to increase the amount of activity that occurs in town centres and areas within town centres that are currently rundown and performing poorly.

Weaknesses

The Policy Direction does not address issues relating to the quality of design which could result in development that hinders the economic growth of town and district centres and makes them more vulnerable to crime. Likewise, without having any reference to sustainable design or standards for the quality of public realm the long term viability of the district and town centres could adversely affected. Although the Policy Direction makes linkages with PD3 Economy – Industry and Commerce, it does not address the linkages with the provision of accessible public transport in town and district centres which can enable access between the network of centres in the Borough.

Given that this Policy Direction is focused on retail and leisure facilities in town and district centres there is no consideration of the potential for links with public realm, civic pride and community cohesion.

If the Policy Direction was implemented on its own it has the potential to have a significant adverse effect on ecology, heritage, landscape assets along with pollution, flood risk and waste management. This is described under section 8.2.2 (page 44).

Enhancement Opportunities

There is a significant opportunity, as part of this Policy Direction, to ensure that developments adopt the principles of ‘secured by design’ as set out in PD9. Creation of DPDs, SPDs and design guides for sustainable development and public realm would also help to significantly enhance the development of town and district centres to that they are accessible and attractive places to visit and shop in.

The town centre and district centre focus of the Policy Direction also provides an opportunity for the Core Strategy to influence the public realm and create areas and spaces that give residents pride in their community and enhance community cohesion. The adverse affects that were identified are either mitigated or enhanced by other Policy Directions within the Core Strategy.
### 8.2.5 Policy Direction 5 Economy – Waste

A summary appraisal matrix for Policy Direction 5 can be found in Figure 16. The full appraisal can be found in Appendix E. A detailed description of the Policy Direction can be found in the Core Strategy Document.

#### Strengths

This Policy Direction complements the proposals for the creation of sustainable communities by using proximity to waste sources as key criteria for locating waste management facilities. It also promotes the minimisation of material consumption through waste reduction, re-use and recycling.

#### Weaknesses

Although this Policy Direction refers to sustainable waste management measures, such as re-use and recycling, it does not promote the wider concept of sustainable waste management. As a result the Policy Direction is missing out on a key opportunity to raise awareness of the principles of sustainable waste management; namely avoid, reduce, re-use, recycle/treat and then as a last resort disposal. This is particularly applicable to the construction of new buildings whereby waste can be minimised and managed on site or locally.

---

**Figure 15 Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 4 Economy – Retail and Leisure.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective (abbreviated)</th>
<th>PD4</th>
<th>Initial ST</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>Residual ST</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Economic Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Creativity, innovation and sound science</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Awareness / encouragement of sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Culture and recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Town / district centre function and vibrancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Safety and Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td>-2 -2 -2 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Natural Resource consumption / renewable energy</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Flooding and climate change</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Settlement / neighbourhood built quality</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Integrated / efficient land use</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Landscape quality / historic assets</td>
<td>-1 -1 0 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Community Cohesion / involvement / pride</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Rotherham’s external image and perceptions</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sum of all effects added together**

-4 2 1 20 26 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Rating (Count of occurrence)</th>
<th>Initial ST</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>Residual ST</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2 Major Negative</td>
<td>1 1 2 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Minor Negative</td>
<td>5 5 4 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Neutral</td>
<td>10 4 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Minor Positive</td>
<td>3 9 9 18 14 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Major Positive</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 6 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Unknown/uncertain effect</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a full definition of the SA Objectives see Table 6 (page 31). An explanation of the significance criteria can be found in Table 7 (page 37).
If the Policy Direction was implemented on its own it has the potential to have a significant adverse effect on ecology, heritage, landscape assets along with flood risk and waste management. This is described under section 8.2.2 (page 44).

**Enhancement Opportunities**

Text setting out the principles of sustainable waste management will address the weaknesses described above. The Policy Direction also provides an opportunity to promote alternative and innovative approaches to waste management that can bring additional benefits, for example, composting of waste to create fertiliser and soil improvers and the use of waste to generate biogas using anaerobic digesters.

The Policy Direction could also be used to promote the use of design to allow residents, commercial, industrial, retail and leisure developments to manage their waste in a more sustainable manner. For example ensuring all developments provide space to allow waste segregation to occur and the creation of designated composting facilities in all new housing developments. The adverse affects that were identified are either mitigated or enhanced by other Policy Directions within the Core Strategy.

**Figure 16 Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 5 Economy - Waste.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective (abbreviated)</th>
<th>Initial ST MT LT</th>
<th>Residual ST MT LT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Employment opportunities</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Economic Growth</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transport</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education and skills</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Creativity, innovation and sound science</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Awareness / encouragement of sustainability</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Health</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Culture and recreation</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Town / district centre function and vibrancy</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Safety and Crime</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Natural Resource consumption / renewable energy</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pollution</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Flooding and climate change</td>
<td>-1 -1 -2 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Waste</td>
<td>1 1 1 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Settlement / neighbourhood built quality</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Integrated / efficient land use</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Landscape quality / historic assets</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Community Cohesion / involvement / pride</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Rotherham’s external image and perceptions</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Equality</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of all effects added together: 3 6 7 14 19 28

Frequency of Rating (Count of occurrence):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-2</th>
<th>Major Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 2 1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12 11 9 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 8 12 9 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Major Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1 1 5 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Unknown/uncertain effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a full definition of the SA Objectives see Table 6 (page 31). An explanation of the significance criteria can be found in Table 7 (page 37).
8.2.6 Policy Direction 6 Transportation

A summary appraisal matrix for Policy Direction 6 can be found in Figure 17. The full appraisal can be found in Appendix E. A detailed description of the Policy Direction can be found in the Core Strategy Document.

Strengths

The Policy Direction’s main strength is the way that it supports accessibility between town and district centres and residential areas by the provision of strategic transport corridors. It also helps to promote sustainable development by encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport and reducing the need to travel by placing services close to the people that need to use them. This is supported by a proposal to limit parking in town centres. These measures are fundamental to the creation of sustainable communities.

Weaknesses

Although this Policy Direction enhances movement between district centres, neighbourhoods and town centres it does not address movement within developments, district and town centres. Restrictions to movement in town and district centres, such as difficult road crossings, can have significant adverse effects on movement and can result in some areas function poorly within these centres. Likewise, poorly designed public realm can have significant adverse effects on people with mobility difficulties. There is no mention of the potential role of transport corridors as green links and the potential ecological benefits this can provide.

The Policy Direction does not address sustainable design and construction issues associated with transportation developments. This could for example include use of recycled aggregates and materials for road and transport infrastructure.

If the Policy Direction was implemented on its own it has the potential to have a significant adverse effect on ecology, heritage, landscape assets along with flood risk, pollution and waste management. This is described under section 8.2.2 (page 44).

Enhancement Opportunities

The Policy Direction would benefit by extending its scope so that it also addresses the issues surrounding movement within developments, district centres and town centres. There is a major opportunity for habitat creation and biodiversity enhancement during the development of or improvement to transport infrastructure. This is particularly the relevant to linear developments, such as roads, cycle-routes, railway lines and canals that can also provide valuable wildlife corridors that help to link habitats across the Borough that would otherwise be isolated. The Policy Direction could also be enhanced by highlighting the potential dual role of transport corridors as recreational facilities, e.g. cycle paths, footpaths and canal towpaths.

The adverse affects that were identified are either mitigated or enhanced by other Policy Directions within the Core Strategy.
8.2.7 Policy Direction 7 Local Heritage

A summary appraisal matrix for Policy Direction 7 can be found in Figure 18. The full appraisal can be found in Appendix E. A detailed description of the Policy Direction can be found in the Core Strategy Document.

Strengths

The main strength of this Policy Direction is the fact that it recognises the importance of all habitats and wildlife, whether they are nationally important Sites of Special Scientific Interest or a small area of brownfield containing species of local interest. It also sets out a framework to protect sites where appropriate or allows development with suitable mitigation measures. It also protects heritage, landscape and green space assets.

Weaknesses

One area of weakness within this Policy Direction is the lack of recognition of the contribution that biodiversity, in its broadest sense, can make towards sustainable development. For example the provision of allotments, gardens and green spaces within developments can also provide biodiversity benefits. The Policy Direction does not reflect the importance of heritage features that are not designated, but may still have some local significance or contribute to the character and setting of a town or village.
Enhancement Opportunities

The Policy Direction would benefit by including references to the importance of non-designated heritage assets and role of biodiversity within sustainable development. These enhancements could be expanded to promote the creation of habitats within developments by creating gardens, allotments, parks and landscaping within the public realm of town and district centres. These measures can also enhance people’s quality of life and can also provide additional recreational and amenity facilities. The policy could also be enhanced by acknowledging the importance of connectivity between green spaces and habitats.

The Policy Direction could also be used to promote the use of biodiversity and the wider environment to respond to the effects of climate change. For example, planting can help to reduce soil erosion, improve natural drainage, retain water resources and provide shading which could all be affected by the changing climate.

Figure 18 Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 7 Local Heritage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective (abbreviated)</th>
<th>PD7</th>
<th>Initial ST MT LT</th>
<th>Residual ST MT LT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   Employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   Economic Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   Education and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   Creativity, innovation and sound science</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6   Awareness / encouragement of sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7   Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8   Culture and recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9   Town / district centre function and vibrancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10  Safety and Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11  Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12  Natural Resource consumption / renewable energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13  Pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  Flooding and climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16  Settlement / neighbourhood built quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17  Integrated / efficient land use</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18  Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19  Landscape quality / historic assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20  Community Cohesion / involvement / pride</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21  Rotherham’s external image and perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22  Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of all effects added together 11 15 15 19 24 36

Frequency of Rating of occurrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Rating</th>
<th>Major Negative</th>
<th>Minor Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Minor Positive</th>
<th>Major Positive</th>
<th>Unknown/uncertain effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 6 6 4 3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 15 15 17 14 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 15 15 17 14 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 5 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a full definition of the SA Objectives see Table 6 (page 31). An explanation of the significance criteria can be found in Table 7 (page 37).
8.2.8 Policy Direction 8 Efficient use of Resources

A summary appraisal matrix for Policy Direction 8 can be found in Figure 19. The full appraisal can be found Appendix E. A detailed description of the Policy Direction can be found in the Core Strategy Document.

Strengths

This Policy Direction provides a very clear and robust framework that promotes the efficient use of land by setting minimum standards for building densities for residential developments. It also promotes the re-use and refurbishment of buildings instead of demolition and prioritises the use of brownfield sites before greenfield sites. It also directs developments towards urban centres that have good access to public transport and other infrastructure.

Renewable energy production and the consumption of water resources also feature within this Policy Direction, setting targets for the amount of renewable energy to be produced within the Borough by 2010.

Weaknesses

Although this Policy Direction addresses sustainable materials and construction it is lost within the text of the Policy Direction and would benefit by being stated in more explicit terms. The Policy Direction could also be enhanced by showing the links between the use of sustainable materials, sustainable design and the creation of sustainable communities.

Enhancement Opportunities

The efficient use of resources is a fundamental element for sustainable design and construction. By making reference to sustainable design the links between it and the efficient use of resources can be highlighted. This will help to reinforce the importance of sustainable design for all types of development.

There is an opportunity, within this Policy Direction, to reflect the role that biodiversity can have as a resource. For example straw bales can be used as building material; coppiced trees can be used as renewable fuel source. The Policy Direction could also encourage the use of locally sourced materials which can reduce pollution and traffic congestion.
### Figure 19 Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 8 Efficient Use of Resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective (abbreviated)</th>
<th>Frequency of Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown/uncertain effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initial Residual**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residual**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a full definition of the SA Objectives see Table 6 (page 31). An explanation of the significance criteria can be found in Table 7 (page 37).

### 8.2.9 Policy Direction 9 Community Safety and Well Being

A summary appraisal matrix for Policy Direction 9 can be found in Figure 20. The full appraisal can be found in Appendix E. A detailed description of the Policy Direction can be found in the Core Strategy Document.

**Strengths**

A key strength of this Policy Direction is the way that it addresses public safety through design, by using the principles of ‘secured by design’ to ensure that developments do not create areas that encourage crime. It also addresses human safety issues such as flood risk and provides safeguards for people from pollution and nuisances that can occur during the construction or operation of developments.

**Weaknesses**

One key weakness of this Policy Direction is the lack of recognition that climate change could have safety or health issues for people in the future. As a result developments could occur that could exacerbate these effects, particularly over the long term as the effects of the changing climate become more apparent.

**Enhancement Opportunities**

The Policy Direction should include some recognition of the potential health and safety issues that could occur due to climate change and propose measures that could be used to...
ensure that developments consider the potential effects within their designs. This should mean that developments are designed to be resilient to potential changes or can easily be adapted to mitigate the effects of climate change. This could be assisted by sustainable design guidance SPD and DPD policies.

Figure 20 Summary SA Matrix for Policy Direction 9 Community Safety and Well Being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective (abbreviated)</th>
<th>PD9</th>
<th>Initial ST MT LT</th>
<th>Residual ST MT LT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Economic Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Education and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Creativity, innovation and sound science</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Awareness / encouragement of sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Culture and recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Town / district centre function and vibrancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Safety and Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Natural Resource consumption / renewable energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Flooding and climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Settlement / neighbourhood built quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Integrated / efficient land use</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>? ? 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Landscape quality / historic assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Community Cohesion / involvement / pride</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Rotherham's external image and perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 ? 1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of all effects added together: 10 12 14 17 21 30

Note: For a full definition of the SA Objectives see Table 6 (page 31). An explanation of the significance criteria can be found in Table 7 (page 37).
8.3 Overview of the Assessment of Individual Core Strategy Policy Directions

8.3.1 Initial affects of the Policy Directions without mitigation or enhancement

Figure 21 (Page 58) illustrates the magnitude of the predicted initial effects of the Core Strategy Policy Directions. These effects have been split into negative, uncertain and positive effects.

- **Negative effects.** At this stage of the assessment the negative effects that were predicted affected either natural environment or built environment SA Objectives. The Policy Directions that tended to have negative effects were those that direct quanta and spatial distributions of development. In other words, these were Policy Directions that if they were implemented without any safeguards could adversely affect biological, landscape, heritage and built environment assets and increasing the risk from flooding and increasing air, water and ground pollution. During the assessment of these Policy Directions a conservative view was taken so that a worst case situation was assessed.

- **Uncertain effects.** Where an uncertain effect was recorded it was due to a potential conflict between the predicted effects. For example, when PD2 (Housing) was assessed against SA Objective 10 (Safety and Crime) the potential for developments to create areas that were vulnerable to crime or deterred crime was identified. As a result it was not possible to predict a definitive effect on the SA Objective and as a result an unknown/uncertain effect was recorded.

- **Positive effects.** The assessment of the initial effects of the Policy Directions did highlight a number of positive effects. The most prominent of these are associated with Policy Directions 7, 8 and 9 which performed well over the short, medium and long term. The beneficial effects occur as a result of the safeguards and enhancements for the environment and human beings that these Policy Directions offer.

8.3.2 Types of Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

The types of mitigation and enhancement measures that were identified during the assessment (see the matrices in Appendix E for full details) can be subdivided into four categories, which are described below:

- **Amendments to the Policy Directions.** This type of mitigation and enhancement measure involves proposing potential amendments or additions to the Policy Directions. A notable example from the Core Strategy was the recommendation to include a reference to sustainable design and development in Policy Direction 1 Sustainable Communities. The aim of this enhancement was to highlight the importance of sustainable design for the creation of sustainable communities;

- **Interaction with other Core Strategy Policy Directions.** Many of the adverse effects that were predicted during the initial assessment were identified as being mitigated by other Policy Directions in the Core Strategy. For example, adverse effects on biodiversity and geodiversity as a result of housing developing (PD2) or the construction of transportation infrastructure (PD6) were mitigated by Policy Direction 7 Local Heritage and Policy Direction 9 Community Safety and Well Being;

- **Interaction with other plans and strategies.** Another mitigation and enhancement measure that was identified during the assessment process is the role that other plans and strategies can play. The assessment of the Policy Directions against SA Objective 9 (Town/district centre function and vibrancy) identified the importance of Development Plan Documents, Area Action Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents for providing the detailed policy and guidance required to ensure that town and district centre vibrancy and function is supported and enhanced; and
Partnerships with external organisations. Identifying potential partnerships was generally used, during the assessment, as a means to enhance the effects of the Policy Directions. Some examples of partnerships that were identified include enhancements for transportation with South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive, healthcare enhancements with the Primary Care Trust and flood risk management enhancements in partnership with the Environment Agency.

8.3.3 Residual affects of the Policy Directions following mitigation and enhancement

Once the initial effects of the Policy Directions on the SA Objectives had been assessed opportunities for mitigation and enhancement measures were identified. The residual effects of the Policy Directions were then reassessed, assuming that all of the proposed mitigation or enhancement measures will be implemented successfully. This is fully documented in Appendix E.

As Figure 22 (Page 59) demonstrates, there is little difference in the residual effects of the Policy Directions when they are compared against one of the SA Objectives under each of the timeframes. For example, the medium term residual effects for all of the Policy Directions are beneficial when assessed against SA Objective 20, Community Cohesion, Involvement and Pride. This occurs because the residual effects take into account the combined effects of the proposed mitigation measures, enhancement measures and interaction with other Policy Directions (as described above). The only differences that were recorded in the assessment of residual effects occurred when the effect of the Policy Direction was predicted to be neutral, even with enhancement measures.

It is important to note that achieving these beneficial residual effects will be highly dependant upon securing and implementing the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures. If this is not possible then the magnitude of the residual effects could be reduced or could result in adverse effects occurring.
Figure 21 Appraisal of Core Strategy Policy Directions Prior to the Implementation of Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective (abbreviated)</th>
<th>Short term (0-4 years)</th>
<th>Medium term (5-9 years)</th>
<th>Long term (10 years +)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD1 PD2 PD3 PD4 PD5 PD6 PD7 PD8 PD9</td>
<td>PD1 PD2 PD3 PD4 PD5 PD6 PD7 PD8 PD9</td>
<td>PD1 PD2 PD3 PD4 PD5 PD6 PD7 PD8 PD9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Employment opportunities</td>
<td>1 0 1 1 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 1 1 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 1 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Economic Growth</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 0 1 0 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transport</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education and skills</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Creativity, innovation and sound science</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Awareness / encouragement of sustainability</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Health</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Culture and recreation</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Town / district centre function and vibrancy</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Safety and Crime</td>
<td>-1 -1 ? -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>-1 ? ? ? 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td>-2 -2 ? -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>-2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2 -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Natural Resource consumption / renewable energy</td>
<td>? -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>? -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pollution</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Flooding and climate change</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>-1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Waste</td>
<td>0 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>0 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Settlement / neighbourhood built quality</td>
<td>1 1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Integrated / efficient land use</td>
<td>? -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>? -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Landscape quality / historic assets</td>
<td>0 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Community Cohesion / involvement / pride</td>
<td>? 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 ? 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>? 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Rotherham’s external image and perceptions</td>
<td>? 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 ? 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>? 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Equality</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of all effects added together</td>
<td>3 -2 -2 -4 3 3 11 10 10</td>
<td>8 4 3 2 6 6 15 14 12</td>
<td>8 5 6 1 7 6 15 17 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a full definition of the SA Objectives see Table 6 (page 31). An explanation of the significance criteria can be found in Table 7 (page 37).
**Figure 22** Appraisal of Core Strategy Policy Directions Residual Effects After the Implementation of Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective (abbreviated)</th>
<th>Short term (0-4 years)</th>
<th>Medium term (5-9 years)</th>
<th>Long term (10 years +)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD1 PD2 PD3 PD4 PD5 PD6 PD7 PD8 PD9</td>
<td>PD1 PD2 PD3 PD4 PD5 PD6 PD7 PD8 PD9</td>
<td>PD1 PD2 PD3 PD4 PD5 PD6 PD7 PD8 PD9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Employment opportunities</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 0</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 0 2 0</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Economic Growth</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transport</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education and skills</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Creativity, innovation and sound science</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Awareness / encouragement of sustainability</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Transport</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Culture and recreation</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Town / district centre function and vibrancy</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Safety and Crime</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Biodiversity and Geodiversity</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Natural Resource consumption / renewable energy</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Pollution</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Flooding and climate change</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Waste</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Settlement / neighbourhood built quality</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Integrated / efficient land use</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Community Cohesion / involvement / pride</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Rotherham’s external image and perceptions</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Equality</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** For a full definition of the SA Objectives see Table 6 (page 31). An explanation of the significance criteria can be found in Table 7 (page 37).
8.4 Significant Effects of the Core Strategy on the Sustainability Objectives

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Objectives can be divided into three interlinked categories; economic, environmental/natural resources and social. The Core Strategy’s contribution towards these three categories is discussed below.

8.4.1 Economic – Sustainability Objectives 1 to 6

8.4.1.1 Key Sustainability Contributions
Securing sustainable economic growth is a key element of the Core Strategy and is likely to achieve this by directing economic development towards town and district centres where the greatest number of people can access the jobs and services offered by this type of development. Concentrating economic development on central locations or sector specific clusters means that growth is more likely to gain critical mass and create the conditions required stimulate competition for jobs and markets. By doing so the Core Strategy will contribute towards the conditions required for sustainable economic growth.

Another important element of the Core Strategy, for the economy of the Borough, is the creation of a hierarchy of settlements. The Core Strategy supports the role and function of the different levels of settlement in the hierarchy. It should also help to ensure that services in the key town centres do not detract and draw people away from the shops and services offered in the local and district centres and vice versa.

8.4.1.2 Key Sustainability Enhancement Opportunities
The economic performance of the Core Strategy could be improved by extending its scope to address movement and accessibility within the district centres and key town centres, rather than concentrating solely on transportation between them. This will help to enhance the way that town and district centres function by reducing physical and psychological barriers that could otherwise hinder the development of areas within district and town centres.

The Core Strategy should also aim to ensure that all development proposals meet the needs of the surrounding area and population. It should attempt to identify these needs in advance so that development can be planned and respond proactively rather than reactively. This will support the different roles and functions of local, district and town centres and should make them more viable over the medium to long term.

8.4.2 Environment and Natural Resources – Sustainability Objectives 7 to 19

8.4.2.1 Key Sustainability Contributions
The Policy Directions within the Core Strategy provide numerous safeguards to protect environmental and natural resource assets. These include; ecology, ‘geodiversity’, air quality, water quality and ground quality, heritage features, landscape character and quality and finally the built environment. In addition to this it raises issues such as flood risk and anticipating future impacts of climate change.

The Core Strategy also raises the issue of sustainable design. It promotes the sustainable use of land by directing development towards urban areas and previously developed sites. It also encourages the re-use or refurbishment of existing buildings rather than demolition. The use of sustainable and renewable resources during construction is highlighted as the minimisation of waste during construction activities as is the use of renewable sources of energy.

8.4.2.2 Key Sustainability Enhancement Opportunities
The performance of the Core Strategy against the environmental and natural resource SA Objectives can be improved in a number of ways. The concept of sustainable design could be given a higher profile. In its current format the Core Strategy contains some of the
elements of sustainable development but they do not appear as a key cross cutting issue. This could be addressed by including sustainable design as an element in its own right within the Policy Directions and would be particularly powerful if it was included under the Sustainable Communities Policy Direction. To deliver truly sustainable communities developments need to take account of all the sustainability issues addressed by the SA process and in particular sustainable design. References could also be made to sustainable development in the ‘spatial’ Policy Directions that direct the type and distribution of development within the borough. The Council could also consider setting a high level target to become a flagship authority for developing truly sustainable communities.

Flood Risk is an important issue for the Borough, through which the Rivers Don and Rother flow. In urban areas these rivers are adjacent to brownfield sites and sites that are currently in use, both of which could be developed as a consequence of the Core Strategy Policy Directions. As a result flood risk could be a significant issue. The easiest way to manage flood risk is to avoid areas at risk by developing outside of the floodplain. The Core Strategy could be enhanced by referring to this within each of the spatial Policy Directions, (PD1 to PD6).

The Core Strategy makes reference in PD 9 Community Safety and Well Being to mitigating the effects of climate change. This is likely to become an increasingly important issue as the behaviour of our climate begins to change. As a result the Core Strategy presents a major opportunity to ensure that all future development in the Borough can counteract the impacts of climate change or can be designed so that enhancements can be retrofitted in the future. The Core Strategy would benefit by reiterating the importance of making references to climate change resilience across all of the spatial development Policy Directions (PD1 to PD6) and PPS1 (Planning and Climate Change).

Safeguarding valuable biodiversity assets and areas of greenspace is addressed by the Core Strategy under Policy Direction 7 Local Heritage. However there is a major opportunity, under this Policy Direction, to promote the wider incorporation of biodiversity and ecological enhancements within developments that can provide an opportunity for this sort of enhancement. This could include small scale enhancements such as providing bat boxes, bird boxes, the use of ecologically friendly public realm design and the specification of native planting species and other enhancements. The Policy Direction could also be enhanced by promoting the role of strategic transport corridors as green corridors linking disparate habitats together and providing an amenity to local communities.

8.4.3 Social – Sustainability Objectives 20 to 22

8.4.3.1 Key Sustainability Contributions

The most significant social contribution from the Core Strategy is the aim to create ‘sustainable communities’ by ensuring that new developments can access community infrastructure and services via a range or transport modes. The Core Strategy also addresses, to a certain extent, the role and function of settlements within a settlement hierarchy. By doing so the Core Strategy ensures that the types and level of development is appropriate to the type and size of the development. It also provides a framework for addressing other social issues, such as the type and quality of housing provision in the borough. This should help to address issues such as low demand for housing.

8.4.3.2 Key Sustainability Enhancement Opportunities

The Core Strategy makes significant contributions towards equality and social cohesion by addressing accessibility to services, transportation, jobs and amenities. It also makes significant contributions to equality and social cohesion by addressing crime and safety at the design stage of developments. The profile of these contributions towards equality and community cohesion could be raised within the Core Strategy document making them more prominent.
At the implementation stage of the Core Strategy and during the development of the other plans within the LDF there is a significant opportunity to encourage and facilitate further community involvement and cohesion. Successful engagement with the communities that will be affected by, or benefit from, the proposals in DPDs, AAPs and SPDs can give those communities ownership the proposals for their area. It can also give people a sense of pride in their area and can provide the basis for bringing the community together and building community cohesion.

8.5 Cumulative Effects of the Policy Directions on all of the SA Objectives

The assessment of the cumulative effects of a plan or programme is one of the requirements of the SEA Regulations. It also helps to make the overall assessment of the plan or programme more robust and transparent.

At the level of detail addressed by the Core Strategy it is difficult to carry out a detailed and comprehensive appraisal of its cumulative effects. As a result the assessment is based on a qualitative appraisal of the Policy Directions. Potential cumulative effects of the Core Strategy are also highlighted within the main Preferred Option SA Matrices (Appendix E) in the form of the interactions between multiple Policy Directions or the Core Strategy as a whole.

The assessment process has highlighted the importance of cumulative effects for the delivery of long term economic growth and recognises that this cannot be achieved successfully if individual Policy Directions were implemented in isolation. To achieve sustainable economic growth the cumulative effects of:

- The development of sites for industrial, commercial, retail and leisure uses allowing the business economy of the Borough to grow and with it the number and variety of employment opportunities;
- Addressing existing problems in the housing market, such as in appropriate types of housing stock and areas of low demand. This should help to stimulate the housing market, thereby supporting economic growth;
- Defining the role and function of the key town, district centres and local centres also supports sustainable economic growth by ensuring that the type of development is appropriate to the catchment that it serves; and
- Improving access to all forms of transport, but non-car transport in particular. This supports wider economic growth by improving people’s accessibility to residential areas, services, jobs, shops and leisure facilities allowing them to earn more and spend more.

All of the Policy Directions that will result in development occurring, namely PD1 to PD6, have the potential to create both positive and negative cumulative effects particularly on the environmental receptors. Potentially development could occur on similar sites or habitats at the same time. This could result in species of wildlife being disturbed or displaced without anywhere nearby to move to because other alternative sites were also being developed. On their own these effects might be negligible, however when they occur in combination the cumulative effects are more significant.

There is also the potential for cumulative effects to have a beneficial effect. One example of this has been described above in the context of economic growth. This also applies to other enhancements which are listed below:

- Requiring all major developments to include ecological enhancements, such as habitat creation and the use of native plant species and species to attract insects and other wildlife. On their own these enhancements are likely to have small scale ecological
benefits. However when their effects are combined the overall cumulative impacts are much greater.

- The cumulative effects of adopting the settlement hierarchy, creating sustainable communities, removing physical barriers to movement between neighbourhoods, district centres and town centres and enhancing community safety and well being by addressing crime and safety though the design of new developments all contribute towards community cohesion.

### 8.6 Sustainability of the Core Strategy as a Whole

Over the long term the Core Strategy should provide a sustainable high level development framework, assuming that all of the Policy Directions, mitigation measures and enhancement measures are implemented successfully. It provides major long term residual benefits for:

- Employment, economic growth, transport, creative and innovative development, sustainability awareness, health, culture and recreation, biodiversity, natural resources, pollution, waste, built environment quality, integrated land use, housing, community cohesion and Rotherham’s external image.

Some sustainability issues are not addressed to the same extent by Core Strategy and as a consequence their long term effects are not as significant as those above. The reasons for this are described below:

- **Education and skills.** The Core Strategy can really only address accessibility and location of educational/skills facilities. It cannot influence how they are used or how people are encouraged to use them.

- **Safety and Crime.** The Core Strategy provides the opportunity to ensure that all future development take safety and crime into account so that the risk of them occurring is reduced. However, the extent of this effect is limited to those areas where development occurs and consequently can only benefit a limited part of the Borough.

- **Flooding and climate change.** Both are considered by the Core Strategy, however the long term effects are only minor because development can only mitigate the effects of flood risk and climate change. It does not address the route causes and is less likely to benefit existing developments and buildings.

- **Landscape quality / historic assets.** The extent of the Core Strategy’s effects on this SA objective is limited due to the small area or number of assets that it protects.

- **Equality.** The Core Strategy is good at addressing equality issues relating to accessibility to housing, employment sites, community services, shops and leisure facilities. However the significance of the effects are minor beneficial because the Core Strategy can only address this aspect of equality rather than the wider social implications of equality.

As mentioned in section 8.3.3 achieving beneficial residual effects is highly dependant upon securing and implementing the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures. The SA highlighted that in some cases these effects cannot be achieved by the Core Strategy alone and is dependant upon on other plans and parties to deliver mitigation and enhancement measures.
9 Implementation and Monitoring

9.1 Links to Other Plans and Programmes

As described in Chapter 1 the Core Strategy provides the high level strategy for future development within the Borough. As a result it will link with all the future Development Plan Documents, Area Action Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents.

The assessment of the preferred option (Policy Directions) has also highlighted potential opportunities to link with other plans that may be produced in the future, such as a sustainable development or design Supplementary Planning Document. The assessment also identifies the opportunities for the Core Strategy to link with other parties and organisations that may also be developing their own strategies and plans that will overlap with the Core Strategy.

9.2 Proposals for Monitoring Significant Effects

The Rotherham LDF General SA Scoping Report included a series of indicators to monitor each of the 22 Sustainability Appraisal objectives. Monitoring is a valuable tool in the SA process to help understand the impacts of the selected options, once they are in place over time.

The majority of the SA Indicators are aligned with existing national and regional indicators, Best Value Reporting, and the LDF Annual Monitoring Report which should make data collection resource efficient. The SA indicators should be monitored and reviewed regularly to include new or improved indicators and datasets. The Rotherham SA Indicators are outlined in Appendix B.
Appendix A
Policies, Plans and Programmes
Contents

A1 List of Documents that were Reviewed
A2 Review of Policies, Plans and Programmes
# 1 List of Documents that were Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Framework Directive (96/62/EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Biodiversity Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Noise Directive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Sixth Environment Action Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Sustainable Development Strategy (ESDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change – 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Framework Directive 92/43/EEC and daughter directives e.g.; Landfill Directive 99/31/EC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Framework Directive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of housing supply (the &quot;Barker Report&quot;.), ODPM/Treasury - Mar 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Basin Planning Strategy: Water for Life and Livelihoods (Consultation), EA - Jan 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Strategy 2004, DEFRA - Jul 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Future of Transport: A Network for 2030’ (White Paper), DfT – 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Planning Response to Climate Change, ODPM - Sep 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Biodiversity Action Plan, DEFRA – 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste not, Want not - A Strategy for tackling the waste problem in England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways for Tomorrow, DEFRA – 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Strategy for the UK. Working together for clean air, DETR - Jan 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Transport White Paper, DfT - Dec 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) Reforms – policy document available?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing the Flow - Priorities for Future Water Policy (Nov 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy White Paper, DTI - Feb 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development, ODPM – 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG2 Green Belts, ODPM - 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 3 Housing, ODPM – 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 4: Industrial, Commercial Development and Small Firms, ODPM – 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 6 Planning for Town Centers, ODPM - 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, ODPM – 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 8 Telecommunications, ODPM - 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, ODPM – 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 10 Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, ODPM – 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG13 Transport, ODPM - 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 15 Planning and The Historic Environment, ODPM - 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 16 Archaeology and Planning, ODPM – 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation, ODPM – 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 22 Renewable Energy - 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 23: Planning and Pollution Control – 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PPG 24 Planning and Noise - 1994
Draft PPS25 – Development and Flood Risk

Regional

Advancing Together: The Vision and Strategic Framework for Yorkshire and Humber, Y&HA - Feb 2004
Climate Change Action Plan for Yorkshire and the Humber (Draft), GITH/Y&HA/YF - Jan 2005
Our Region, Our Health, : A Regional Strategic Framework for Public Health in Yorkshire and the Humber, Dec 2004
Planning for Renewable Energy Targets in Yorkshire & Humber, GOYH - 2004
Pre Draft RSS Topic 4: Economy, Winter Consultation 2004/5
Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 11: Biodiversity, Winter Consultation 2004/5
Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 12 Culture, Winter Consultation 2004/5
Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 14 Education and Skills, Winter Consultation 2004/5
Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 2: Spatial Options, Winter Consultation 2004/5
Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 5b: Strategic Public Transport, Winter Consultation 2004/5
Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 7 Energy, Winter Consultation 2004/5
Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper6 CAP Reform, Winter Consultation 2004/5
Regional Cultural Strategy Action Plan 2004-06, Yorkshire Culture - 2004
Regional Economic Strategy 2003-12, YF/Y&HA - Feb 2003
Regional Employment Land Strategy, Draft Demand Assessment, Arup on behalf of Yorkshire & Humber Assembly, 2005
Regional Environment Enhancement Strategy, Y&H Regional Environment Forum - Sep 2003
Regional Forestry Strategy, Forestry Consultation Draft Commission/GOYH - July 2004
Regional Housing Strategy (draft), Y&HA - Feb 2005
Regional Spatial Strategy for Y&H (based on selective review of RPG12), Y&HA/GOYH - Dec 2004
Regional Waste Strategy, Y&HA - Jul 2003
Countryside Character Areas Volume 3. Countryside Agency (Yorkshire and Humber)
Biodiversity and Natural Environment Study, Yorks and Humber Biodiversity Forum, October 2004
Yorkshire Plan for Sport, Sport England – 2004

Sub-regional / RMBC

Equalities Impact and Needs/requirements Assessment Toolkit, 2005 INRA
RMBC Biodiversity Action Plan, Rotherham Biodiversity Forum – 2004
Rotherham Partnership Community Strategy 2005-10, - May 2005
RMBC Corporate Housing Strategy 2003-6
RMBC Cultural Strategy
RMBC Green Spaces Audit for Rotherham, RMBC - Mar 2005
RMBC Regeneration Plan 2004-07, RMBC – 2004
RMBC Retail & Leisure Study, White Young Green - Jul 2004
RMBC Sustainable Development Framework
RMBC Tourism Plan (Draft), RMBC - May 2005
RMBC Unitary Development Plan, RMBC - Jun 1999
RMBC Urban Potential Study, RMBC - Feb 2004
Rotherham Best Value Plan, 2004
Rotherham PCT Health Impact Assessment (HIA)
Rotherham Town Centre Strategic Development Framework (Phase 2), FY/Renaissance South Yorkshire, RMBC
Town Team, LDA Design - Feb 2005
SA Framework Rural Regeneration, 2002 Arup, RMBC, Countryside Agency
South and West Yorkshire Multi-Modal Study - Final Report, Government Office for Y&H & MVA Ltd – 2002
South Yorkshire Forest Plan 2002, South Yorkshire Forest – 2002
South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan – Update, SYPTA/SY Local Authority – 2004
South Yorkshire Settlement Study (The “Babtie Study”), Jacobs Babtie - May 2005
South Yorkshire Spatial Strategy Vision, South Yorkshire Partnership - Nov 2004
Transform South Yorkshire Prospectus (Draft), Transform South Yorkshire - Jun 2005
Don and Rother Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS), EA 2003.
Don Flood Risk Management Strategy, EA.
## 2 Review of Policies, Plans and Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Framework Directive (96/62/EC)</td>
<td>The Directive seeks to define and establish objectives for ambient air quality to avoid, reduce or prevent harmful effects on human health and the environment as a whole</td>
<td>Prescribe limit values for certain pollutants that all member states must meet. These targets must be adopted into UK legislation.</td>
<td>Plan policies should support the objectives of the directive and consider the impact that planning decisions have on air quality.</td>
<td>Reflect objectives of the directive in the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Biodiversity Strategy</td>
<td>Aims to anticipate, prevent and attack the causes of significant reduction or loss of biodiversity at the source. A range of objectives is identified under four themes: i) conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity; ii) sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources; iii) research, identification and monitoring of information; and iv) education, training and awareness.</td>
<td>No specific targets identified</td>
<td>No direct implications</td>
<td>Key European Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Noise Directive</td>
<td>The four main objectives of the Directive are: i) monitor the environmental problem by drawing up strategic noise maps; ii) informing and consulting the public about noise exposure, its effects and the measures considered to address noise; iii) addressing local noise issues by requiring authorities to draw up action plans to reduce noise where necessary and maintain environmental noise where it is good; vi) developing a long term EU strategy.</td>
<td>The Directive states that Member States must draw up action plan to manage noise issues and effects, including noise reduction by 18th July 2008. However, the Directive does not set ‘ideal’ noise limits or targets to be met by 2008.</td>
<td>This Directive applies to environmental noise to which humans are exposed in particular in built-up areas, in public parks or other quiet areas in an agglomeration, in quiet areas in open country, near schools, hospitals and other noise sensitive buildings and areas. Therefore plan policies should support the objectives of the directives.</td>
<td>Reflect objectives of the directives in the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Sixth Environment Action Programme</td>
<td>The Sixth Environmental Action Programme sets the environmental objectives and priorities that will be an integral part of the European Community’s strategy for sustainable development. Over the next 5 to 10 years it aims to tackle issues relating to: i) Climate Change - to stabilise the atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases at a level that will not cause unnatural variations of the earth’s climate.</td>
<td>Plan policies should support the objectives of the directives.</td>
<td>Reflect objectives of the directives in the SA framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Nature and Biodiversity - to protect and restore the functioning of natural systems and halt the loss of biodiversity in the European Union and globally. To protect soils against erosion and pollution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Natural Environment and Health and Quality of Life - to achieve a quality of the environment where the levels of man – made contaminants, including different types of radiation, do not give rise to significant impacts on or risks to human health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Natural Resources and Waste - to ensure the consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources does no exceed the carrying capacity of the environment. To achieve a de-coupling of resource use from economic growth through significantly improved resource efficiency, dematerialization of the economy, and waste prevention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP)</td>
<td>ESDP considers that there are strong links and impacts from urban development and spatial organisation on sustainable development, as well as on environmental quality, energy consumption, mobility, health and quality of life. The ESDP put forward three spatial policy guidelines; i) Development of a balanced and polycentric urban system and a new urban-rural relationship; ii) Securing parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge; and iii) Sustainable development, prudent management and production of nature and cultural heritage.</td>
<td>The ESDP does not contain targets but sets a number of guiding principles: i) policies and decision with implications for spatial development must not have negative impacts on sustainable development; ii) Spatial planning should balance public interest between the objectives of social cohesion and sustainability and need of competitiveness and market imperatives; iii) conservation of the rich diversity of European territory is paramount; and iv) spatial planning should be a tool for combating local and global climate change.</td>
<td>Mainly relevant at national and regional scale</td>
<td>Mainly relevant at national and regional scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Sustainable Development Strategy (ESDS)</td>
<td>The ESDS focuses on four key-priorities: i) limiting climate change and increasing the use of clean energy; ii) addressing threats to public health; iii) managing natural resources more responsibly; and iv) improving the transport system and land use</td>
<td>The ESDS sets a number of headline indicators to meet its priorities. These are i) Limit climate change and increase the use of clean energy - The EU will meet its Kyoto commitment. ii) Address threats to public health - Make food safety and quality the objective of all players in the food chain. - By 2020, ensure that chemicals are only produced and used in ways that do not pose significant threats to human health and the environment. - Tackle issues related to outbreaks of infectious diseases and resistance to antibiotics.</td>
<td>Mainly relevant at national and regional scale</td>
<td>Mainly relevant at national and regional scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change - 1999</td>
<td>The ultimate objective of the Convention is “to achieve stabilization of atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases at levels that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic (human-induced) interference with the climate system.”</td>
<td>Does not include any targets</td>
<td>Mainly relevant at national and regional scale</td>
<td>Mainly relevant at national and regional scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Framework Directive 92/43/EEC and daughter directives e.g.; Landfill Directive 99/31/EC</td>
<td>Waste production should be minimized through the promotion of clean technology and reusable or recyclable products. Where the possible secondary raw materials should be recovered from waste by recycling, reuse and reclamation or any other process, as well as used to produce energy. Waste should be managed with minimal environmental impact.</td>
<td>Advocates the use of a waste hierarchy – Reduce, reuse and recycle</td>
<td>Implications for general waste management policies and also policies relating specifically to the waste energy facility.</td>
<td>Reflect objectives of the directives in the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Framework Directive</td>
<td>Promote sustainable water use based on a long-term protection of available water resources; Contribute to mitigating the effects of floods and droughts; Ensure the progressive reduction of pollution of groundwater and prevent its further pollution.</td>
<td>All inland and coastal waters to reach good ecological and chemical status by 2015. By 2010 ensure adequate contribution from key sectors to the recovery of costs of water services. Initial characterisation maps have been completed for some water bodies in Rotherham.</td>
<td>Plan policies to support overall objectives and requirements of the Directive. Note characterisation map availability.</td>
<td>Reflect objectives of the directives in the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of housing supply (the “Barker Report”), ODPM/Treasury - Mar 2004</td>
<td>Objectives of the review were to: 1. Achieve improvements in housing affordability in the market sector 2. a more stable housing market 3. location of housing supply which supports patterns of economic development; and 4. an adequate supply of publicly funded housing for those who need it. The review makes a number of recommendations for improving the</td>
<td>No targets or indicators featured in the report</td>
<td>The recommendations of the Barker Report have been considered in review of national Planning Policy Statements which have a bearing on the LDF.</td>
<td>Housing issues and affordability should feature in the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Basin Planning Strategy: Water for Life and Livelihoods (Consultation), EA - Jan 2005</td>
<td>The strategy is the current thinking on how to implement key parts of the Water Framework Directive. The objectives of the directive are: Reduce pollution, prevent deterioration and improve health of aquatic ecosystems. Promote the sustainable use of water. Help reduce the effects of floods and drought. Objectives of the Strategy are: Create a more integrated, long-term approach to river basin planning and management Work closely with partners and provide increased opportunity for stakeholder involvement. Aim to achieve environmental, social and economic benefits concurrently.</td>
<td>Publish River Basin Management Plans by the end of 2009 Ensure appropriate reference to the Water Framework Directive in Planning Policy Statements</td>
<td>Direct regulation of abstraction from and emission to the water environment. Economic instruments – taxes, grants and incentives. New emphasis on collaborative agreements – land use planning and regeneration policies. Links between land use planning and River Basin Management Planning</td>
<td>Must address the requirements of the Strategy and Water Framework Directive for integrated, long-term approach and environmental, social and economic benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Strategy 2004, DEFRA - Jul 2004</td>
<td>The strategy reviews the Rural White Paper, 2000 after the creation of Defra in 2001. It sets out a new devolved and targeted approach to rural policy and delivery over the next 3-5 years. There are three priorities for rural policy: Economic and social regeneration – supporting enterprise across rural England but targeting greater resources at areas of greatest need. Social justice for all – tackling rural social exclusion and providing fair access to services and opportunities. Enhancing the value of our countryside – protecting the natural environment</td>
<td>Reduce the gap in productivity by 2008, demonstrating progress by 2006. Improve accessibility of services for rural people. Production of a second generation Local Public Service Agreement. Provide affordable housing Make the countryside more accessible and promote sustainable tourism.</td>
<td>There will be a new PPS on sustainable development in rural areas including: Social inclusion. Effective protection and enhancement of the environment. Prudent use of natural resources. High and stable levels of economic growth and employment. There will be a new Integrated Agency for conserving and enhancing resources of nature together with realizing social and economic benefits for people.</td>
<td>Strategic priorities for creating Sustainable Communities apply equally in rural and urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW)</td>
<td>Extends the public’s ability to enjoy the countryside whilst providing safeguards for landowners and occupiers. Created a new statutory right of access and modernised the rights of way system. Gives greater protection to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs).</td>
<td>LDF and SA should reflect Local Authority’s duty to prepare a Rights of Way Improvement Plan.</td>
<td>Plan policies should assist promotion of access to countryside and rights of way network.</td>
<td>Plan policies should assist promotion of access to countryside and rights of way network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving Lives: Our Healthier Nation White Paper, DoH - 1999</td>
<td>Strategy is largely an Action plan for tackling poor health and improving the health of everyone in England, especially the worst off. Addresses inequality with a range of initiatives on education, welfare to work, housing, neighbourhoods, transport and the environment, By 2010: reduce the death rate from cancer in people under 75</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan policies should support the provision of health care facilities where appropriate.</td>
<td>Consider sustainability objectives that aim to improve human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Future of Transport: A Network for 2030&quot; (White Paper), DfT - 2004</td>
<td>Advocates taking a long term view of transport issues.</td>
<td>The Vision for 2030 is: 1. the road network providing a more reliable and freer flowing services for both personal travel and freight, with people able to make informed choices about how and when they travel; 2. the rail network providing a fast, reliable and efficient service, particularly for interurban journeys and commuting into large urban areas; 3. bus services that are reliable, flexible, convenient and tailored to local needs; 4. making walking and cycling a real alternative for local trips; and 5. ports and airports providing international and domestic links.</td>
<td>Plan policies should support the aim to take a long term view of transport issues</td>
<td>Consider including a sustainability objective relating to transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Planning Response to Climate Change, ODPM - Sep 2004</td>
<td>Provides planning professionals with an overview of current thinking and state of knowledge on planning response to climate change. It aims to stimulate planners to look for new strategies to respond to climate change in partnership with developers and the wider community. It aims to strengthen policies that will mitigate and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>Local Planning Authorities must be familiar with the UK’s commitment to its climate change programme. They should be actively involved in regional climate change studies. LPA’s should consider identifying areas at risk of flooding an unstable land on the LDF. Recognise the availability of water resources in formulating development plans. Include climate change sensitive policies on biodiversity and landscape. Set a context in which there is less need for travel. Set out a framework for minimizing greenhouse gas emission from waste management. Consider an integrated framework for climate sensitive built developments.</td>
<td>Climate change sensitive development checklist sets out the role of SA and Environmental Appraisal in assessing development plans, LDFs RPGs and RSSs for climate change considerations.</td>
<td>Climate change sensitive development checklist sets out the role of SA and EA in assessing development plans, LDFs RBGs and RSSs for climate change considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UK Government Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Living Within Environmental Limits - Respecting the limits of the planet’s environment, resources and biodiversity – to improve our environment and ensure that the natural resources needed for life are available for future generations.</td>
<td>The Strategy introduces a set of high-level indicators; the UK Framework Indicators to give an overview of sustainable development and priority areas shared.</td>
<td>The LDF will have to take into account the Key Objectives and targets of</td>
<td>All aspects of this strategy must be reflected fully within</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Plan, Policy or Programme

**Strategy: Securing the Future, DTI - Mar 2005**

- **Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA**: Unimpaired and remain so for future generations.
- **Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA**: Across the UK, there will also be a mix of indicators, targets and performance measures in the individual strategies for the UK Government, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.
- **Implications for LDF**: The Strategy states that it must be implemented by working across departmental boundaries and through all levels of government. Development must be focused on long-term solutions, ensuring we get the full environmental, social and economic dividend for money spent. This Strategy is the highest level plan for sustainable development.
- **Implications for SA**: The appraisal process.

**UK Biodiversity Action Plan, DEFRA - 1994**

- **Objective** - Promotion of waterways, encouraging their use and development.
- **Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA**: Describes a vision for managing waste and resources better. Sets out changes needed to deliver more sustainable development.
- **Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA**: Key targets include; reducing industrial and commercial waste sent to landfill 85% of 1998 levels by 2005. Recycle or compost 25% of household waste by 2005, 30% of household waste by 2010 and 33% by 2013. Restrict the amount of biodegradable municipal waste sent to landfill.
- **Implications for LDF**: Waste management strategy to be incorporated into waste policies within the SDF.
- **Implications for SA**: SA will include indicator on minimization of waste. Will also need indicators on re-use, recycling and recovery of waste as well, to demonstrate the movement away from disposal.

**Waste Not, Want Not - A Strategy for tackling the waste problem in England**

- Provides a robust and long-term economic and regulatory framework for waste management.
- **Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA**: Provide a robust and long-term economic and regulatory framework for waste management. Invest in new waste facilities and a package of measures to boost the progress on sustainable waste management. Provide additional funding accompanied by radical reform of delivery structures.
- **Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA**: Slow waste growth from 3% to 2% per annum. Boost the national recycling rates to at least 45% by 2015. Divert significant amounts of waste from landfill. Increase choice for industry, Local Authorities and households over how waste is managed. Stimulate innovation in waste treatment. Reduce damage to the environment while increasing resource productivity.
- **Implications for LDF**: Waste management strategy to be incorporated into waste policies within the SDF.
- **Implications for SA**: SA will include indicator on minimization of waste. Will also need indicators on re-use, recycling and recovery of waste as well, to demonstrate the movement away from disposal.


- Provides an integrated strategy for tackling the waste problem in England and Wales.
- **Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA**: Provides a coherent framework for tackling the waste problem in England and Wales.
- **Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA**: Slow waste growth from 3% to 2% per annum. Boost the national recycling rates to at least 45% by 2015. Divert significant amounts of waste from landfill. Increase choice for industry, Local Authorities and households over how waste is managed. Stimulate innovation in waste treatment. Reduce damage to the environment while increasing resource productivity.
- **Implications for LDF**: Waste management strategy to be incorporated into waste policies within the SDF.
- **Implications for SA**: SA will include indicator on minimization of waste. Will also need indicators on re-use, recycling and recovery of waste as well, to demonstrate the movement away from disposal.

**Waterways for Tomorrow, DEFRA - 2000**

- **Objective** - Promotion of waterways, encouraging their use and development.
- **Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA**: Promote the use of inland waterways in encouraging a modern, integrated and sustainable approach to their use. Maximise the opportunities the waterways offer for.
- **Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA**: Useful in context of regeneration Masterplan, as well as plan policies for regeneration, leisure and.
- **Implications for LDF**: Assessment of opportunities provided by waterways is.
- **Implications for SA**: The appraisal process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with the Grain of Nature: A Biodiversity Strategy for England, DEFRA - 2002</td>
<td>The Strategy builds on the Biodiversity Action Plan, 1994 and aims to embed biodiversity in policy, decisions and society as a whole. It addresses the following issues; Agriculture – encouraging the management of farmland and agricultural land so as to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Water – whole catchment approach to wise, sustainable use of water and wetlands. Woodland – management and extension of woodland to promote enhance biodiversity and quality of life. Marine and Coastal Management – to achieve sustainable use and management of coasts and seas using natural processes and ecosystem based approaches. Urban areas – biodiversity needs to become part of development policy on sustainable communities, urban green space and the built environment.</td>
<td>Strategy aim to provide biodiversity considerations are embedded in all sections of public policy. Sets out key species for concern in different environments. Aims to bring 95% of SSSI’s into favourable condition by 2010 Aims to reverse the decline of farmland birds.</td>
<td>recreation, tourism, heritage and culture, natural environment and transport.</td>
<td>important in terms of impact across a broad spectrum of topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Strategy for the UK. Working together for clean air, DETR - Jan 2000</td>
<td>Aims to improve and protect ambient air quality in the UK in the medium-term. Sets objectives for 8 main air pollutants to protect health. Performance against these objectives will be regularly monitored</td>
<td>Contains a number of national air quality targets that were updated by DEFRA in Aug 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Transport White Paper, DfT - Dec 2003</td>
<td>Significant growth at many airports in the North of England is anticipated and supported. Additional terminal capacity and a runway extension at Leeds Bradford Airport are supported, but should be accompanied by measures to minimise and mitigate noise impacts and improve access developments in relation to Doncaster – Finningley and Sheffield will be determined through the normal regional and local planning processes. White paper states that Humberside airport should be encouraged to attract as much traffic as it can. Environmental Impacts – At the local level, decisions about the amount and location of future airport capacity must properly reflect environmental concerns</td>
<td>Local controls should manage the environmental impact of aviation and airport development so that: • Noise impacts are limited, and where possible reduced over time • Local air quality is maintained within legal limits across all relevant pollutants in order to protect human health and the wider environment • Loss of landscape and built heritage is avoided wherever possible, and otherwise minimised and mitigated to the greatest extent possible • All relevant water quality and other mandatory environmental standards are met • Surface access to airports is designed to help limit local environmental impacts • Impacts on biodiversity, such as disturbance of habitats and species, are minimised.</td>
<td>There are no airports within Rotherham Borough, however both Sheffield City Airport and Robin Hood airport are within close proximity. Therefore the LDF should have regard to White Paper, in particular where development in Rotherham could impact on Robin Hood Airport (i.e. travel from Rotherham to the airport)</td>
<td>Reflect objectives of the White Paper in the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) Reforms – policy document available?</td>
<td>Agenda 2000 (the last CAP reform agreement): • Further reduction in intervention support • Introduced the Rural Development Regulation 2004 Reforms:</td>
<td>Reform will happen by: • Taking away the incentive to ‘farm for the subsidy’ – via decoupling • Committing the farmer to environmental stewardship – via cross compliance • Maintaining some form of income support – via</td>
<td>The implications of the CAP Reform should be reflected and potentially managed in the LDF. The implications could include:</td>
<td>Reflect implications of CAP Reform in SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing the Flow -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities for Future</td>
<td>• Encourage farmers to produce what</td>
<td>the single farm payment (SFP) Divert part of</td>
<td>- The removal of the</td>
<td>The SA should have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Policy (Nov 2002)</td>
<td>the market wants, getting away from</td>
<td>farmers SFP to rural development funds – via</td>
<td>incentive to overgraze</td>
<td>regard to the issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘farming for subsidies’</td>
<td>modulation</td>
<td>could lead to an increase</td>
<td>raised in Directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remove the environmentally negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>in fallow land</td>
<td>the Flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve and provide encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for more sustainable farming practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide more money for rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sets out what the priorities for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policy on water should be in England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over the longer term. These include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prudent use of water resources and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keeping its use within the limits of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>its replenishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tackling agricultural and urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diffuse pollution of water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Achieving better integration between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>water and other policies and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between different aspects of water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The document sets out a number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>priorities for water but these mainly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outline future actions and strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rather than targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The document highlights how the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following issues can have an impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on water: Agriculture and fisheries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can impact on water quality,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management, demand and flood risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land use changes can impact on water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and water treatment services by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affecting levels of demand,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affecting the nature of the demand,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affecting urban diffuse pollution and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affecting flood risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate change will affect the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>availability of fresh water. Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temperatures will increase evaporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy White Paper, DTI - Feb 2003</td>
<td>White Paper proposes to ensure that a strategic approach to energy is developed and implemented in each region. It is based on four goals: 1. Cut the UK’s carbon dioxide emissions by 80% by 2050, 2. Maintain the reliability of energy supplies, 3. Promote competitive markets and 4. Ensure every home is adequately and affordably heated.</td>
<td>Nobody in Britain should be living in fuel poverty by 2016-18 More diverse energy system by 2020. Achieve carbon cuts of between 15-25 million tonnes of carbon in 2020 UK has a Kyoto Protocol commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5% below 1990 levels by 2008-12. Seek to make households more energy efficient by encouraging use of most energy efficient condensing boilers, insulating 4.5 million cavity walls, installing an extra 100 million energy saving lights by 2005, improve standards of household appliances and revision of building regulations to improve the energy efficiency standards of new build properties. Renewable should supply 10% of UK electricity in 2010.</td>
<td>LDF needs to take account of government long term aspirations and targets</td>
<td>The SA needs to take account of the long term aspirations and targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Space for Water: Taking Forward a Government Strategy for Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk</td>
<td>The government is trying to implement a more holistic approach to managing flood and coastal erosion. It takes into account all sources of flooding, embedding flood and coastal risk management across a range of government policies and reflecting other relevant government policies in policies and operations of flood and coastal erosion risk management. It aims to manage risks by employing an integrated</td>
<td>Progress stakeholder engagement at all levels of decision making. Revise risk management and scheme appraisal</td>
<td>Flood risk assessment will become a more important part of planning policies. There will be increased emphasis on integrated systems and multi-</td>
<td>Implementation of sustainable building codes Integration of schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management in England. First Government Response, DEFRA March 2005</td>
<td>portfolio of approaches which reflect both national and local priorities to - reduce threat to people and their property - deliver the greatest environmental, social and economic benefit consistent with government sustainable development principles.</td>
<td>guidance. Complete revision of PPG25 into PSS format. Add flood risk assessment question into Standard Planning Application. Make Environment Agency a Statutory Consultee. Incorporate sustainable buildings code Increase the use of multi-objective schemes in rural areas Undertake pilot studies for integrated urban drainage</td>
<td>objective schemes. The EA will become a more significant consultee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The Historic Environment: A Force for Our Future’, DCMS 2001.</td>
<td>Government’s vision for a future in which: - public interest in the historic environment is matched by firm leadership, effective partnerships, and the development of a sound knowledge base from which to develop policies; - the full potential of the historic environment as a learning resource is realised; - the historic environment is protected and sustained for the benefit of our own and future generations; - the historic environment’s importance as an economic asset is skillfully harnessed;</td>
<td>Reaffirms commitments established in PPGs 15 and 16 (see below).</td>
<td>Reaffirms commitments established in PPGs 15 and 16 (see below).</td>
<td>Reaffirms commitments established in PPGs 15 and 16 (see below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development, ODPM – 2005</td>
<td>Sustainable development is identified as the key principle underlying planning. Planning is charged with addressing sustainable development through: – making suitable land available for development in line with economic, social and environmental objectives to improve people’s quality of life; – contributing to sustainable economic development; – protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment, the quality and character of the countryside, and existing communities; – ensuring high quality development through good and inclusive design, and the efficient use of resources; and, – ensuring that development supports existing communities and contributes to the creation of safe, sustainable, livable and mixed communities with good access to jobs and key services for all members of the community.</td>
<td>No specific target</td>
<td>Key policy context More effective community involvement is a key element of the Government’s planning reforms</td>
<td>Check that the government’s aims for sustainable development are reflected in the sustainability appraisal framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PPG2 Green Belts, ODPM – 1995 | The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The purposes of Green Belts include:  
- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;  
- to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;  
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and  
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. | No specific target | The open land around Rotherham is protected within the South and West Yorkshire Green Belt. | |
| PPG 3 Housing, ODPM – 2000 | Prioritise the re-use of previously-developed land (including empty buildings and conversions) within urban areas, in preference to greenfield sites.  
Make more efficient use of land by reviewing planning policies and standards.  
Provide greater choice and a better mix in the size, type and location of housing.  
Plan to meet the housing requirements of the whole community, including those in need of affordable and special needs housing. | 60% of additional housing to be provided on previously developed land or through conversions. | Compare plan target for delivery of housing on previously developed land with national target.  
Plan policies to promote redevelopment of Brownfield sites in preference to Greenfield.  
Plan policies should provide for a mix of housing types, including affordable housing, to meet the needs of the local population. | Check that the requirements of national planning guidance are reflected in the sustainability appraisal framework. |
| PPG 4: Industrial, Commercial Development and Small Firms, ODPM – 1992 | One of the Government's key aims is to encourage continued economic development in a way which is compatible with its stated environmental objectives.  
PPG 4 requires that development plans contain clear land-use and locational policies for different types of industrial and commercial development and positive policies to provide for the needs of small businesses.  
Mixed uses are encouraged where appropriate in scale of development, the nature of the use of the site and location. | Through the LDF planning authorities should ensure that there is sufficient land available which is readily capable of development and well served by infrastructure. They should also ensure that there is a variety of sites available to meet differing needs.  
The LDF should identify areas of under-used or vacant urban land and indicate their appropriate alternative uses, including industrial and commercial uses. | The SA must balance the importance of industrial and commercial development with that of maintaining and improving environmental quality. |
| PPS 8 Planning for Town Centers, ODPM – 2005 | The Government’s key objectives for town centres is to promote their vitality and viability by planning for growth and development of existing centres and promoting and enhancing existing centres by focusing development in such centres and encouraging a wide range of services in a good environment, accessible to all.  
The main town centre uses are: retail, leisure and entertainment, offices, arts, culture and tourism. Housing will also be important as an | A sequential test must be applied to any proposals to develop main town centre uses outside of existing town centre designations. | The LDF should implement the government’s objectives by  
- developing a hierarchy and network of centres;  
- assess the need for further main town centre uses. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>element of mixed use schemes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>uses and ensure there is capacity to accommodate them; - focus development in existing centres and identify appropriate sites for development; and - promote town centre management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, ODPM – 2004</td>
<td>Key national objectives: To raise the quality of life and the environment in rural areas through the promotion of: - thriving, inclusive and sustainable rural communities; - sustainable economic growth and diversification; - good quality, sustainable development that respects local distinctiveness and the intrinsic qualities of the countryside; and - a high level of protection for our most valued landscapes and environmental resources. To promote more sustainable patterns of development and support an urban renaissance; To make sustainable improvements in the economic performance of all English regions and, over the long term, reduce the persistent gap in growth rates within and between the regions; To promote sustainable, diverse and adaptable agriculture sectors.</td>
<td>No specific targets</td>
<td>Develop plan policies in line with national planning guidance on Sustainable Development in Rural Areas. Check that the requirements of national planning guidance are reflected in the sustainability appraisal framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 8 Telecommunications, ODPM - 2001</td>
<td>Overall objective is to facilitate the growth of new communications systems in order to provide people with a wider choice, while protecting human health and keeping environmental impact to a minimum.</td>
<td>No specific targets</td>
<td>Develop plan policies in line with national planning guidance on planning and telecommunications. Plan policies should consider the location of new communication systems. Check that the requirements of national planning guidance are reflected in the sustainability appraisal framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, ODPM – 2005</td>
<td>The Government’s objectives for conserving and enhancing biological diversity are to promote sustainable development, conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of England’s wildlife and geology and contribute to rural renewal and urban renaissance by enhancing biodiversity in green spaces and ensuring that developments take account of the role and value of biodiversity.</td>
<td>No specific targets</td>
<td>Consider impact of any development on designated protected sites, species and areas of nature conservation interest. Local plans should identify relevant international, national and local nature and geological conservation interests. They should ensure the protection and enhancement of those biological and geological diversity are conserved and enhanced as an integral part of social,</td>
<td>Check that the requirements of national planning guidance are reflected in the sustainability appraisal framework. Ensure that biological and geological diversity are conserved and enhanced as an integral part of social,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 10 Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, ODPM – 2005</td>
<td>The overall government policy on waste is to protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible. The government aims to break the link between economic growth and the environmental impact of waste.</td>
<td>Guidance on sustainable waste management, and criteria for siting facilities.</td>
<td>Interests as an integral part of development is properly provided for in development and land-use policies.</td>
<td>Environmental and economic development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PPG13 Transport, ODPM - 2001 | - Promote more sustainable transport choices for people and freight  
- Promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, cycling and walking  
- Reduce the need to travel, especially by car  
- Locate new development in places which can be served by public transport.  

Develop plan policies in line with national planning guidance on transport, which states that when preparing development plans local authorities should:  
1. actively manage the pattern of urban growth to make the fullest use of public transport, and focus major generators of travel demand in city, town and district centres and near to major public transport interchanges;  
2. locate day to day facilities which need to be near their clients in local centres so that they are accessible by walking and cycling;  
3. accommodate housing principally within existing urban areas, planning for increased intensity of development for both housing and other uses at locations which are highly accessible by public transport, walking and cycling;  
4. ensure that development comprising jobs, shopping, leisure and services offers a realistic choice of access by public transport, walking, and cycling, recognising that this may be less achievable in some rural areas;  
5. in rural areas, locate most development for housing, jobs, shopping, leisure and services in local service centres which are designated in the development plan to act as focal points for housing, transport and other services, and encourage better transport provision in the countryside;  
6. ensure that strategies in the development and local transport planning complement each other and that consideration of development plan | No specific targets | “See Key Objectives”  
Develop plan policies in line with national planning guidance on transport, | Check that the requirements of national planning guidance are reflected in the sustainability appraisal framework. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allocations and local transport investment and priorities are closely linked; 7. use parking policies, alongside other planning and transport measures, to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce reliance on the car for work and other journeys; 8. give priority to people over ease of traffic movement and plan to provide more road space to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport in town centres, local neighbourhoods and other areas with a mixture of land uses; 9. ensure that the needs of disabled people as pedestrians, public transport users and motorists - are taken into account in the implementation of planning policies and traffic management schemes, and in the design of individual developments; consider how best to reduce crime and the fear of crime, and seek by the design and layout of developments and areas, to secure community safety and road safety; and 10. protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choices for both passenger and freight movements.</td>
<td>No specific targets</td>
<td>Plan policies should seek to protect and enhance the historic environment.</td>
<td>Requirements of national planning guidance should be reflected in SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 15 Planning and The Historic Environment, ODPM - 1994</td>
<td>National policy outlines the role of the planning system in the protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment, by regulating the development and use of land whilst reconciling the need for economic growth with the need to protect the natural and historic environment.</td>
<td>No specific targets</td>
<td>Plan policies should seek to protect and enhance archaeological remains.</td>
<td>Requirements of national planning guidance should be reflected in SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 16 Archaeology and Planning, ODPM – 1990</td>
<td>National guidance states that where nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings, are affected by proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. Cases involving archaeological remains of lesser importance will not always be so clear cut and planning authorities will need to weigh the relative importance of archaeology against other factors including the need for the proposed development.</td>
<td>No specific targets</td>
<td>Plan policies should seek to protect and enhance archaeological remains.</td>
<td>Requirements of national planning guidance should be reflected in SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation, ODPM – 2002</td>
<td>Government objectives for open space, sport and recreation are as follows: Supporting an urban renaissance – creating local networks of high quality and well managed and maintained open spaces, sports and recreational facilities. Supporting a rural renewal - the countryside can provide opportunities for recreation and visitors can play an important role in the regeneration of the economies of rural areas. Promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion - well planned and maintained open spaces and recreational facilities can improve people's sense of well being in the place they live and act as a focal point for community activities.</td>
<td>No specific targets</td>
<td>Develop plan policies in line with national planning guidance open space, sport and recreation. Consider the baseline for the quantity and quality of open space and range of types of open space and include relevant policies to ensure open spaces are attractive and accessible to all. Note benefits that greenspace can provide for biodiversity.</td>
<td>Check that the requirements of national planning guidance are reflected in the sustainability appraisal framework. Consider sustainability objectives that aim to improve the amount and quality of open space in the city. Note benefits that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and well being - open spaces, sports and recreational facilities have a vital role to play in promoting healthy living and preventing illness, and in the social development of children of all ages. Promoting more sustainable development - by ensuring that open space, sports and recreational facilities are easily accessible by walking and cycling and that more heavily used sports and recreational facilities are well served by public transport.</td>
<td>The Government has set a target to generate 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010 and 20% by 2020.</td>
<td>Develop plan policies in line with national planning guidance on Renewable energy. Consider how the plan can contribute to national targets. Plan policies should promote energy efficiency. Policies should promote the use of renewable energy and may include a certain percentage of energy in new developments to come from on-site renewable energy schemes.</td>
<td>Greenspace can provide for biodiversity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 22 Renewable Energy - 2004</td>
<td>The Government’s policy on renewable energy will contribute to sustainable development objectives by ensuring: - social progress which recognises the needs of everyone; - effective protection of the environment; - prudent use of natural resources; and - maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment. Government objectives in relation to renewable energy are set out in full in the Energy White Paper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 23: Planning and Pollution Control – 2004</td>
<td>In accordance with national policies, the Government expects LPAs to adopt a strategic approach to integrate their land use planning processes with plans and strategies for the control, mitigation and removal of pollution, as far as it is possible and practicable to do so. The overall aim of planning and pollution control policy is to ensure the sustainable and beneficial use of land (and in particular encouraging reuse of previously developed land in preference to greenfield sites). Within this aim, polluting activities that are necessary for society and the economy should be so sited and planned, and subject to such planning conditions, that their adverse effects are minimised and contained to within acceptable limits. Opportunities should be taken wherever possible to use the development process to assist and encourage the remediation of land already affected by contamination.</td>
<td>Plan policies will need to take account of national guidance in terms of decisions on specific developments, and broad spatial policy in terms of minimizing pollution levels.</td>
<td>Requirements of national planning guidance should be reflected in SA framework. This is particularly important for transport assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 24 Planning and Noise - 1994</td>
<td>The planning system should ensure that, wherever practicable, noise-sensitive developments are separated from major sources of noise (such as road, rail and air transport and certain types of industrial development). It is equally important that new development involving</td>
<td>No specific targets</td>
<td>Develop plan policies in line with national planning guidance on planning and noise.</td>
<td>Requirements of national planning guidance should be reflected in SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG25 Development and Flood Risk, ODPM – 2000</td>
<td>Government policy is to reduce the risks to people and the developed and natural environment from flooding. National guidance sets out the following requirements for LPAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recognising that the susceptibility of land to flooding is a material planning consideration;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- giving appropriate weight to information on flood-risk and how it might be affected by climate change;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- consulting the Environment Agency;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- applying the precautionary principle to decision-making so that risk is avoided where possible and managed elsewhere;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- improving the information available to the public;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- taking into account the responsibility of owners for safeguarding their own property as far as is reasonably practicable;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recognising that flood plains and washlands have a natural role as a form of flood defence as well as providing important wildlife habitats and adding to landscape value; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recognising that engineered flood reduction measures may not always be the appropriate solution, since they can have economic and environmental costs, impacts on the natural and built environment, need maintenance and replacement and cannot eliminate all risk of flooding.</td>
<td>No specific targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- more strategic approach to flood risk and development: need to consider flood risk at earliest stage of planning process, embed it into plans and strategies, and thereby provide certainty to development proposals;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- more robust/comprehensive guidance on flood risk assessment;</td>
<td>No specific targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Flood Risk Assessments (RFRA) by Regional Planning Bodies (RPBs); Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) by local planning bodies (LPAs) with link to catchment flood management plans; site specific FRA by developers for planning applications</td>
<td>• clarified ‘sequential test’: simplification/reduction of high risk flood zones into 3a (high probability) and 3b (functional flood plain), and classification of vulnerability of development types (within different flood zones) to provide greater clarity in matching development to the degree of flood risk concerned • new ‘exceptions test’: provision of 4 sets of criteria to be applied as early as possible where there are no lower risk sites suitable for development (i.e. development only to be permitted in high flood risk areas where it: contributes to sustainable communities; is located on brownfield land where possible; site-specific FRA shows that the risks are acceptable/manageable; development contributes to reducing or managing the flood risk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advancing Together: The Vision and Strategic Framework for Yorkshire and Humber, Y&HA - Feb 2004**

Advancing Together has 6 relevant objectives:

1. Y & H will have a world class prosperous and sustainable economy
2. Y & H will have physical infrastructure and communications that meet the needs of people, businesses, places and the environment
3. Y & H will have high quality natural and man-made environments
4. Y & H will have exceptional education and training, widespread learning and skills and a healthy labour market without skills gaps or shortages
5. Y & H will be a socially cohesive and inclusive region. Our people will have the capacity, resources and equitable access to quality services needed to live well
6. Y & H will possess and portray the highest standards of governance at all levels and the highest levels of civic participation in decision-making and community life

Advancing Together has 32 indicators that cover all these objectives:

1. Economic growth
2. Productivity
3. Enterprise
4. Innovation
5. Investment
6. Employment
7. Rural Economy
8. Traffic Volume
9. Transport Use
10. Housing Completions
11. Housing Affordability
12. Land Re-use
13. Air Quality
14. Water Quality
15. Biodiversity
16. Waste
17. Emissions
18. Energy Consumption
19. Young People’s Education & Skills
20. Basic Skills
21. IT Skills
22. Workforce Skills and Training
23. Higher Level Skills
24. Deprivation
25. Health

Advancing Together objectives will be fully integrated into the Regional Spatial Strategy so the LDF may need to draw reference to them to ensure conformity.

Advancing Together indicators may be useful for developing the LDF monitoring framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building the Benefits: Y&amp;H Regional Sustainable Development Framework, Y&amp;H Assembly – July 2003</td>
<td>The RSDF seeks to ensure that sustainable development is an integral part of policy and decision making at regional, sub-regional and local levels throughout the region. Sustainable development depends upon achieving four aims in an integrated way: 1. social progress that meets the needs of everyone; 2. effective protection and enhancement of the environment; 3. maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment; and 4. prudent use of natural resources.</td>
<td>The RSDF has 15 aims and 4 cross cutting themes. The 15 aims are: 1. good quality employment opportunities available to all; 2. conditions enabling business success, economic growth and investment; 3. education and training opportunities building the skills and capabilities of the population; 4. safety and security for people and property; 5. conditions and services engendering good health; 6. culture, leisure and recreation opportunities available for all; 7. vibrant communities participating in decision making; 8. local needs met locally; 9. a transport network maximizing access whilst minimizing detrimental impacts; 10. a quality built environment and efficient land use patterns making good use of derelict sites, minimizing travel and promoting balanced development; 11. quality housing available to everyone; 12. a bio-diverse and attractive natural environment; 13. minimal pollution levels 14. minimal greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change; 15. prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste. The four cross cutting themes are:</td>
<td>The LDF may need to draw reference to the RSDF aims and themes.</td>
<td>The RSDF is a useful base for the LDF SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change</strong>&lt;br&gt;Action Plan for Yorkshire and the Humber (Draft), GITH/Y&amp;HA/YF - Jan 2005</td>
<td>Provides the region with a framework to respond to the threat of climate change. Aim to achieve a 60% greenhouse gas reductions by 2050. Seek to minimize emissions and adapt to the consequences of climate change</td>
<td>Sets regional target of reducing emissions by 20% between 1990 and 2010, a cumulative 40% reduction by 2030 and a cumulative 60% reduction by 2050. The Plan includes an Action Plan to ensure that climate change is reflected in key regional documents and steps towards achieving the target.</td>
<td>The regional climate change target will be reflected in the RSS. The LDF must be in conformity with the RSS so it should include policies relating to climate change.</td>
<td>The SA should reflect the climate change target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Northern Way</strong>&lt;br&gt;First Growth Strategy Report, NW/ODPM - Sept 2004</td>
<td>Establish the North of England as an area of exceptional opportunity combining a world-class economy with a superb quality of life</td>
<td>Investing in the city regions in the North to make them more attractive places to live, work and visit</td>
<td>The Northern Way will be one of the factors to consider in drafting the LDF</td>
<td>Take Into consideration when developing the SA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Way</strong>&lt;br&gt;Business Plan June 2005</td>
<td>The Business Plan sets a budget for a Growth Fund which will do Three Things:&lt;br&gt;1. Produce Greater impact by doing important things together across the North&lt;br&gt;2. Demonstrate how existing national programmes could be even more effective across the North&lt;br&gt;3. Prepare a robust evidence base for new investment and specific policies that will meet the North’s requirements</td>
<td>No specific targets or indicators</td>
<td>The Northern Way will be one of the factors to consider in drafting the LDF</td>
<td>Take Into consideration when developing the SA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Northern Way</strong>&lt;br&gt;Sheffield City Region Development Programme, South</td>
<td>Main ambition for the Sheffield City Region is to capitalize on this phase of revival to transform the economy into one that is sustainable and that can make a contribution to the objectives of the Northern Way.</td>
<td>Broad priorities for the Sheffield City Region:&lt;br&gt;1. Developing knowledge and research on an internationally competitive scale</td>
<td>The Northern Way will be one of the factors to consider in drafting the LDF</td>
<td>Take Into consideration when developing the SA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Partnership -June 2005 (2nd Draft)</td>
<td>By 2025 the Sheffield City Region will be: ‘A pivotal international business location and one of the most successful city regions in the North of England’ It will be characterized by its: 1. innovative and creative economy 2. strong connections to key markets 3. unrivalled quality of life 4. vibrant and cosmopolitan population</td>
<td>2. Developing a comprehensive connectivity strategy 3. providing skills required by an internationally competitive economy 4. Creating an environment to encourage investment and higher quality of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Region, Our Health: A Regional Strategic Framework for Public Health in Yorkshire and the Humber, Dec 2004</td>
<td>The report describes the state of the public’s health in the region and what can be done at the regional level to meet the challenge. The document recognises that there is a strong correlation between educational attainment, employability and health. The three purposes of this framework are to: 1. offer a vision of what better public health will look like across the region 2. identify the unique actions that can be taken at a regional level to influence better health and reduce health inequalities. 3. maximise opportunities for co-ordinated regional action through the implementation of the White Paper on Health.</td>
<td>Detailed Action Plan due shortly which will include activities and timescales The Framework identifies 8 strategic priorities to promote the health of the region. These are: 1. improving health and reducing health inequalities through regional policies, strategies and plans 2. developing the regional role in supporting the implementation of national public health programmes and policies 3. influencing national and European health policy development 4. continuing to form and develop strategic partnerships that have the potential to improve public health 5. working to support the development of organisations, networks and communities. 6. developing strong, reliable and accessible public health intelligence systems 7. establishing an intrinsic culture of learning from evidence and bets public health practice 8. creating a sustainable long term strategy for public health capacity development</td>
<td>The LDF should be informed by the priorities of the Regional Strategic Health Framework.</td>
<td>The SA should have regard to the priorities of the Regional Strategic Health Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANet Yorkshire and Humber Developing the Regional Spatial Strategy: Draft Spatial Vision and Strategic Approach, Consultation Document, July 2004</td>
<td>Seeks to develop a clear spatial vision for the region using ‘Advancing Together’ as the starting point. From this vision, the RSS will develop a clear development strategy and appropriate policies to ensure its delivery. A sub regional strategy will be prepared for South Yorkshire led by the South Yorkshire Partnership. The unifying concept for this sub area is ‘transformation’. The draft vision sets out future role for Rotherham as an area that will benefit from planned growth in Sheffield and Doncaster but will maintain and enhance its distinctive identity through creative</td>
<td>The Draft Spatial Vision sets out a number of spatial planning responses to help meet the 6 objectives of Advancing Together in South Yorkshire. These include: Building a balanced, diverse and sustainable high quality economy for South Yorkshire; Revitalizing settlements, create distinctive environments and quality urban centres; and Significantly improve transport connectivity.</td>
<td>The Draft Spatial Vision is a consultation document about how the Assembly is intending to develop the RSS. The comments made to this document will contribute to the development of the RSS. Therefore the LDF should have regard to the</td>
<td>The Draft Spatial Vision seeks to apply the objectives of ‘Advancing Together’ to a spatial context. It provides a useful guide of how the SA and LDF can align with the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regeneration of its centre and the economic activity generated in Dinnington and Manvers. Its accessibility and amenity will make Rotherham an ideal central location for living, working and leisure with easy access.</td>
<td>National targets for 10% of electricity to be generated from renewable by 2010. The study recommends a regional target of 708 MW to meet the 2010 target. This is broken down into local authority area targets. This target is a revision of the RSS figure. Due to its characteristics, the overall potential for renewable energy generation in Rotherham is lower than average for other local authorities in the region.</td>
<td>emerging concepts when developing its strategy and approach.</td>
<td>Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Renewable Energy Targets in Yorkshire &amp; Humber, GOYH - 2004</td>
<td>The study states that on a regional level, on shore wind is the single most important renewable technology at the local authority level. At the regional level offshore wind and biomass co-firing at power stations are both expected to make a significant contribution to meeting the 2010 target. Other technologies can make an increased contribution post 2010.</td>
<td>The 2010 suggested target for Rotherham (10 MW wind, 0.51MW Photovoltaics and 0.6 MW hydro may need to be reflected in the LDF</td>
<td>The SA should have regard to these renewable energy targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Draft RSS Topic 4: Economy, Winter Consultation 2004/5</td>
<td>This topic paper sets out some ways in which the RSS could respond to economic issues in the region. It explores the role of Business Clusters, the supply and demand of employment land, urban renaissance and competitiveness and skills.</td>
<td>The Topic Paper highlights the results of the RELS Demand Assessment (Arup 2005). This includes the fact that Rotherham is the only authority area anticipated to experience a decline in the demand for B1 floorspace. The Topic Paper provides initial employment land forecasts and these will have an implication on the sites selected for employment development in the LDF</td>
<td>The issues raised in the topic paper may need to be taken into account in developing the SA framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 11: Biodiversity, Winter Consultation 2004/5</td>
<td>Sets out 7 draft biodiversity principles that the RSS should include. 1. inclusion of biodiversity principles at the earliest possible stage to minimize negative impacts and identify opportunities for habitat enhancement/creation 2. recognize importance of both designated sites and non designated areas 3. delivery of biodiversity goals avoiding any net loss of important species and habitats 4. linking up strategic habitat networks both to opportunities provided by development and with neighbouring regions 5. the role of biodiversity in helping to manage river basins and the coast and the incorporation of water conservation management 6. the provision of access to high quality natural or semi-natural greenspace</td>
<td>The topic paper does not include any indicators or targets.</td>
<td>The implications of the draft biodiversity principles may need to be taken into account when developing the LDF</td>
<td>The issues raised in the topic paper may need to be taken into account in developing the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 12 Culture, Winter Consultation 2004/5</td>
<td>7. the importance of conserving, enhancing and creating habitats as an integral part of all types of development, influencing design, layout, landscaping and restoration. The topic paper also highlights a number of spatial specific issues and suggests a number of biodiversity related policies for each of the regions sub-areas.</td>
<td>The topic paper does not include any indicators or targets.</td>
<td>The implications of this topic paper may need to be taken into account when developing the LDF.</td>
<td>The issues raised in the topic paper may need to be taken into account in developing the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 14 Education and Skills, Winter Consultation 2004/5</td>
<td>Education and skills should be considered as a theme to run through the preparation of the whole RSS. This topic paper summarises work undertaken by MLT consultants which scoped education and skills issues for the development of the RSS.</td>
<td>South Yorkshire has a lower proportion of people attaining the highest GCSE grades. In South Yorkshire a higher proportion of people are employed in low skilled occupations than higher level managerial and professional occupations. The Topic paper does not provide any targets or indicators.</td>
<td>The implications of education and skills issues may need to be taken into account when developing the LDF.</td>
<td>The issues raised in the topic paper may need to be taken into account in developing the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 2: Spatial Options, Winter Consultation 2004/5</td>
<td>Provides basis for discussion about future change and development of the region. Examines different options (scenarios) to help identify likely impacts and implications of different approaches to shaping the core strategy and overall direction for the future planning of the region. The three scenarios were tested by the RSS SEA/SA steering group and are: Scenario A - responding to market forces Scenario B - matching need with opportunity and Scenario C - managing the environment as a key resource. The Topic Paper identifies 31 strategic choice areas to highlight where strategic decisions will need to be taken in the future. These include Rotherham, the M1 &amp; M18 Motorways and the Dearne Valley. The Topic Paper also explores settlement classification and the potential role of settlements. Rotherham is identified as a Sub-Regional Centre (Sheffield is a Regional Centre)</td>
<td>The Spatial Options Topic Paper does not include any targets or indicators</td>
<td>The three scenarios could be used to test options for the LDF. Decisions made about strategic choice areas and the roles of settlements could influence the LDF strategy.</td>
<td>Scoping work for the SEA and SA of the RSS has identified key sustainability issues that are of relevance to the emerging RSS. These are: 1. Social inequalities 2. Lifestyles 3. Regional economic prosperity 4. Climate change 5. Biodiversity 6. Waste and resource consumption 7. Rural and urban landscapes 8. Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 3: Housing and Paper 3a Distributing the Housing Requirement, Winter Consultation 2004/5</td>
<td>Together with the RHS the RSS will assess the need for housing in the region. These topic papers address the potential scale and distribution of housing and related issues such as affordability. A housing model has been used to develop draft net and gross annual housing rates for each local authority area for each of the Scenarios set out in Topic Paper 2.</td>
<td>The topic papers do not include any indicators or targets</td>
<td>The housing target set in the RSS must be adhered to in the LDF</td>
<td>The issues such as affordability and low demand raised in this topic paper may need to be taken into account in developing the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 5b: Strategic Public Transport, Winter Consultation 2004/5</td>
<td>This Topic Paper relates to the development of a strategic framework for public transport in the region and sets out initial findings. The draft framework identifies a series of key corridors, interchange nodes and service delivery points. It has 7 themes: 1. strengthen key corridors 2. encourage sustainable travel demands and choices 3. influence peak capacity and address demand suppression 4. strategic Park &amp; Ride / Parkway stations 5. develop and improve interchanges 6. support strategies encouraging the use of public transport ticketing, information etc, 7. develop a regional transport funding taskforce to seek innovation and government support.</td>
<td>The topic paper does not include any indicators or targets</td>
<td>The implications of the Strategic Public Transport Framework may need to be taken into account when developing the LDF</td>
<td>The issues raised in the topic paper may need to be taken into account in developing the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 7 Energy, Winter Consultation 2004/5 Targets taken from ‘Renewable Energy Assessment and Targets for Yorkshire and the Humber’</td>
<td>This paper states that the key energy issues for the RSS are the consideration of an energy hierarchy approach, possibility of LA renewable energy targets and the need for SPG.</td>
<td>Indicative Renewable Energy Target for Rotherham is: 10 MW Wind, 0.51 MW Photovolactics and 0.10 MW Hydro</td>
<td>The LDF may need to reflect the renewable energy targets if they are continued forward into the revised RSS.</td>
<td>The issues raised in the topic paper may need to be taken into account in developing the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Draft RSS Topic Paper 9: Sustainable Tourism, Winter Consultation 2004/5</td>
<td>Proposes 7 principles for sustainable tourism. 1. Sustainable growth of tourism as an integral contributor to the economy 2. responsible investment in the quality of the tourism product 3. investment in local people skills and capacities in Yorkshire’s</td>
<td>The topic paper does not include any indicators or targets</td>
<td>The implications of the Sustainable Tourism Principles may need to be taken into account when developing the LDF</td>
<td>The issues raised in the topic paper may need to be taken into account in developing the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| tourism industry.  
4. sustainable growth of tourism that supports local cultural distinctiveness and contributes to the quality of life in the region.  
5. adoption of a more sustainable approach to tourism activity by visitors and regional businesses.  
6. conservation and enhancement of the built and natural environment through effective visitor management.  
7. development of an integrated, viable transport infrastructure that enables a realistic choice of travel mode to and within the region. | Reform of the EU’s CAP to a Single Farm Payment scheme will impact on the levels, type and use of funding that is available to farmers in the Region. The impact of the changes resulting from CAP Reform will have implications for the RSS.  
Y&H is a major agricultural region in England. Production of commodities such as wheat, barley, potatoes, sugar beet, oilseed rape, peas, beans and grass are greater than the average across the 9 other regions in England. Sheep dominate the livestock production in Y&H. There are no targets or indicators included within the topic paper. | The implications of CAP Reform, and in particular the RSS response to this may need to be taken into account when developing the LDF. | The issues raised in the topic paper may need to be taken into account in developing the SA framework. |

The strategy has 8 areas of activity which form the basis of the action plan for 2004-6. These are:  
1. access  
2. culture, tourism and regional profile  
3. industry development (facing into the sector/region)  
4. industry development (facing out of the sector/region)  
5. education & young people  
6. health and well-being  
7. intelligence  
8. advocacy and leadership  
The Action Plan sets out tasks and who should undertake these tasks, but does not include targets | The LDF should have regard to the aims of the Regional Cultural Strategy | The SA should have regard to the aims of the Regional Cultural Strategy |

Regional Economic Strategy 2003-12, YFY&HA - Feb 2003  
Sustainable development is central to the strategy. The Regional Economic Strategy has 6 objectives and 6 cross-cutting themes that are intended collectively to deliver sustainable development.  
Objectives:  
1. Grow the region’s businesses  
2. Higher business birth rates  
3. More private and public investment  
4. Improving education, learning and skills  
5. Connecting communities to economic opportunity  
6. Enhanced infrastructure and environment  
Cross-cutting themes:  
• Environmental good practice  
• Partnerships  
Tier 1 targets (by 2010):  
• Create 150,000 new jobs  
• Double the rate of business start-ups per 10,000 population  
• Treble investment  
• 3 million people trained in IT skills  
• Halve the number of deprived wards  
• Cut greenhouse gases by over 20%  
• A year on year increase in GDP growth above EU average  
Tier 2 targets (by 2005):  
• Employment rate above 72.8%  
• Increase productivity by at least 6% | The LDF should have regard to the RES targets and indicators. | The RES indicators and targets may be useful to developing the SA baseline and monitoring progress. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report</td>
<td>Geographic adaptation</td>
<td>Increase level of business innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social inclusion and diversity</td>
<td>10% increase in number of people considering going into business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity, innovation and technology</td>
<td>6% increase in productivity of small firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment and skills</td>
<td>10% increase in disadvantaged communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>620 active investment cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98 successful investment projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve LSC targets on structured learning, NVQ level 2 &amp; 3, numeracy and literacy skills and workforce development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase level of business innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% increase in number of people considering going into business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6% increase in productivity of small firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% increase in disadvantaged communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>620 active investment cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98 successful investment projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve LSC targets on structured learning, NVQ level 2 &amp; 3, numeracy and literacy skills and workforce development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase level of business innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% increase in number of people considering going into business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6% increase in productivity of small firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% increase in disadvantaged communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>620 active investment cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98 successful investment projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve LSC targets on structured learning, NVQ level 2 &amp; 3, numeracy and literacy skills and workforce development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In wards in the most deprived 20% in England:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remove 34,00 adults from income support households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remove 9,600 adults out of income-based job-seekers allowance households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce unemployment claimant count from 59,000 to 53,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A 0.15% population increase in wards falling wholly within urban areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In six pilot market towns:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide 1,100 learning opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create/assist 615 new firm formations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create/safeguard 1,125 jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 60% of new housing to be built on previously developed land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reclaim at least 219 hectares of previously developed land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A year on year increase in GDP above the EU average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Employment Land Strategy, Draft Demand Assessment, Arup on behalf of Yorkshire & Humber Assembly, 2005

RELS provides strategic framework for economic growth through site portfolio rationalization, supporting growth and regeneration initiatives and allowing for sustainable and economic development. It is anticipated that RELS will provide a 20 year strategy.

The demand assessment examines whether the current supply of employment sites in the region is commensurate with patterns of current and projected economic growth in the region. This will inform both the RSS and LDF production in the region. The study does not set targets for employment land rationalisation, however Rotherham is projected to experience a loss of almost 4,300 employees up to 2014 in key growth sectors and therefore may need to review its portfolio of employment sites. This is intended as a general indication of where Rotherham’s economy might be heading based on a model operated by Yorkshire Futures.

RELS will inform policies for the economy in the LDF

The SA should have regard to RELS and its implications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Environment Enhancement Strategy, Y&amp;H Regional Environment Forum - Sep 2003</td>
<td>The strategy presents 5 to 10 year regional objectives for environmental enhancement arranged within 4 themes and a set of practical 2-5 year actions to achieve these objectives. Objectives: 1. Building knowledge and understanding 2. Conserving environmental resources 3. Managing environmental change 4. Making community connections</td>
<td>The Regional Environment Enhancement Strategy includes an Action Plan for 2003-6 but this does not include specific targets. However, the strategy does draw reference to the Regional Environmental Indicators (from Progress in the Region 2002): • River Quality • Household Waste Arising • % of housing developed on previously used land • Industrial Property – rental costs • Total Motor Vehicle Km travelled • % of journeys to work by walk/cycle/public transport • Average time taken travelling to work (mins) • Mean traffic speed (kph) Natural Environment - % of England’s Area of National Parks.</td>
<td>The LDF should have regard to the regional environmental objectives.</td>
<td>The SA should have regard to the regional environmental objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Forestry Strategy, Forestry Commission/GOYH - July 2005</td>
<td>Aims to establish a strategic framework for trees and woodland to 2020. Accompanied by Action Plan. Woodland cover for the region is approximately 5.8% which is below the average for England which is 8.4%. Proposed strategic aims (each of which are supported by a series of objectives): 1. Regional Context - to ensure that transformation and expansion of the region’s tree and woodland resource takes account of and respects the historic, natural and cultural identity of the region while contributing to its economic, environmental and social development and regeneration. 2. Trees, Woods and People - to ensure the benefits provided by the region’s trees and woodlands are understood, recognized and valued; 3. Sustainable Forestry - A sustainably managed regional tree and woodland resource supporting the retention and development of a viable and vibrant forestry sector, and contributing to the overall sustainable development of the region. 4. Creating a Setting - to utilize the many environmental strengths of trees and woodlands to underpin the economic and social renaissance of the region. 5. Natural Environment - to achieve maximum biodiversity gain for the region through appropriate tree and woodland planting and management that takes proper account of the needs of all</td>
<td>Aim to increase woodlands cover by 500 hectares per year.</td>
<td>LDFs should take account of the aims and objectives of the Regional Forestry Strategy</td>
<td>The SA should take account of the aims and objectives of the Regional Forestry Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Housing Strategy (draft), Y&amp;HA - Feb 2005</td>
<td>Purpose of the strategy is to influence the creation and management of housing and neighbourhoods in the region so that we deliver the goals set out and create sustainable communities. The Strategy has three strategic themes: 1. creating better places 2. delivering better homes, choice and opportunity 3. fair access</td>
<td>The strategy sets out priorities, criteria, targets and actions to meet the strategic themes. Targets include: - close by a third the gap between vacancies and house values in Pathfinder areas and West Yorkshire low demand areas compared to the regional average. - achieve population stability in the main urban areas. - achieve an overall regional vacancy rate of between 2.5 and 3.5% by 2010 and sustain it. - ensure all social housing tenants live in decent homes by 2010 as a minimum and continue to do so thereafter. - increase the proportion of vulnerable private sector households living in decent homes to at least 70% by 2010. - end fuel poverty for vulnerable households by 2010 and for all households by 2016. - reduce the number of homelessness acceptances by 30% by 2010 Continue to ensure than no families with children are placed in Bed &amp; Breakfast accommodation for longer than 6 weeks.</td>
<td>The RHS and RSS compliment each other. The LDF should be in conformity with the RSS so the LDF should have regard to the objectives and targets of the RHS</td>
<td>The RHS provides useful baseline information and targets that could be incorporated into the SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Spatial Strategy for Y&amp;H (based on selective review of RPG12), Y&amp;HA/GOYH - Dec 2004</td>
<td>The RSS has statutory status and together with the LDF forms the development plan. The RSS has four strategic themes: 1. economic regeneration and growth 2. promoting social inclusion 3. urban and rural renaissance 4. conserving and enhancing natural resources</td>
<td>Policy S1 of the RSS states that LA’s and regional stakeholders are encouraged to carry out sustainability appraisals of their plans, strategies, proposals and programmes. The RSS includes a number of indicators and targets to monitor the success and implementation of each policy. The RSS is monitored annually.</td>
<td>The LDF must demonstrate conformity with the RSS. The policies and proposals in the LDF must therefore align with the objectives and policies of the RSS.</td>
<td>The indicators and targets in the RSS, which are monitored annually are a useful framework for both LDF monitoring and the SA baseline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Regional Waste Strategy, Y&HA - Jul 2003 | Amount of municipal waste produced is increasing at a rate of 3% per year. The purpose of this strategy is to address the barriers to progress in order to facilitate waste management across the region by: A stating the region’s agreed objectives for waste management; and Reduce the annual increase in waste production per household to 2% by 2008/9 Achieve statutory targets for recycling and composting household waste and diverting biodegradable municipal waste from landfill | The issues raised in the regional waste strategy may need to be taken into account in developing the SA | Objectives and targets for Rotherham should be fully integrated into LDF | }
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. collating and interpreting best available data on waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. providing the regional planning framework for waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. developing actions to address the barriers to progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. supporting local and sub-regional Municipal Waste Management Strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Objectives are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Gain community support and involvement in the delivery of the strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Reduce waste production and increase re-use, recycling and composting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Manage residual waste in the most sustainable way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Provide technical support and advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber Draft Rural Framework, GOYH - Dec 2004.</td>
<td>Rural Framework has an opportunity to provide a 'rural checklist' to embed rural priorities into regional strategies and sub-regional and local plans.</td>
<td>No targets have been set at this stage – priorities must be agreed first.</td>
<td>Should act as a checklist to influence the review of strategies and plans.</td>
<td>Priorities should be considered in SA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Regional Rural Priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced rural deprivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An increase in sustainable rural business start-ups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An increase in levels of business and social enterprise skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased levels of rural business knowledge transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More locally based employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Y&amp;H 'sustainable tourism' product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Healthier environments contributing to healthier lifestyles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessible service provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality development reflecting local environmental and cultural assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affordable rural housing based on local need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An enhanced, protected and accessible countryside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A 'functional' landscape delivering economic benefit and contributing to regional environmental targets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Character Areas Volume 3. Countryside Agency (Yorkshire and Humber), 1999.</td>
<td>Establishes the Region's Countryside Character Areas (areas of distinct and recognizable landscape character) which can be used to inform determination of planning applications ideally through locally specific and more detailed landscape character assessments.</td>
<td>Identifies 25 Regional Character Areas for Yorkshire and Humber.</td>
<td>Sets the regional context for local preparation of Landscape Character Assessments.</td>
<td>Sets the regional context for local preparation of Landscape Character Assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber Wetland Feasibility Study. Countryside Agency, English Nature, RSPB and EA, February 2005.</td>
<td>Identifies areas within the region with potential for wetland conservation and restoration, particularly in the floodplain and is linked to the delivery of the UK Biodiversity Action Plan.</td>
<td>Could impact upon development identification.</td>
<td>Assessment to cover impact on existing and potential wetland areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity and</td>
<td>Prepared to assist production of Regional Spatial Strategy.</td>
<td>Via production of Regional</td>
<td>Via production of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment Study, Yorkshire &amp; Humber Biodiversity Forum, October 2004.</td>
<td>Provides an agenda for change that will shape the activity of all those involved in delivering the vision of an active and successful sporting nation.</td>
<td>Introduces 7 regional outcomes to be reached by 2008 including: increased participation in sport, widening access, improving health and wellbeing, improving levels of performance, creating safer stronger communities, improving education and benefiting the economy.</td>
<td>Spatial Strategy.</td>
<td>Regional Spatial Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Plan for Sport, Sport England – 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-regional / RMBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalities Impact and Needs/requirements Assessment Toolkit, 2005 INRA</td>
<td>Tool kit for new or changing RMBC policies/services. Ensures compliance with the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, and the extension of the Disability Discrimination Act. To identify adverse and positive impacts and unmet needs/enhancement opportunities for groups of people in terms of disability, gender or race equality. Other factors such as sexuality, age, belief and needs of different communities (including refugee/asylum, sexual orientation, traveling, young people and careers) need to be considered and are likely to come on board through legislation.</td>
<td>Considers intended, unintended, negative, positive impacts and promotion of equality and good community relations. Decisions must be evidence based – gathered through existing or new representative consultation (can be completed). Consultation with people affected by policy/procedure is also part of the appraisal.</td>
<td>The LDF must promote equality for all.</td>
<td>The LDF will be subject to this tool, and the SA is to form the basis of a general appraisal tool for RMBC and must include equality issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMBC Biodiversity Action Plan, Rotherham Biodiversity Forum – 2004</td>
<td>Biodiversity is recognized as supporting the economy, cultural heritage, spiritual importance, safeguarding the future, moral imperative</td>
<td>A series of actions are identified which include identifying habitats and areas for management; agree management processes with land owners; Consider developing SPG to aid best practice. Separate action plans have also been produced for Woodlands, Grasslands, Wetlands and for Great Crested Newt, Badgers, Bellflower Stem Miner, Pillwort and Common Tern.</td>
<td>The LDF should be aware of the locations of these habitats, species and various actions and be sensitive to biodiversity issues.</td>
<td>Biodiversity is a key issue and the SA needs to ensure it reflects the BAP and need to protect and enhance habitats and biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMBC Community Strategy 2005-10, RMBC - May 2005</td>
<td>There are five strategic themes that will direct the future work of the Rotherham Partnership. They are underpinned by two cross-cutting themes. Strategic themes include; Achieving – Rotherham will be a prosperous place with a vibrant, mixed and diverse economy and flourishing businesses. Learning – Rotherham people will be recognized as being informed, skilled and creative, innovative and constructively challenging. Alive – Rotherham will be a place where people feel good, are healthy and active and enjoy live to the full. Safe – Rotherham will be a place where neighbourhoods are safe, clean, green and well maintained, well designed, good quality homes and accessible local facilities and services for all. Proud – Rotherham people, businesses and pride in the borough are</td>
<td>There are 18 targets for each strategic theme which should be used accordingly.</td>
<td>The Community Strategy is the highest level plan for the Borough and therefore needs to be considered in the LDF which is a cross cutting plan.</td>
<td>Sustainable Development is identified as a cross cutting theme that should be considered in the SA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>at the heart of our vision.</strong></td>
<td>Cross cutting themes include; Fairness – All individuals in Rotherham will have equality of opportunity and choice. Sustainable Development – Rotherham will be a place where the conditions are right to sustain economic growth, the well being of its citizens is prioritized and there is a high quality living environment sustained through minimizing harm from development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RMBC Corporate Housing Strategy 2003-6 and Statement 2005-07.</strong></td>
<td>Meeting housing need Addressing low demand housing across all tenures Meeting the Decent Homes Standard Tacking clime and anti-social behaviour Improving links with other services Raising performance across the service Energy efficiency Tenant and residential involvement Rent setting and arrears Service delivery network</td>
<td></td>
<td>Areas to be targeted for improved housing which have the highest Local Index of Deprivation Rotherham has one of the highest teenage pregnancy rates in the Country. Rotherham needs to respond to this in regard to housing. Affordable housing set at 25% where the development is more than 1ha or where there are more 25 homes proposed.</td>
<td>Affordable housing Housing of a decent standard Energy efficient standards are to be met (30% CO2 reduction by 2010 (Home Energy Conservation Act 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RMBC Cultural Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Increasing wealth and prosperity for all Stimulating a culture of learning and development Improving health and social well being for all Creating safe and inclusive communities for all</td>
<td>Major rationalisation and investment programme in Rotherham’s swimming pools to create a strategic network of pools to ensure that pools are fit for purpose, and to make a major impact on Rotherham’s cultural infrastructure in order to generate jobs, encourage inward investment, and help make Rotherham a better place to live, learn and work. Strengthen a network of socially inclusive sport and active recreation opportunities that maximise usage among those identified as being most at need.</td>
<td>Key targets should be reflected in LDF</td>
<td>Availability and access to quality recreation facilities for all is a key sustainability issue. Impacts on recreation have to be considered in context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create park ranger teams in Rotherham’s major parks in order to encourage use, discourage misuse, and bring about a sense of safety and security for all park users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refurbish Clifton Park Museum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide the best possible library services which meet the diverse needs of the people of Rotherham by bringing Rotherham’s public library service into line with national library standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMBC Green Spaces Audit for Rotherham, RMBC - Mar 2005</td>
<td>Green space is a key component of regeneration Vision for Rotherham is: ‘A place within a network of green spaces that improves the well-being of everybody in the Borough by offering a wide range of accessible recreational opportunities and by protecting and enhancing the quality and sustainability of the environment.’ Greenspace Audit • To encourage all members of the community to use green space. To increase people’s enjoyment/ awareness for everyone. To make Rotherham a safer, healthier and more attractive place to live and visit by ensuring green spaces are clean and well designed, managed and maintained • To target improvement of green space services in disadvantaged communities to assist in neighbourhood regeneration. • To make green spaces accessible and attractive to all groups and individuals, and thereby contribute to community cohesion. • To improve environmental sustainability through biodiversity, landscape protection, reducing surface water runoff and other measures.</td>
<td>Greenspace is important for the environment, health and well being and leisure and the LDF should ensure there is provision locally throughout Rotherham.</td>
<td>Availability and access to quality greenspace for all is a key sustainability issue. Impacts on greenspace have to be considered in context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMBC (Draft) Rights of Way Improvement Plan, Jan 2006.</td>
<td>Aims to: • Provide a network which is correctly recorded, easy to follow, free from obstruction and safe to use; • Develop a network which meets the needs of local users and visitors to the Borough whilst retaining the character of the countryside; • Make the most of access opportunities to enable the network to be accessed by the widest possible audience, with particular regard to those with mobility problems; • Increase opportunities for sustainable travel, for leisure and access to work, school and local services; • ensure that proposals and schemes are prioritized and implemented to meet the needs and aspirations of the population to deliver maximum benefit within available resources.</td>
<td>Identify, develop and promote links from the Trans Pennine Trail (TPT) into surrounding urban centers. Maximise opportunities for access improvements by reclamation projects. Assist the identification, development and promotion of safer routes to school. Ensure the rights of way network remains relevant to local use and demand.</td>
<td>The public rights of way network is a valuable resource which needs to be protected and enhanced through the planning system.</td>
<td>Access to an adequate rights of way network is a key sustainability issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMBC Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy 2004-10, Rotherham Partnership – 2004</td>
<td>A. Address the root causes of deprivation in target neighborhoods and for target groups, by focusing actions on 3 core themes 1 Improving life chances of children and young people 2 Enabling everyone to achieve functional skills for life 3 Improving the position of the economically disadvantaged through sustainable employment. B2 Prioritising the active involvement of communities – both geographical communities and communities of interest – and place community needs and aspirations at the heart of neighborhood renewal. Focus for strategy in key areas of deprivation Level 1 - Central, Dinnington, Kimberworth Park, Maltby, Masbrough, Rawmarsh and Wath. Level 2 – Brinsworth Pocket and Wath Pocket</td>
<td>There are a range of Neighbourhood targets and indicators built on the NRS Floor targets. These are around the following themes:  • Wealth  • Life Long Learning  • Health and Social Well Being  • Safe and Inclusive Communities</td>
<td>The LDF needs to support NRS areas, objectives and targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMBC Regeneration Plan 2004-07, RMBC – 2004</td>
<td>• Improve and promote the image of Rotherham  • Provide an excellent and sustainable environment for businesses  • Provide sustainable neighbourhoods of quality, choice and aspiration  • Provide an excellent environment for people to fulfil their potential  • Achieve Rotherham Town Renaissance</td>
<td>ACTIONS  Over 50 key actions have been identified. Rotherham as tourist destination – improve cultural infrastructure. Links with local, national and regional networks Employment plan Dearne Strategic Economic Zone SY Technology Corridor Rotherham Town Centre Light railway from Sheffield Support business growth, rural economy, SMEs Links between education and employment Culture and open space Crime and fear of crime Recycling Housing mix and market Transport and infrastructure Community cohesion and anti poverty Education, training and skills Populating the Town Centre River and Canal from key part of Rotherham Ensuring best in architecture Dynamic vibrant town centres INDICATORS AND TARGETS 26 indicators and targets identified. See Indicator table</td>
<td>Regeneration is a top priority. Borough and sub region is Objective 1 area (EU). Faces significant challenges. A summary of key issues and major projects is provided. This should inform A3</td>
<td>LDF has potential to support regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RMBC Retail & Leisure Study, White Young Green - Jul 2004 | Key objectives are:  
  - Selecting appropriate centres to accommodate identified needs for additional retail and leisure facilities.  
  - Identifying sites within and adjoining existing centres for development or redevelopment.  
  A range of potential development sites identified including in the Town Centre, Edge of Centre and Out of Centre  
The strategy re-classifies the Town, District and Local centres by their role particularly in relation to shopping.  
Principle Town Centre – Rotherham  
Town Centres – Dinnington, Maltby, Parkgate, Wath upon Dearne, Wickersley  
District Centres – Bramley, Kiverton Park, Rawmarsh, Swallownest (Aston cum Aughton, Swinton, Thurncroft, Local Centres – numerous in Borough. No local centres recommended for upgrade. Large food stores not integrated with other facilities should not be identified as a local centre. | The strategy identifies:  
Overview of Needs – convenience retail, comparison retail and leisure.  
Proposed Retail and Leisure Allocations - Rotherham Town Centre, Swallownest (District) Centre, Wickersley Town Centre.  
Centre Specific Policies – Rotherham Town Centre, Other Defined Centres, Retail World and Other Retail Parks.  
General Policies – New Retail and Leisure Development | The reclassified hierarchy of different centres should be used to guide retail and leisure policies in order to aim to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of defined centres and encouraging appropriate services, commensurate with their individual scale, role and function. | The SA should support this. |
| RMBC School Organisation Plan 2003/04 – 2007/08 & 2nd Update | Establishes levels of need throughout the Borough (by area). Will be replaced by the Single Education Plan and should be read in conjunction with RMBC Asset Management Plan and Schools Capital Strategy. | Primary Schools with 25%+ unfilled places.  
Secondary Schools with 25%+ unfilled places.  
% of unfilled places in all primary schools.  
% of unfilled places in all secondary schools.  
% of pupils in excess of school capacity in secondary schools. | School provision needs to be aligned to new house development. 2005/06 bid made under ‘Building Schools for the Future programme’ to replace the remaining 10 secondary schools not covered by Private Finance Initiative scheme. | Alignment of school provision with new house building. |
| RMBC Sustainable Development Framework | This is the same as the RSDF | See RSDF | See RSDF | See RSDF |
| RMBC Tourism Plan, RMBC - 2005 | =To improve the quality standards of Rotherham’s Tourism Offer  
To improve the image and perception of Rotherham  
To improve the effectiveness of partnership working  
To promote Rotherham as a visitor location  
To attract investment to the local area, increasing job creation and ensuring sustainable development.  
To increase the skills base in tourism associated areas | (the plan generally does not provide specific targets, it does provide general intentions) | Identifies that business/conference tourism is greater than weekend/leisure tourism.  
To restore the borough canals.  
To ensure that new developments add to the attractiveness of the Borough | Objectives to include those for conserving and restoring woodlands, SSSI, nature reserves and canals and river networks. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMBC Unitary Development Plan, RMBC - Jun 1999</td>
<td>The UDP was drawn up with meeting the needs of disadvantaged sections of the community in mind.</td>
<td>The UDP identifies sites for new housing growth and aims to meet the needs of groups such as the elderly and people with disabilities</td>
<td>This will be the base or starting point from which the new LDF will be developed</td>
<td>Some sustainability ideas have moved on since the UDP was adopted, but it is a useful reference point for the SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMBC Urban Potential Study, RMBC - Feb 2004</td>
<td>Use brownfield land Develop mixed communities Affordable housing should be included in all housing developments Housing should be accessible by public transport Should be a managed release of future housing land</td>
<td>The study has concluded that urban housing potential for the period 2001-2016 is 7843.</td>
<td>The LDF will need to take into account the potential number of housing (7843) identified by this study. Housing potential should be considered including flats over shops, redevelopment of car parks, review of existing housing allocations, subdivision of existing houses, empty homes, and redevelopment of existing housing,</td>
<td>Further housing is likely to be required over the next few years and should be developed in a sustainable manner, i.e. use of existing brownfield sites, mixed communities, affordable, good design, linked to public transport, managed release of future housing land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Best Value Plan, 2004</td>
<td>A number of objectives are included in this</td>
<td>A wide range of performance indicators are identified.</td>
<td>Indicators and targets should be used to support alignment</td>
<td>Indicators and targets should be used to support alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham PCT Health Impact</td>
<td>Provides a framework for HIA. Six determinants of health are identified.</td>
<td>The LDF Should support these principles</td>
<td>The SA needs to consider how it can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment (HIA)</td>
<td>Housing and environment; Lifestyle, wellbeing and leisure; Jobs and economy; Lifelong learning; Crime and community safety, Transport and mobility.</td>
<td>Rotherham Town Centre Strategic Development Framework (Phase 2), Yorkshire Forward/ Renaissance South Yorkshire, RMBC Town Team, LDA Design - Feb 2005&lt;br&gt;Clear direction to guide planning, development and investment decisions towards an agreed structure. Identify land-use potential and a land-use framework. Establish a development framework for Rotherham’s urban centre supported by sound urban design principles. Clarify appropriate scale of development and density in conjunction with an integrated pattern of development. Prepare a movement framework that identifies a robust standard for road connection, public transport systems and pedestrian routes. Assess infrastructure and engineering issues and identify environmental issues and constraints. Develop a public realm strategy as part of Yorkshire Forward’s ambitions to promote excellence in public space design.</td>
<td>River and Canal to form a key part of the town’s future – development must follow an agreed masterplan. Populate the town centre. Improve existing housing stock and provide greater choice and accessibility to good quality housing. Place Rotherham within a sustainable landscape setting of the highest quality. Place Rotherham at the centre of a public transport network. Remove and downgrade parts of the major road infrastructure that encircles the town centre. Make Forge Island a major new piece of the town centre. Establish a new civic focus for the town. Improve community access to health, education and promote social well-being.</td>
<td>Goals must be incorporated in the LDF&lt;br&gt;Consideration of landscape/recreation issues utilising aspects of the HIA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Framework Rural Regeneration, 2002 Arup, RMBC, Countryside Agency</td>
<td>The SA contains a large no of objectives.</td>
<td>The measure of congestion used for the Plan is the average time lost per vehicle km in seconds. There are two indicators to be reported: • % change in average time lost; and • change in total road vehicle hours between the Do-Minimum and the Plan [Measure considered superseded by Local Transport Plan].</td>
<td>Plan policies should support the long term objectives of reducing congestion and facilitating sustainable economic growth.</td>
<td>The SA should utilise these objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and West Yorkshire Multi-Modal Study - Final Report, Government Office for Y&amp;H &amp; MVA Ltd - 2002</td>
<td>The objectives for the study are to • to reduce congestion on the motorways and the A1; • to re-establish the primary role of the trunk road network for strategic traffic; • to facilitate sustainable economic regeneration of depressed areas, especially the Objective 1 status of South Yorkshire; • to sustain economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire Forest Plan 2002, South Yorkshire Forest - 2002</td>
<td>Community – environmental projects, strengthen communities by providing people with opportunity of working together &amp; enjoy their environment Health – trees reduce smog, filter polluted air and provide a calming, attractive setting and reduce stress related illnesses. Local economy – greener landscapes encourage investment and can increase property values Landscape – greenspaces make environment more attractive Wildlife – range of habitats and woody areas provide a vital role in the ecosystem and support a variety of wildlife Atmosphere – trees help reduce CO2 levels helping offset effects of climate change Built environment – trees stabilize the soil, prevent erosion and reduce storm water runoff and aid in land reclamation</td>
<td>LDF will have policies that protect various features of importance such as ancient woodlands and SSSIs, etc. The Forest Plans sets out a range of strategic objectives relating to the ‘topics’ listed in the first-hand column</td>
<td>Emphasis on protection of existing protected areas and of conservation and enhancement SA objective setting should be in-line with the objectives included in this document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **HIA** refers to Health Impact Assessment.
- **LDF** refers to Local Development Framework.
- **SA** refers to Sustainability Appraisal.
- **Y&H & MVA Ltd** refers to Yorkshire and Hartlepool Metropolitan Borough Council and MVA Ltd.
- **Do-Minimum** refers to a no-growth scenario in transport planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan, Policy or Programme</th>
<th>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Implications for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan – Update, SYPTE/SYPTA/SY Local Authority - 2004</td>
<td>Seven key objectives are:</td>
<td>9 Core Indicators:</td>
<td>LDF will need to have policies that support the objectives of the LTP.</td>
<td>SA objectives should be consistent with LTP objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to improve and protect the environment;</td>
<td>• Road condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to improve safety and security for all travellers;</td>
<td>• Number of bus passenger journeys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to improve transport to areas of poor accessibility and job creation as an integral part of regeneration;</td>
<td>• Number of cycling trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to meet the needs of the socially and physically disadvantaged;</td>
<td>• Number of deaths and serious injuries (all ages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to provide genuine choice of travel mode;</td>
<td>• Number of children killed and seriously injured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to reduce the need to travel whilst improving the efficiency of the transport system and sustaining a vibrant economy;</td>
<td>• Light rail passenger journeys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods.</td>
<td>• % of rural households within 13 minutes walk of an hourly or better bus service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 Local Performance Indicators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rail journeys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfaction with light rail/ rail services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reliability of light rail/ bus / rail services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Punctuality of light rail/ bus / rail services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-car use to Primary/ Secondary schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Car traffic levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Car occupancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recorded incidents of personal or vehicle crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Walking levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Council owned commuter parking space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Satisfaction with bus services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire Settlement Study (The &quot;Babbie Study&quot;), Jacobs Babbie - May 2005</td>
<td>This study examines how sustainable settlements in Rotherham are at present, and if future change would improve or decrease its overall sustainability. Overall, the study highlights which settlements would derive the most benefit from future change.</td>
<td>Key settlements and urban neighbourhoods identified for change are: Mabrough, East Dene, East Herringthorpe and Dalton, St Ann’s Dinnington, Brampton and West Melton, Canklow, Herringthorpe</td>
<td>This study forms part of the evidence base for the LDF</td>
<td>The study methodology is enshrined in Sustainable Development Principles. The SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire Spatial Strategy Vision, South Yorkshire Partnership - Nov 2004</td>
<td>The Vision seeks to drive forward the transformation of South Yorkshire into a place that is a national economic motor combining exceptional quality of life with economic opportunities for all. Guiding principles: spatial investment in South Yorkshire will concentrate on: • Those locations capable of attracting viable economic development investment and/or able to access the main regional economic centres without contributing unnecessarily in the long term to congestion and environmentally damaging journeys by car; • Enhanced transport connectivity where it improves the competitiveness of the overall South Yorkshire spatial mix and enables the unlocking of key outlying settlements that would otherwise decline;</td>
<td>Five core themes: • Economic development • Urban areas • Transport • Settlement • Rural areas</td>
<td>The sub-regional spatial strategy vision introduces sub-regionally significant elements of local strategies – and is looking to develop more complementary local development documents.</td>
<td>Reflect guiding principles and themes in the SA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Policy or Programme</td>
<td>Key Objectives Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Key Targets and Indicators Relevant to LDF and SA</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Implications for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transform South Yorkshire Prospectus (Draft), Transform South Yorkshire - Jun 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Focused housing and related investments on those settlements which are most sustainable or which have the capacity to become most sustainable. | | | |
| | This document relates to the South Yorkshire regional area. Ensure that the Decent Homes Standard is met Ensuring healthier lifestyles State of repair of housing seen as a major issue by residents surveyed in this general area. Need to encourage people to the South Yorkshire housing market South Yorkshire as a whole has more people of a working age migrating in than those leaving the area. Improve radical improvement in the character and diversity of neighbourhoods Expand the areas range of housing options Improve housing quality | | Opportunities should be addressed to design out crime, vandalism, litter. Integrate provisions for street safety in design Highlights Rotherham Town Centre as key strategic area for regeneration. In terms of housing, retail and employment. | Environmental improvements should be integrated into design Create safer communities Design quality and environmental sustainability should be inherent in all new builds. Support performance to BREEAM standards |
| Don and Rother Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS), EA 2003 | Vision: "to contribute towards sustainable development by managing the water resources within the catchment to maximize the availability of resources for abstraction while protecting the flow requirements of the riverine ecology." | | | |
| Don Flood Risk Management Strategy, EA | Long term flood risk management strategy for the River Don Catchment. SEA has been undertaken as an integral part of the strategy to help inform its development and ensure that decisions regarding flood risk management take account of their wider environmental effects and context. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
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### B1 Baseline for Rotherham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Baseline Summary</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support, maintain or enhance the provision of quality local or easily accessible employment opportunities for all in stable or competitive growth sectors</td>
<td>Employment rates have improved in Rotherham and are now less than 1% below the national average. However some parts of the Borough have high unemployment rates and a high proportion of benefits claimants, particularly in neighbourhoods close to Rotherham Town Centre. Ill health and low skills have a bearing on the labour market. Economic inactivity is also high in the 50 and over age group with higher unemployment in groups with few qualifications. A high proportion of residents (over a third) commute out of Rotherham to work. A high number of non residents also commute in. Due to close proximity many people in Rotherham would find it easier to get to work within Sheffield’s boundary rather than Rotherham's. As well as anticipated losses in more traditional and established employment sectors (Machinery &amp; Equipment, Retailing ) it is noted at the regional level that over the next 10 years Rotherham is also forecast to lose employment in key growth sectors (Business &amp; Services, Hotels &amp; Catering) but increases are forecast in construction, public services and other services. The latest regional econometric model predicts a net rise of over 3,000 full time equivalents in the next 10 years.</td>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>Employment rate in Rotherham 74.3% May 2005(based on last 8Q average from Labour Force Survey), 0.5% below national average.</td>
<td>2% above GB average by 2010</td>
<td>Rotherham has reduced gap to national average from over 4% in 2002 to current 0.5%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Rate by Sector</td>
<td>Current (2004 ASHE) average weekly gross salary for full time employees = £439.30 (87% of UK average)</td>
<td>Reach 90% of UK average by 2010</td>
<td>Fluctuated over recent years but always below 87% of UK average</td>
<td>£455.30 (90% of UK)</td>
<td>£504.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Gross Weekly Salary</td>
<td>Male/female = 79.4%/66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Rate: By Gender</td>
<td>All working age/50 to retirement = 73%/59.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Rate: By Age</td>
<td>Census shows unemployment of 7.5% for 'non white' compared to 4% for 'white'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Baseline Summary</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Regional Comparison</td>
<td>National Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>Overall Rotherham = 2.4% but varies by ward from 1.0% to as high as 5.7%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Inactivity</td>
<td>Economic Inactivity rate for Rotherham (LFS 8Q average) at May 2005 = 23.4%</td>
<td>UK average by 2010</td>
<td>Improved from 25.9% in 2002 reducing gap from 4.7% to 2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Travelled to Work</td>
<td>Census shows that Rotherham residents 24% travel over 10km to place of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of new jobs created from inward investment</td>
<td>New jobs created 1,271 in 2004/05</td>
<td>- targets (cumulative) = 3,813(2006/0) &amp; 6,355 (2009/10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy rate for commercial and industrial property</td>
<td>9.9% for 2004/05</td>
<td>8.0% for next three years 2006 to 2008</td>
<td>Improved from 10.5% in 2003/04.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintain or enhance conditions that enable sustainable economic growth and investment without environmental damage</td>
<td>The number of businesses starting up in Rotherham has grown over recent years, but not as fast as the national rate and there are still fewer businesses per head than the national average. Profit margins have reduced recently particularly for SME’s. However, on a positive note there are more businesses VAT registering than de-registering which is against the national trend. Economic growth in Rotherham is currently affected by the lack of skilled workforce, low levels of economic activity. There is currently a skills gap which hinders potential investment and businesses</td>
<td>Number of new business start ups</td>
<td>215 for 2004/05</td>
<td>To be established</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New businesses surviving 3 years plus.</td>
<td>74% in 2004</td>
<td>85% by 2010</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>74% in 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase annually the net stock of VAT registered businesses</td>
<td>During 2003 Rotherham had 555 new registered and 415 de-registrations (net gain of 140)</td>
<td>125 (2009/10)</td>
<td>Last few years have seen Rotherham increasing by more than national average but stocks remain low - 186 per 10,000 population at end of 2003 compared to 303 for GB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% working age population self employed</td>
<td>7.2% (LaLFS Feb 2004)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Drop from 11% in 2000 to 7.2% in 2004 - partly explained by rise in numbers of all employed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Deprivation</td>
<td>Rotherham has 20 Super Output Areas falling into top 10% most deprived nationally (12% of borough)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of unpaid care</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Creation</td>
<td>Rotherham Investment &amp; Development Office record investment in the borough and job creation: 2004/05 figures show job creation by 144 companies. Not all companies give investment/job details but of those that did 1,271 new jobs created and 539 safeguarded in this period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Baseline Summary

Choosing to locate in Rotherham.

Employers in Rotherham note that that it is difficult to find skilled workers to fill vacant positions. There is also poor graduate retention.

High levels of ill health and family members consequently providing unpaid care impact on levels of economic activity in Rotherham. This issue is compounded by the ageing population and overall a reducing workforce. Rotherham has one of the highest rates of its population acting as unpaid carers to family and others the 14th highest in the country.

There is a supply of employment land available in Rotherham, but much of this requires investment to bring it forward for immediate development. Many sites require remediation and some sites within Templeborough and Rotherham Town Centre are at risk of flooding.

Yorkshire Forward is supporting the development of Waverly Advanced Manufacturing Park (AMP) which is a 40ha site intended to be a focus for metals and manufacturing related research. The aim is to attract a cluster of high technology companies to provide c. 5,000 jobs in key growth sectors. Phase 1 is under construction and phase 2 has outline planning permission. It is hoped that this will encourage graduate retention in South Yorkshire. AMP is located on the boundary of Rotherham close to

### Occupational Grouping

- Managers & senior officials: 10.3%
- Professional: 9.7%
- Associate professional & technical: 11.5%
- Administrative and secretarial: 12.6%
- Skilled trades: 12.9%
- Personal service: 8.0%
- Sales & customer services: 9.2%
- Process plant & machine operatives: 13.4%
- Elementary: 12.1%
- Elementary: 12.1%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Baseline Summary</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheffield so will provide employment for both authorities. The Town Centre Masterplan seeks to improve the quality of Rotherham Town Centre and in particular increase the resident population and consequently support the development of an evening economy.</td>
<td>Amount /Area of allocated employment land immediately available for development</td>
<td>End of 2004: 51.5ha, 16% of employment land on market/suitable for promotion.</td>
<td>Between 1994 and 2004 over 467,000 sq m of floor space constructed on Rotherham’s employment sites. Total (2004) standing at over 2.48 million sq.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of employment land that is constrained</td>
<td>End of 2004: 32.1ha, 10% of employment land retained for development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress of Advanced Manufacturing Park, Waverley (Number of new companies located here)</td>
<td>1 currently located, 2 more by end of year(2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per capita Gross Value Added</td>
<td>Experian Business Strategies using 2001 constant prices shows for 2003 GVA per capita in Rotherham at £13,150</td>
<td>Significant increases in GVA over the last three years has reduced the gap to UK - from 70% of UK GVA in 1994 to almost 86% by 2003.</td>
<td>£14,051</td>
<td>£15,322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of households without access to a vehicle</td>
<td>2001 Census shows 29.7% of households in Rotherham without access to car.</td>
<td>At the 1991 Census over 38% of households in Rotherham had no access to a car.</td>
<td>30.3% without car</td>
<td>26.8% without car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facilitate sustainable transport and movement patterns</td>
<td>Mode of Travel to School</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The majority of Rotherham's settlements have good access to the strategic road network 57% of people travel to work by car which is above the national average and the majority of people commuting out of Rotherham to work travel by car. Across the Borough as a whole, 30% of the population do not have access to a car and some settlements and neighbourhoods have even lower levels of car ownership which means that the public transport network is important to facilitate access to services and</td>
<td>Mode of travel to work</td>
<td>69.3% by car, 13.1% by public transport, 9.2% on foot &amp; remainder work from home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profile of where Rotherham's Resident's work</td>
<td>2001 Census shows 61% work in Rotherham, 21.6% Sheffield, 4.6% Doncaster, 2.8% Barnsley 10% elsewhere. 41,785 total out commuting.</td>
<td>Increase in out commuting since 1991 Census when 65.5% worked in Rotherham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Baseline Summary</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Regional Comparison</td>
<td>National Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities. The large employment areas have developed separately from the residential areas, which means that ensuring they are well linked to settlements and neighbourhoods by public transport is important. Rotherham Town Centre Masterplan sees to create a more sustainable mix of uses in the town centre. Quality Bus Corridors (existing and proposed) serve key routes and there are interchange facilities in Dinnington and Maltby so that more remote settlements can make connections to key destinations. The majority of Rotherham’s residents have access by public transport to either Rotherham, Sheffield, Meadowhall or Worksop. However, most bus services run along main routes and do not always penetrate residential estates. Connections to more peripheral settlements can be weaker and less frequent. Only Kiveton, Rotherham Town Centre and Swinton have train stations. The Sheffield and South Yorkshire Canal is a potential method to move freight and could also become part of a green network.</td>
<td>Number of people who live outside Rotherham, who come to Rotherham to work</td>
<td>2001 Census shows 69.3% of workplace population from Rotherham with commuting from Sheffield accounting for 10.5%, Doncaster 6.8%, Barnsley 5.3% and 8% elsewhere - total of 29,015 people commuting into Rotherham to work</td>
<td>Increase in inward commuting since 1991 Census when 75% of workplace population where from Rotherham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of new developments with Green Travel Plans</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROTHERHAM LEARNING**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improve the level of education and skills for all, reducing disparities across Rotherham and strengthening its</td>
<td>Rotherham is currently progressing the Transform Schools Programme (PFI) to fund new and replacement schools or extensions to existing premises. This includes the</td>
<td>Number /percentage of pupils achieving 5+ GCSE’s at grades A*-C</td>
<td>In 2004 46% achieved this level in Rotherham compared to England average of 53.7% (7.7% gap)</td>
<td>Reduce gap to national average to 5% by 2010</td>
<td>The last two years have seen a narrowing of the gap to the England average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SA Objective | Baseline Summary | Indicator | Rotherham | Target for Rotherham | Trend | Regional Comparison | National Comparison |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>position regionally and nationally</td>
<td>construction of 10 new schools and substantial upgrade of a further 5. The majority of the Borough’s secondary schools are included the programme.</td>
<td>Number of 16-19 year olds in education, training or employment.</td>
<td>2004 88.7% entered education, employment or work based learning.</td>
<td>Reduce number not in education training and employment to 6.7% by 2010</td>
<td>Last few years have seen Rotherham reach the national average.</td>
<td>87.2% in 2003 for England (2004 - not yet available)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are 4 colleges in the Borough (Dearne Valley College, Thomas Rotherham College, Rotherham College of Arts and Technology and Rother Valley College) which offer a range of higher, further educational courses and vocational training. Educational achievement at key stage 2 and GCSE level is significantly below the national average in Rotherham and there are disparities in attainment throughout the Borough. However, recently more school leavers have entered further education, training or employment. There has also been a recent increase in the number of school leavers entering higher education and the rate of increase is higher than the national average. Rotherham does make provision for special needs, but places are close to capacity. There is an identified need to improve provision for pupils with special educational needs. The number of working age people with no qualifications in Rotherham is significantly above the national average.</td>
<td>Number of school leavers entering higher education</td>
<td>2002 shows 8.7 entrants into HE per 1,000 population</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Increase has been greater in Rotherham (stood at 4.3 per 100 population in 1994) but remains below regional and national averages.</td>
<td>10.7 per 1,000 population</td>
<td>12.9 per 1,000 population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number/ percentage of working age adults achieving NVQ Level 2 or above</td>
<td>Labour Force Survey shows 84,000 (55.4%) for Rotherham in 2004 achieving at least NVQ2.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Rotherham NVQ2 performance has improved at a similar rate to nationally remaining 6 percentage points behind national average.</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number/ percentage of working age adults achieving NVQ Level 3 or above</td>
<td>Labour Force Survey shows 554,000 (36.1%) for Rotherham in 2004 achieving at least NVQ3.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Rotherham NVQ3 performance has improved at a faster rate to nationally over the last 5 years but remains 7 percentage points behind national average.</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of working age people receiving job related training in the last 13 weeks.</td>
<td>Annual LFS for 2003/04 shows 34% of working age people in employment in Rotherham having received work related training in the last 13 weeks.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Only three years data but trend is upwards compared to stable rate nationally.</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to and usage of Internet points in Borough</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of visits to Libraries</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Baseline Summary</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Regional Comparison</td>
<td>National Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Encourage creativity, innovation and the effective use of sound science and appropriate technology</td>
<td>It is intended that AMP will establish a cluster of high technology companies which will be a focus for metals and manufacturing related research. AMP will be a cluster of sub-regional significance. The success of MAGNA science park is a good base to build from.</td>
<td>Business with links to higher education/further education colleges</td>
<td>&quot;Investors in education initiative&quot; aims to bring business and education together via LA and Chamber, being piloted in Rotherham - 80 businesses signed up</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Promote awareness of sustainable development and encourage sustainable lifestyles and business practices</td>
<td>About one third of Rotherham’s resident workforce commutes out of Rotherham Borough for employment. Although it should be acknowledged that some peripheral settlements are physically closer to larger towns in neighbouring authorities so this represents, in some cases, a sustainable option. A lot of people also commute into Rotherham. For those who own cars there has been a change in lifestyle patterns including and increasing dispersal between places where people live, work and shop and increasing patterns of consumption. Often Rotherham residents travel outside of the Borough to work and to access cultural, leisure and retail facilities</td>
<td>Number of businesses with EMS system / accredited to ISO 14001</td>
<td>EMAS registration for three council buildings achieved (Eric Manns Building, Bailey House and Netherfield Court)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of new developments with green travel plans

Number of new developments constructed in line with revised Part L of the building regulations (Conservation of fuel and power in dwellings - increases the performance of central heating boilers)

Profile of where Rotherham’s resident’s work

2001 Census shows 61% work in Rotherham, 21.6% Sheffield, 4.6% Doncaster, 2.8% Barnsley 10% elsewhere. 41,785 total out commuting.

Increase in out commuting since 1991 Census when 65.5% worked in Rotherham.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Baseline Summary</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people who live outside Rotherham, who come to Rotherham to work</td>
<td>2001 Census shows 69.3% of workplace population from Rotherham with commuting from Sheffield accounting for 10.5%, Doncaster 6.8%, Barnsley 5.3% and 8% elsewhere - total of 29,015 people commuting into Rotherham to work.</td>
<td>Increase in inward commuting since 1991 Census when 75% of workplace population where from Rotherham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTHERHAM ALIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life expectancy is low in Rotherham compared to national average (due to lifestyle, diet and history of occupational illnesses from mining and heavy industry). Mortality rates were 9% higher than national average for the period 1998-2000. In particular, Rotherham has significantly higher rates of deaths from heart disease and circulatory disease and cancers than the national average.</td>
<td>Percentage of Rotherham's population living in 10% most deprived SOA's nationally.</td>
<td>19 of Rotherham's 166 Super Output Areas are within top 10% most deprived (11.5% of population)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOA's in Rotherham which are within 10% most deprived SOA's nationally for health</td>
<td>IMD2004 shows 34 of Rotherham's SOAs falling into the top 10% most deprived nationally on the health domain (20.5% of population)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child Deprivation</td>
<td>Awaiting data (IMD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low birth weight (under 2.5kg) live born infants per 100 births.</td>
<td>2004 = 8.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of under 18 conceptions</td>
<td>Change in number of conceptions to females aged under 18 per thousand females aged 15-17 compared with baseline year of 1998.</td>
<td>-21.98% for 2005/06 -28.06% for 2006/07 -30.41% for 2007/08</td>
<td>Downward trend but increase from -16% in 2003/04(2002) to -9% in 2004/5(2003).</td>
<td>+4.0% (2003/04)</td>
<td>-2.1% (2003/04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SA Objective | Baseline Summary | Indicator | Rotherham | Target for Rotherham | Trend | Regional Comparison | National Comparison
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
The number of pregnancies in under 18’s in Rotherham is falling but still remain above the national average. Poor diet and lifestyle are issues in parts of Rotherham as a third of residents are overweight, 17% are obese, almost half do no regular or moderate exercise, a third do not eat fruit or vegetables and a quarter are smokers.

Certain settlements and neighbourhoods in the Borough have poorer health, including in children and infants.

There are Two Air Quality Air Management Areas (AQMAa) in Rotherham: 1. M1 Corridor (which includes the settlements of Catcliffe, Brinsworth, Blackburn and Wales); and 2. Brampton

**Pensioner poverty**
IMD2004 for Rotherham shows 21 SOA’s (12.65% of the borough) falling into the top 10% nationally on the income deprivation affecting older people domain.

**Life expectancy**
2001/03
Rotherham male = 75.2 (E&W = 76.1)
Rotherham female = 79.5 (E&W = 80.7)

Both male and female life expectancy has improved over recent years, narrowing gap to national average. However this hides large discrepancies between different wards, with life expectancy up to 9 years below national average.

**Mortality by type (e.g. cancer, coronary heart disease etc) - (1)** Community Strategy target reduce the mortality rate from coronary heart disease and stroke per 100,000 pop under 75. (2) reduce mortality rate from malignant cancer per 100,000 pop under 75.


**Adult smoking rate (Community Strategy)**
27% in 1998, 24% in latest 2005 survey
21% in 2006
20.25% in 2010
26% - 2002/03

**Adult obesity**
17% in 2005

11.4% (Health Survey for England 2003)
13.7% (Health Survey for England 2003)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Baseline Summary</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improve access to quality cultural, leisure and recreational activities available to everyone</td>
<td>Participation in cultural and sporting activities in Rotherham below the national average. RMBC is currently restructuring its public leisure provision. This will result in the redevelopment, replacement and enhancement of some facilities but also the closure of sports centres and pools in other parts of the Borough – including a £30m investment in four new high quality swimming pools across the borough and the redevelopment of Herringthorpe Leisure Centre</td>
<td>Swimming pools and other visits per 1,000 population</td>
<td>2004/05 3,280 visits per 1,000 population</td>
<td>3,400 by 2007/08</td>
<td>Downward trend over last 3 years due to closure of 2 leisure facilities. Plans for new facilities should start to reverse this decline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of adults participating in regular exercise (3 x 30 minute session per week)</td>
<td>25% in 2005</td>
<td>31% by 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people eating fresh fruit, fresh or frozen vegetables or salad every day</td>
<td>65% in 2002</td>
<td>81% by 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number/percentage of Rotherham’s population living within an AQMA</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of patients per GP</td>
<td>Sep 2002 GP statistics for Rotherham shows 40 practices with average list size of 2,039 per GP.</td>
<td>1,838 average list size (Sep 2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of patients per dentists</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of visits to or usage of museums per 1,000 population</td>
<td>For 2004/05 355 per 1,000 population</td>
<td>425 per 1,000 population by 2007/08</td>
<td>Re-opening of Clifton museum is now reflected in upward trend (257 in 2003/04)</td>
<td>2003/04 = 871.6</td>
<td>2003/04 = 976.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of day visitors to Rotherham</td>
<td>6.8 million for the year 2004/05</td>
<td>Increase to 7.5 million by 2006/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of residents within English Nature’s recommended distance from nearest greenspace</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lengths of new Public Rights of Way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of allotments in active use</td>
<td>Tim Archer is providing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SA Objective

### Baseline Summary

The Greenspace Audit found that the Borough has a large number of amenity greenspace sites and when compared to the Borough’s population the amount is twice the standard recommended by English Nature. There is an even split between high value/high quality and low value/low quality sites.

Open spaces need to be managed and promoted so that the local population are encouraged to use it for healthy activity. Informal walking, children’s events, and other activities which offer an alternative to competitive sports. Rotherham has over 200 miles of public footpaths, cycleways and bridleways and holds an annual two week long walking festival.

Heritage attractions in Rotherham include Roche Abbey, Clifton Park Museum, Rotherham Churches Tourism Initiative, All Saints’ Minster, Chapel of Our Lady, Magna Science Adventure Centre. There are also various nature and wildlife attractions.

A large indoor leisure development is being promoted adjacent to Rother Valley County Park. A planning application was submitted in early 2005 for the YES! Project, which will feature over 1 million sq ft of entertainment facilities including a extreme sports centre, indoor entertainment, resort spa, conference centre, hotel, golf range, restaurants, bars and cafes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of recreational space - from Greenspace Audit: type/number/area</td>
<td>Amenity greenspace: 187 / 176.8ha Natural: 100 / 948.3ha Outdoor Sports: 46 / 205.8ha Parks: 56 / 595.3ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Baseline Summary</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Enhance the function and vibrancy of town or district centres</td>
<td>Perceptions of Rotherham are generally poor, with over 50% respondents highlighting need to revive the Town Centre as very important, although the majority of people are satisfied with the environment of their area.</td>
<td>Vacancy rate of Rotherham Town Centre premises</td>
<td>2004/05 vacancy rate of 10.2%</td>
<td>9.0% for next three years to 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy rate of town centre premises</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy rate for all town centres in 2004/05 was 7.7%</td>
<td>7.0% for next three years to 2007/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foot flow in primary shopping streets of Rotherham Town Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 million in 2005</td>
<td>12% increase on baseline figure by 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Yields (rental income likely to command and its capital value expressed as a percentage)</td>
<td>Commercial Yields for Rotherham town centre in 2003 was 9%, compared to 5.75% in Sheffield (lower yield suggests higher popularity/investor confidence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with Rotherham town centre</td>
<td>Survey in 2003 showed 20% of residents think restoring and reviving Rotherham town centre should be top priority, 44% ranking this in their top 3 priorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROTHERHAM SAFE**

| 10           | Enhance safety, and reduce crime and fear of crime for everyone | Rotherham has the lowest crime rate in South Yorkshire, but there are some hotspots of activity including Rotherham Town Centre, The Valley and Clifton, Malby and Swinton. | Number of people killed or seriously injured on Rotherham's roads | 2003 calendar year outturn = 127 | Target calendar year 2006 = 108 | Last year increase caused by rising number of motor cycle accidents but showing a reduction against the 1994-98 average. |                     |
### SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic burglaries per 1,000 households</td>
<td>For 2004/05 there were 12.74 domestic burglaries per 1,000 households in Rotherham (18.8 in 2003/04)</td>
<td>12.25 by 2007/08</td>
<td>Burglaries decreased by 32% in 2004/05 and have almost halved during the last 2 years.</td>
<td>20.7 (2003/04)</td>
<td>25.9 by authority type (2003/04), 14.5 overall average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crimes per 1,000 population</td>
<td>For Rotherham 5.91 in 2004/05 (4.4 in 2003/04)</td>
<td>No target set due to changes in recording which artificially inflated recorded violent crime figures.</td>
<td>5.0 (2003/04)</td>
<td>9.8 by authority type (2003/04), 6.5 overall average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle crimes per 1,000 population</td>
<td>14 vehicle crimes in Rotherham per 1,000 population for 2004/05 (19.3 in 2003/04)</td>
<td>12.55 per 1,000 population by 2007/08</td>
<td>Vehicle crimes reduced by 27% in 2004/05</td>
<td>17.9 (2003/04)</td>
<td>21.2 by authority type (2003/04), 14.5 overall average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of racial incidents per 100,000 population</td>
<td>For 2004/05 there were 99.8 for Rotherham (135 in 2003/04)</td>
<td>110 per 100,000 population by 2007/08</td>
<td>Not enough data for trend to be established.</td>
<td>46.2 (2003/04)</td>
<td>77.4 by authority type (2003/04), 31.1 overall average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>Latest survey in 2004 shows 27% of residents in Rotherham are 'very concerned' about being a victim of crime</td>
<td>Reduce to 20% by 2010</td>
<td>Large fall from 51% in a 2002 survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth nuisance rate</td>
<td>79.2 per 1,000 households 2002/03</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For the period Apr 04 to Mar 05 overall ward crime rates varied from 40.3 (Sitwell Ward) to 240.3 (Boston Castle Ward - due to town centre crime).**

In particular, the burglary rate remains above the national average in hotspots around Rotherham Town Centre, Canklow and Eastwood.

RMBC operates a Neighbourhood Warden Scheme aimed at improving the quality of life in certain neighbourhoods and settlements and making people feel safer. 5 locations - Rawmarsh East & west, Parkgate, Klinhurst Village, Dalton & Thrybergh, and the Valley, East Herringthorpe.

Youth nuisance rate

Rotherham is over 70% rural with 10% of the Borough covered by trees.

Land covered by environment stewardship schemes

Awaiting data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Baseline Summary</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>biodiversity and geodiversity.</td>
<td>There are 7 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI’s), 6 Local Nature Reserves (LNR’s) and 9 historic parks and gardens. Rotherham has Ancient woodlands at Canklow, Scholes Coppice, Grange Park and Wickersley. Much resource has been put into these so continued promotion is considered beneficial - much of rural Rotherham is designated as an Area of High Landscape Value. There has been significant decline in biodiversity in the region and this is at further risk from the effects of climate change. A local Biodiversity Action Plan has been prepared and presents priorities for action. Brownfield sites offer an opportunity to create new woodland, meadow and wetland habitats. Since 2001, 208 ha of woodland has been approved in the borough with the support of the Forestry Resources Grant.</td>
<td>Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance, including i) change in priority habitats and species. ii) change in areas designated for their intrinsic environment value including sites of international, national, regional, sub-regional or local significance</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>SYF figures show 2,964.33 ha of woodlands (10.38% of borough)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of borough covered by woodland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of SSSI’s in borough</td>
<td>7, Anston Stones Wood, Lindrick Golf Course, Maltby Low Common, Roche Abbey Woodlands, Wood Lea Common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of LNR’s in borough</td>
<td>6, Anston Stones Wood, Catcliffe Flash, Firleby Reservoirs, Maltby Common, Scholes Coppice &amp; Keppels Field, Warren Vale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement of Local Biodiversity Action Plan Targets.</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Efficient consumption of natural resources and</td>
<td>Research undertaken on behalf of the Y&amp;H Assembly provides</td>
<td>Renewable electricity generated as percentage of total electricity</td>
<td>none generated in authority currently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 7 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI’s), 6 Local Nature Reserves (LNR’s) and 9 historic parks and gardens. Rotherham has Ancient woodlands at Canklow, Scholes Coppice, Grange Park and Wickersley. Much resource has been put into these so continued promotion is considered beneficial - much of rural Rotherham is designated as an Area of High Landscape Value. There has been significant decline in biodiversity in the region and this is at further risk from the effects of climate change. A local Biodiversity Action Plan has been prepared and presents priorities for action. Brownfield sites offer an opportunity to create new woodland, meadow and wetland habitats. Since 2001, 208 ha of woodland has been approved in the borough with the support of the Forestry Resources Grant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Baseline Summary</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>optimises the use of renewable energy</td>
<td>indicative renewable energy targets for each local authority in the region. The suggested 2010 target for Rotherham is 10 MW wind, 0.51MW Photovoltaics and 0.5MW hydro. Renewable wood fuel energy is being promoted by SYFP (supported by YF) through the Pathfinder programme. This programme offers an opportunity to obtain support for the installation of wood fuel boilers in the borough. Converting to wood fuel reduces CO2 emissions and can also use wood waste which otherwise goes into landfill. There are a number of outstanding Greenfield housing allocations in the Rotherham UDP. RMBC are resisting development on these sites, but this may be difficult until a new portfolio of sites is identified in the Housing DPD. The Rotherham Urban Potential Study identified land for 7,843 dwellings up to 2016.</td>
<td>Renewable energy capacity installed by type</td>
<td>Plans submitted for wind farm in borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No trend - first year of experimental statistics</td>
<td>Electricity: domestic = 4,239KWH, Ind &amp; Comm = 76,115KWH Gas: domestic = 20,063KWH, Ind &amp; Comm = 938,420KWH</td>
<td>Electricity: domestic = 4,600KWH, Ind &amp; Comm = 77,909KWH Gas: domestic = 20,111KWH, Ind &amp; Comm = 938,420KWH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Trends in Rotherham</td>
<td>Electricity (sales per consumer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of homes built on previously developed land</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rotherham 2004/05 achieved 46.87%</td>
<td>60% by 2007/08</td>
<td>Percentage has dropped from 53% in 2003/04 to below 47% in 2004/05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise local and global pollution including greenhouse gases and protect or enhance environmental quality</td>
<td>Rotherham is not on track to reducing its greenhouse gas targets and it is forecast that there will be an overall rise in CO2 emission over the period 1990-2010 without further action. Increases in road and air traffic are identified as key factors. There are Two Air Quality Management Areas in Rotherham: 1. M1 Corridor (which includes the settlements of Catcliffe, Brinsworth, Blackburn and Wales); and 2. Brampton</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas emissions by % of population</td>
<td>Reduce CO2 emissions from council buildings and council's housing stock</td>
<td>15% reduction in energy consumption by 2010 for council buildings. Council housing stock = 177 Ktonnes, reduce to 85 Ktonnes by 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 emissions by end user e.g. industry, domestic, transport.</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 13**

Minimise local and global pollution including greenhouse gases and protect or enhance environmental quality

- Rotherham is not on track to reducing its greenhouse gas targets and it is forecast that there will be an overall rise in CO2 emission over the period 1990-2010 without further action. Increases in road and air traffic are identified as key factors.
- There are Two Air Quality Management Areas in Rotherham: 1. M1 Corridor (which includes the settlements of Catcliffe, Brinsworth, Blackburn and Wales); and 2. Brampton

- Greenhouse gas emissions by % of population
  - Reduce CO2 emissions from council buildings and council's housing stock
  - 15% reduction in energy consumption by 2010 for council buildings. Council housing stock = 177 Ktonnes, reduce to 85 Ktonnes by 2010

- CO2 emissions by end user e.g. industry, domestic, transport. No data

- Expected from DTI late 2005
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Baseline Summary</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River quality in Rotherham is close to the England average and has improved drastically since 1990.</td>
<td>River quality</td>
<td>in 2002 92.6% of Rotherham’s river water was classified as fair or good.</td>
<td>In 1990 only 44% of Rotherham’s river water was classified as fair or good compared to 83.5% in England as a whole.</td>
<td>2002 = 93.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual levels of particles and ozone</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number/ % Population living within AQMA</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of sites of potential concern with respect to land contamination</td>
<td>New BVPI for 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of sites for which sufficient detailed information is available to decide whether remediation of the land is necessary as a percentage of all sites of potential concern</td>
<td>New BVPI for 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of pollution control improvements to existing installations completed on time</td>
<td>New BVPI for 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Reduce Rotherham’s vulnerability to flooding and to the impacts of climate change</td>
<td>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the EA on flood defence grounds</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of properties within 1:100 year flood plain</td>
<td>Awaiting data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of flood incidents and proportion of population affected</td>
<td>Graham Kaye is providing flood info - awaiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal and minimise the use of non re-usable materials</td>
<td>Rotherham produces over 120,000 tonnes of rubbish a year, the majority of which is sent to landfill.</td>
<td>Domestic material consumption</td>
<td>In 2004/05 493kgs of household waste collected per head</td>
<td>By 2007/08 = 515.05kg</td>
<td>Increase in household waste collected due to increased recycling (up from 475kg in 2003/04)</td>
<td>469.8kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Baseline Summary</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Regional Comparison</td>
<td>National Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However as a result of the need to meet European and national targets, recycling in the Borough has increased from 4% to 14.0% in 4 years</td>
<td>Total tonnage of household waste arising which is sent to recycling</td>
<td>amended BVPI indicator for 2005/06</td>
<td>18803.07 - 2005/06 21322.88 - 2006/07 24187.54 - 2007/08</td>
<td>Increase recycling from 10.7% in 2003/04 to 14.0% in 2004/05</td>
<td>10.3% (2003/04)</td>
<td>13.2% (2003/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Y&amp;H Assembly are also considering setting local authority level apportionments for dealing with municipal waste in the revised Regional Spatial Strategy.</td>
<td>Tonnage of household waste arising which is sent for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion</td>
<td>amended BVPI indicator for 2005/06</td>
<td>9366.15 - 2005/06 10618.45 - 2006/07 12045.00 - 2007/08</td>
<td>Increase from 4.2% in 2003/04 to 7.0% in 2004/05</td>
<td>4.3% (2003/04)</td>
<td>3.9% (2003/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tonnage of household waste arising used to recover heat, pose and other energy sources</td>
<td>amended BVPI indicator for 2005/06</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7% (2003/04)</td>
<td>10.5% (2003/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tonnage of household waste arising which is landfilled</td>
<td>amended BVPI indicator for 2005/06</td>
<td>98158.07 - 2005/06 95990.31 - 2006/07 93323.83 - 2007/08</td>
<td>Decrease from 85.1% in 2003/04 to 79% in 2004/05</td>
<td>77.1% (2003/04)</td>
<td>71.9% (2003/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of waste exported out of the borough</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of recycling sites in Rotherham</td>
<td>4 Waste Recycling Centres + 54 local recycling sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Enhance the built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods</td>
<td>There are 25 Conservation Areas in Rotherham Borough and a number of high quality villages set in countryside designated as an Area of High Landscape Value. RMBC operates a Neighbourhood Warden Scheme aimed at improving the quality of life in certain settlements and neighbourhoods and making people feel safer.</td>
<td>Number of listed buildings in Rotherham</td>
<td>16 Grade I 35 Grade ii* 465 Grade ii Listed Buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number/Percentage of listed buildings in Rotherham &quot;at risk&quot;</td>
<td>according to English Heritage 3 (6%) listed buildings (Grade I and II*) are &quot;at risk&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of scheduled ancient monuments</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of conservation areas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%Number of conservation areas with an up to date character appraisal</td>
<td>2004/05 = 60% 100% for 2005/06 and forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Baseline Summary</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Regional Comparison</td>
<td>National Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Encourage integrated and efficient land use</td>
<td>Number of planning applications refused as proposed development was considered inappropriate in scale and or character</td>
<td>Data not yet available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of people satisfied with area in which they live</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Encourage integrated and efficient land use</td>
<td>Percentage new homes built on previously developed land</td>
<td>Rotherham 2004/05 achieved 46.87%</td>
<td>60% by 2007/08</td>
<td>Percentage has dropped from 53% in 2003/04 to below 47% in 2004/05.</td>
<td>72.1% (2003/04)</td>
<td>70.2% (2003/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of new dwellings completed at i) Less than 30 dwellings per hectare ii) Between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare iii) Over 50 dwellings per hectare</td>
<td>No data yet – to be developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary + secondary school, employment + major health centre</td>
<td>No data yet – to be developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in decent affordable housing</td>
<td>Number / percentage of Rotherham’s settlements and neighbourhoods have Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder status. This includes the majority of the urban area of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Baseline Summary</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Regional Comparison</td>
<td>National Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Town and all settlements in the Dearne Valley. Overall. Around 3% of properties are vacant, but there are disparities across the Borough. In 2003, 78% of RMBC’s stock was classed as non-decent and 8,000 pre 20th century private rented dwellings gave cause for concern. Much of the recent new housing development has been focused on the outlying settlements. Within Rotherham Urban Area there is a notable absence of new build properties and a higher proportion of pre 20th century and local authority stock. House prices have risen in Rotherham but remain lower than the average house price for England and Wales. However house price inflation has outstripped wage inflation in Rotherham which means that homeownership is becoming more difficult. Demand for council housing remains high. Overall 65% of all housing stock is owner occupied, 23% is rented from the local authority and the remainder is rented from a private landlord or registered social landlord. There are disparities across the Borough and in the Rotherham Town Urban area home ownership averages less than 50%.</td>
<td>Proportion of LA homes which are non-decent 78% non-decent in 2004/05 following stock condition survey in December 2004</td>
<td>62% by 2007/08</td>
<td>47% in 2003/04 was reported before new stock condition survey</td>
<td>47% (2003/04)</td>
<td>52.8% by auth type, 37.9% overall (2003/04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The portion of unfit private sector dwellings made fit or demolished as a direct result of action by RMBC</td>
<td>For 2004/05 in Rotherham = 4.83% (3.21% in 2003/04)</td>
<td>Indicator is to be deleted for 2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of outstanding unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td>Community Plan indicator to decrease number of unfit private dwellings, 2003/04 = 2299</td>
<td>Achieve a 5% reduction by 2010.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of rough sleepers</td>
<td>2004/05 there were 4 known rough sleepers in the borough.</td>
<td>Reduce to 1 by 2007/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of households in temporary accommodation</td>
<td>New indicator for 2004/05 avg number of families placed in temporary accommodation under homelessness legislation compared with average from previous year. (BV203) = -75.11%</td>
<td>-15.96% 2005/06 -25% 2006/07 -33% 2007/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average house price</td>
<td>For quarter ending June 2005 average house price in Rotherham = £113,303, 61% of E&amp;W average</td>
<td>133,691 (72.3% of E&amp;W average)</td>
<td>£184,924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable Housing Completions</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Baseline Summary</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Regional Comparison</td>
<td>National Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing stock by tenure.</td>
<td>65% owner occupied, 23% rented from the local authority, remainder is rented from a private landlord or registered social landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average household size.</td>
<td>2001 Census = 2.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers on Local Authority waiting list</td>
<td>2005: 13,903 on housing register plus further 2,414 transfers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROTHERHAM PROUD**

<p>| 19 | Conserve and where appropriate enhance the landscape quality and historic assets of Rotherham | There are 25 Conservation Areas throughout Rotherham, 5 registered historic parks and gardens and 16 Grade I Listed Buildings, 35 Grade ii* and 465 Grade ii Listed Buildings. There are also 37 Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Much of rural Rotherham’s landscape is designated as an Area of High Landscape Value. | Number of conservation areas | 25 | 25 in 2007/08 | | |
|    |                                             | There are 7 SSSI’s within the Borough and 6 Local Nature Reserves | Percentage of conservation areas with an up to date character appraisal | 2004/05 = 60% | 100% for 2005/06 and forward | | |
|    |                                             | Rotherham has Ancient woodlands at Canklow, Scholes Coppice, Grange Park and Wickersley. Lots of resources have been put into these so continued promotion is considered beneficial. | Total number of listed buildings and number demolished. | | | | |
|    |                                             | Cultural attractions include, Roche Abbey, Clifton Park Museum, Rotherham Churches Tourism | Number and % of listed buildings at risk. | | | | |
|    |                                             | | Number of Scheduled Monuments. | | | | |
|    |                                             | | Number and % of Scheduled Monuments at risk. | | | | |
|    |                                             | | Number of Registered Historic Parks and Gardens. | | | | |
|    |                                             | | Number and % Registered Historic Parks and Gardens at risk. | | | | |
|    |                                             | | Percentage of borough covered by AHLV | Awaiting data | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Baseline Summary</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
<th>National Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative, All Saints’ Minster, Chapel of Our Lady.</td>
<td>% or Greenfield used for development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of urban fringe land that is degraded or not managed that is brought back into productive or recreational use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve Green Flag Award for Sustainable Management of Parks</td>
<td>Achieve Green Flag Award for Sustainable Management of Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 awards by 2006, 3 more awards by 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of local community groups</td>
<td>Listing of over 40 available (but probably not comprehensive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of racial incidents per 100,000 population</td>
<td>For 2004/05 there were 99.8 for Rotherham (135 in 2003/04)</td>
<td>110 per 100,000 population by 2007/08</td>
<td>Not enough data for trend to be established.</td>
<td>46.2 (2003/04)</td>
<td>77.4 by authority type (2003/04), 31.1 overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal and formal volunteering</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Enhance internal and external images and perceptions of Rotherham and make Rotherham a good place to live, work or visit</td>
<td>Perceptions of Rotherham are generally poor, with over 50% of respondents to ‘A Vision for Rotherham’ highlighting need to revive the Town Centre as very important.</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Draft Spatial Vision for the Region states that the accessibility and amenity of Rotherham will make it an ideal central location for living, working and leisure with easy access.</td>
<td>Percentage of residents who are satisfied with their area as a place to live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of day visitors to Rotherham</td>
<td>6.8 million for the year 2004/05</td>
<td>Increase to 7.5 million by 2006/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of new business start ups</td>
<td>215 for 2004/05</td>
<td>To be established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTHERHAM FAIRNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Enables and enhances equality and tackles prejudice and discrimination</td>
<td>There are many different ethnic groups in Rotherham and there is a significant gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender community.</td>
<td>Number of Asylum Seekers in Rotherham</td>
<td>Home Office reports that there are 677 asylum seekers in Rotherham and 151 asylum seeker children (aged 0-16).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Baseline Summary</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Regional Comparison</td>
<td>National Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of racial incidents per 100,000 population</td>
<td>For 2004/05 there were 99.8 for Rotherham (135 in 2003/04)</td>
<td>110 per 100,000 population by 2007/08</td>
<td>Not enough data for trend to be established.</td>
<td>46.2 (2003/04)</td>
<td>77.4 by authority type (2003/04), 31.1 overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of top 5% earners in RMBC that are women</td>
<td>For 2004/05 44.3% of women make up top 5% of earners</td>
<td>To achieve 50% by 2007/08</td>
<td>Upward trend, increasing from 41% in 2003/04</td>
<td>32.9% (2003/04)</td>
<td>28% (2003/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of top 5% earners in RMBC from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities</td>
<td>For 2004/05 3.02% of top earners were from BME communities</td>
<td>To achieve 4.25% by 2007/08</td>
<td>Upward trend, increasing from 1.43% in 2003/04</td>
<td>1.6% (2003/04)</td>
<td>2.6% (2003/04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of top paid 5% of RMBC staff who have a disability</td>
<td>new indicator for 2005/06</td>
<td>None set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## B2 Indicators and Targets for Rotherham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROtherham Achieving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Support, maintain or enhance the provision of quality local or easily accessible employment opportunities for all in stable or competitive growth sectors</td>
<td>Total Employment (Office for National Statistics (ONS) Labour Force Survey)</td>
<td>2% above GB average by 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Gross Weekly Salary (ONS Annual Survey of Hours &amp; Earnings)</td>
<td>Reach 90% of UK average by 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Rate: By Gender (ONS Labour Force Survey)</td>
<td>None set (but trend measurable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Rate: By Age (ONS Labour Force Survey)</td>
<td>None set (but trend measurable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Rate: By BME (ONS Labour Force Survey)</td>
<td>None set (but trend measurable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Inactivity (ONS Labour Force Survey)</td>
<td>UK average by 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of new jobs created from inward investment (RMBC)</td>
<td>Targets (cumulative) = 3,813 (2006/07) &amp; 6,355 (2009/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy rate for commercial and industrial property (RMBC)</td>
<td>No greater than 8.0% for next 3 years 2006–08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maintain or enhance conditions that enable sustainable economic growth and investment without environmental damage</td>
<td>Number of new business start ups</td>
<td>To be established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New businesses surviving 3 years plus. (Small Business Service)</td>
<td>85% by 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase annually the net stock of VAT registered businesses (ONS NOMIS)</td>
<td>Increase to 125 (2009/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inward Investment Inquiries (RMBC)</td>
<td>2005/06: 410 2006/07: 415 2007/08: 420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount/Area of allocated employment land immediately available for development (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of employment land that is constrained (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of employment generating developments granted permission that deliver significant environmental benefits e.g. habitat creation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress of Advanced Manufacturing Park, Waverley - Number of new companies located (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Facilitate sustainable transport and movement patterns</td>
<td>Mode of travel to School (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode of travel to work (2001 Census)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profile of where Rotherham's resident's work (2001 Census)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people who live outside Rotherham, who come to Rotherham to work (2001 Census)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROtherham Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Improve the level of education and skills for all, reducing disparities across Rotherham and strengthening its position regionally and nationally</td>
<td>Number /percentage of pupils achieving 5+ GCSE's at grades A*-C (DFES – RMBC)</td>
<td>Reduce gap to national average to 5% by 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of 16–19 year olds in education, training or employment. (Connexions SY)</td>
<td>Reduce number not in education training and employment to 6.7% by 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number/ percentage of working age adults achieving NVQ Level 2 or above (ONS Labour Force Survey)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number/ percentage of working age adults achieving NVQ Level 3 or above (ONS Labour Force Survey)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of working age people receiving job related training in the last 13 weeks. (ONS Labour Force Survey)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of visits to libraries (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Encourage creativity, innovation and the effective use of sound science and appropriate technology</td>
<td>Businesses with links to higher education/ further education colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to and usage of Internet points in Borough (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of businesses with IT/ broadband access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Promote awareness of sustainable development and encourage sustainable lifestyles and business practices</td>
<td>Number of new developments with green travel plans (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of new developments incorporating sustainable design features: use natural heat, energy, light &amp; water efficiency.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ROTHERHAM ALIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Improve the health of the people of Rotherham, reduce disparities in health and encourage healthy living for all</td>
<td>Number of new developments constructed in line with revised Part L of the building regulations (Conservation of fuel and power in dwellings - raises the performance of central heating boilers) (RMBC)</td>
<td>-21.98% for 2005/06; 26.06% for 2006/07; -30.41% for 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Super Output Area's in Rotherham which are within 10% most deprived SOA's nationally for health (ONS Index Multiple Deprivation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life expectancy (DoH)</td>
<td>21% in 2006; 20.25% in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortality by type (e.g. cancer, coronary heart disease etc) - (1) Community Strategy target reduce the mortality rate from coronary heart disease and stroke per 100,000 pop under 75. (2) reduce mortality rate from malignant cancer per 100,000 pop under 75. (DoH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult smoking rate (Community Strategy) (Rotherham PCT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult obesity (Rotherham PCT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of adults participating in regular exercise (3 x 30 minute session per week (Rotherham PCT)</td>
<td>31% by 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people eating fresh fruit, fresh or frozen vegetable or salad every day (Rotherham PCT)</td>
<td>81% by 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ROTHERHAM SAFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target for Rotherham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Enhance safety, and reduce crime and fear of crime for everyone</td>
<td>Number of people killed or seriously injured on Rotherham’s roads (RMBC)</td>
<td>Reduce to 108 by 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic burglaries per 1,000 households. (South Yorkshire Police)</td>
<td>Reduce to 12.25 by 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent crimes per 1,000 population (South Yorkshire Police)</td>
<td>No target set due to changes in recording which artificially inflated recorded violent crime figures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle crimes per 1,000 population (South Yorkshire Police)</td>
<td>Reduce to 12.55 per 1,000 population by 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of racial incidents per 100,000 population (South Yorkshire Police)</td>
<td>Reduce to 110 per 100,000 population by 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of crime (RMBC – survey)</td>
<td>Reduce to 20% by 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Conserve and enhance Rotherham’s habitats, biodiversity and geodiversity.</td>
<td>Land covered by environment stewardship schemes (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) change in priority habitats and species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) change in areas designated for their intrinsic environment value including sites of international, national, regional, sub- regional or local significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of Borough covered by woodland (SY Forest Partnership)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of locally designated wildlife sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in Borough (English Nature)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Efficient consumption of natural resources and optimises the use of renewable energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) in Borough (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewable electricity generated as percentage of total electricity (Dti)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewable energy capacity installed by type (Dti)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of homes built on previously developed land (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Minimise local and global pollution including greenhouse gases and protect or enhance environmental quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse gas emissions by % of population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO² emissions by end user e.g. industry, domestic, transport. (Dti will supply in future)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River quality (Environment Agency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition of surface water and ground water bodies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual levels of particles and ozone. (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Reduce Rotherham’s vulnerability to flooding and to the impacts of climate change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of properties within 1:100 year flood plain (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of properties at risk of flooding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of new developments incorporating sustainable drainage schemes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of flood incidents and proportion of population affected (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal and minimise the use of non re-usable materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic material consumption per household (RMBC)</td>
<td>By 2007/08 = 515.05kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total tonnage of household waste arising which is sent to recycling (RMBC)</td>
<td>18803.07 - 2005/06 21322.88 - 2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonnage of household waste arising which is sent for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion (RMBC)</td>
<td>24187.54 - 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonnage of household waste arising used to recover heat, power and other energy sources (RMBC)</td>
<td>9366.15 - 2005/06 10618.45 - 2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonnage of house hold waste arising which is landfilled (RMBC)</td>
<td>12045.00 - 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of recycling sites in Rotherham (RMBC)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Enhance the built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods</td>
<td>98158.07 - 2005/06 95990.31 - 2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of listed buildings in Rotherham (English Heritage)</td>
<td>93323.63 - 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number/ Percentage of listed buildings in Rotherham &quot;at risk&quot; (English Heritage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of scheduled ancient monuments (English Heritage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%/Number of conservation areas with an up to date character appraisal (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Encourage integrated and efficient land use</td>
<td>100% for 2005/06 and forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage new homes built on previously developed land (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of new dwellings completed at (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Less than 30 dwellings per hectare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) Between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi) Over 50 dwellings per hectare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary + secondary school, employment + major health centre (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in decent affordable housing</td>
<td>60% by 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of Local Authority homes which are non-decent (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of outstanding unfit private sector dwellings (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of rough sleepers (RMBC)</td>
<td>62% by 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of households in temporary accommodation (RMBC)</td>
<td>Achieve a 5% reduction by 2010. Reduce to 1 by 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.96% 2005/06; -25% 2006/07; -33% 2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Target for Rotherham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average house price (Land Registry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable Housing Completions (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers on Local Authority waiting list (RMBC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy efficiency - average Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) for energy ratings of Local Authority owned dwellings (RMBC)</td>
<td>To achieve average SAP rating of 61 by 2007/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROTHERHAM PROUD**

19 Conserve and where appropriate enhance the landscape quality and historic assets of Rotherham

| Number of conservation areas (RMBC) | 25 in 2007/08 |
| Number of listed buildings and number demolished. | |
| Number and % of listed buildings at risk. | |
| Number of Scheduled Monuments. | |
| Number and % of Scheduled Monuments at risk. | |
| Number of Registered Historic Parks and Gardens. | |
| Number and % Registered Historic Parks and Gardens at risk. | |
| Percentage of borough covered by Areas of High Landscape Value (RMBC) | |
| % of Greenfield land used for development. | |
| % of urban fringe land that is degraded or not managed that is brought back into productive or recreational use. | |
| Achieve Green Flag Award for Sustainable Management of Parks (RMBC) | 3 awards by 2006, 3 more awards by 2008 |

21 Enhance internal and external images and perceptions of Rotherham and make Rotherham a good place to live, work or visit

| Percentage of residents who are satisfied with their area as a place to live. (RMBC – survey) | Increase to 7.5 million by 2006/07 |
| Number of day visitors to Rotherham (RMBC) | |
| Number of new business start ups | To be established |

**ROTHERHAM FAIRNESS**

22 Enables and enhances equality and tackles prejudice and discrimination

| Number of racial incidents per 100,000 population (RMBC) | Reduce to at least 110 per 100,000 population by 2007/08 |
| Percentage of top 5% earners in RMBC that are women (RMBC) | To achieve 50% by 2007/08 |
| Percentage of top 5% earners in RMBC from Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) communities (RMBC) | To achieve 4.25% by 2007/08 |
| Percentage of top paid 5% of RMBC staff who have a disability (RMBC) | None set |
Contents
C1  Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Decision Guiding Questions
## C1 Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Decision Guiding Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Decision Guiding Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROtherham Achieving</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support, maintain or enhance the provision of quality local or easily accessible employment opportunities for all in stable or competitive growth sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it maintain or increase current employment rates in growth or stable sectors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it increase the diversity of job opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it enable easy access to employment opportunities including by public transport?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it help reduce disparities in the labour market actively promoting real opportunities for people and neighbourhoods most in need and encourage representation of groups in non traditional industries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it provide necessary support or services which enable people to go back to work? e.g. care support, crèche, training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage fair and decent work conditions and increase average salaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintain or enhance conditions that enable sustainable economic growth and investment without environmental damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it support growth business sectors, Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and the development of an enterprising culture, encouraging indigenous investment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage diversity and reduce dependence on single or vulnerable economic activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it help build, attract and retain a skilled workforce that meets existing and future needs? e.g. by developing the capacity of local people, tackling barriers to employment, and creating a place where people want to live or work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it build on existing successful clusters, initiatives, infrastructure and local assets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it help create confidence in Rotherham to encourage investors and employers to make a long term commitment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Environmental damage' as stated in the objective will need to be considered with reference to Objectives 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facilitate sustainable transport and movement patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it maintain or provide facilities, services and employment in locations that reduce the need to travel or are accessible by sustainable transport modes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it increase quality and affordable sustainable integrated transport options particularly in areas of need and that are accessible for the disabled? e.g. public or community transport, car share, car clubs etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it make it more attractive for pedestrians and cycling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it secure the implementation of green travel plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage local supply chains?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RoTherham Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improve the level of education and skills for all, reducing disparities across Rotherham and strengthening its position regionally and nationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it invest in the next generation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve educational attainment and qualifications particularly in low performing neighbourhoods and other groups under represented in educational achievement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it increase accessibility and participation of vocational and non vocational education and training for all but particularly for groups of people with low levels of achievement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it provide or facilitate appropriate training to address the identified skills gap?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it help increase confidence, self esteem, and aspirations to learn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Decision Guiding Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 Encourage creativity, innovation and the effective use of sound science and appropriate technology | Will it support local and sub regional clusters? e.g. AMP (Advanced Manufacturing Park, Waverley)  
Will it encourage partnership working across sectors and organisations?  
Will it create places that encourage innovation?  
Will it enhance or enable the use of ICT, innovative or sustainable technologies? |
| 6 Promote awareness of sustainable development and encourage sustainable lifestyles and business practices | Will it increase knowledge and understanding of sustainable development?  
Will it encourage or enable people to live and work more sustainably?  
Will it ensure inward investment projects are sustainable?  
Will it promote sustainable design and construction? e.g. materials, clean technologies (such as Sustainable Drainage Systems - SuDS), whole life, fit for purpose, etc. |

**ROtherham Alive**

| 7 Improve the health of the people of Rotherham, reduce disparities in health and encourage healthy living for all | Will it help ensure there is adequate provision of easily accessible services appropriate to local needs?  
Will it help address causes of ill health? e.g. poverty, social exclusion, poor housing and work conditions, under-participation in health services by specific groups or communities.  
Will it reduce inequalities in health and help target Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy areas?  
Will it encourage healthy lifestyles and prevent ill health? e.g. reducing car use, providing new facilities for and maintaining or enhancing access to physical sports, greenspace, recreation and cultural facilities, quality food retailers and a good work/life balance.  
Will it minimise risks associated with air and noise pollution or road accidents? |
| 8 Improve access to quality cultural, leisure and recreational activities available to everyone | Will it maintain or increase the type or quality of facilities in areas where there is need?  
Will it enable non-car based access?  
Will it utilise the potential of Rotherham’s greenspace and natural areas, enabling everyone to have easy access to quality areas?  
Will it improve and extend the public rights of way and green infrastructure corridors network by providing recreation for walkers, cyclists and riders?  
Will it promote Rotherham’s facilities to local people and tourists encouraging participation by all? |

**Rotherham Safe**

| 9 Enhance the function and vibrancy of town or district centres | Will it support or develop services and facilities appropriate to the community, function, character and scale of the centre and existing facilities?  
Will it help create an appropriate range of independent, competitive and national retailers?  
Will it help reduce the number of vacant properties?  
Will it support or create high quality public realm and community/amenity space encouraging positive community interaction?  
Will it encourage clean, safe neighbourhoods with minimal pollution?  
Will it create places where people of all backgrounds and circumstances want to live, work or spend leisure time?  
Will it encourage a sense of place, ownership and pride? |
| 10 Enhance safety, and reduce crime and fear of crime for | Will it enhance safety, security and reduce crime or fear of crime (including hate crime) through design or other measures?  
Will it help improve quality of life and address the causes of crime or anti social behaviour? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Decision Guiding Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>everyone</td>
<td>Will it encourage respect for people and property?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Will it protect and enhance habitats and geological sites of national, regional, or local importance? e.g. woodland, waterbodies and river corridors, regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS), meadows and brownfield sites of ecological value. Will it protect and enhance national, regional or locally important terrestrial or aquatic species? Will it maintain and enhance wildlife corridors and minimise fragmentation of ecological areas and greenspaces? Will it manage sites in a way that protects and enhances their nature conservation value? Will it create new appropriate habitats?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Will it minimise the consumption of non renewable resources? Will it increase the efficient use of water, energy, land, soil, minerals, aggregates and other raw materials by all? E.g. through integrated planning and sustainable transport, sustainable design and construction, local supply chains or awareness raising. During the appraisal each of these resources should be considered separately. Will it encourage the re-use/enhancement of existing buildings and minimise the need for new build? Will it optimise the use of renewable energy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Will it reduce emissions by greenhouse gases and ozone depleters? Will it minimise water, air, soil, land, groundwater, noise and light pollution from current activities and the potential for such pollution? During the appraisal each of these issues should be considered separately. Will it tackle key issues in Rotherham including improving water quality and reducing contaminated land? Will it help achieve the objectives of Air Quality Management Plans? Will it encourage the use of clean technologies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Will it prevent inappropriate development in the flood plain and include flood protection systems? Through design (e.g. use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) / efficient use of water) or other measures will it withstand the potential implications of climate change? E.g. changes in temperature, rainfall, drainage patterns, soil erosion, wind and storms; minimise risks or damage to the environment, property, communities and the economy; make provision for species dispersal. Note: that Objective 13 addresses prevention of climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Will it minimise the use of non re-usable materials? Will it minimise waste from households, businesses, industry or construction, including hazardous waste? Will it promote re-use, recovery, and recycling of waste? Will it provide accessible facilities for recycling waste? Will it deal with waste locally and/or through the Best Practical Environmental Option?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Decision Guiding Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 16 Enhance the built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods | Will it maintain or improve the quality or character of the settlement, area or building?  
Will it prevent development which is inappropriate in scale or character of its setting or to its function?  
Will it encourage cleanliness and/or improve the general appearance of neighbourhoods?  
Will it support local distinctiveness? (Note potential contribution of natural environment). |
| 17 Encourage integrated and efficient land use | Will it ensure new developments are in appropriate locations and are accessible by walking, cycling or sustainable transport and/or will increase the share of these transport modes?  
Will it encourage an appropriate density and mix of uses?  
Does it protect the best and most versatile agricultural land subject to other sustainability considerations?  
Will it minimise development on Greenfield sites?  
Will it ensure, where possible new development occurs on derelict, vacant or underused land and buildings? |
| 18 Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in decent affordable housing | Will it address pockets of low demand and poor housing, and reduce the number of empty/hard to let properties?  
Will it increase access to good quality housing meeting people's needs? e.g. tenure, aspirations, location, affordability, size and type particularly in high demand areas or urban areas, housing accessible to disabled people. During the appraisal each of these issues should be considered separately.  
Will it reduce the amount of unfit homes particularly run by the Local Authority or private landlords?  
Will it improve energy efficiency of homes and reduce fuel poverty? |
| ROTHERHAM PROUD | |
| 19 Conserve and where appropriate enhance the landscape quality and historic assets of Rotherham | Will it improve landscape quality? Will it ensure urban fringe and rural landscapes are protected and enhanced and degraded landscapes are improved for the benefits of all residents and visitors and significant loss of landscape character and quality is minimised?  
Will it protect and enhance Conservation Areas, listed buildings, historic parks and gardens, archaeological features and other sites and areas of historical and cultural value or their settings? During the appraisal each of these resources should be considered separately. |
| 20 Build community cohesion, involvement and encourage a pride in the community | Will it provide opportunities for communities and local groups to participate in decisions and local democracy and increase their ability to influence particularly at a local level?  
Will it help build a sustainable voluntary and community sector which works jointly with statutory agencies to meet the needs of diverse communities?  
Will it build better relations and encourage respect across communities and interests e.g. through communication or joint actions?  
Will it enable people to celebrate social, cultural and community assets and encourage community pride?  
Will it increase community capacity and confidence?  
Will it avoid creating tensions or resentment between different communities? |
| 21 Enhance internal and external images and perceptions of Rotherham and make Rotherham a good place to live, work or visit | Will it increase the aspirations of local people?  
Will it promote Rotherham as a good place which is inclusive and welcoming for all encourage people to live, work or visit Rotherham?  
Will it increase the levels of satisfaction at living in, working in or visiting Rotherham? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Decision Guiding Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROTHERHAM FAIRNESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Enables and enhances equality and tackles prejudice and discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it avoid negative impacts on different groups of people because of their race, gender, disability, religion, sexuality or age?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it promote equality directly or indirectly optimising positive impacts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it enable the involvement of all affected parties including hard to reach groups, and ensure consultation takes place to identify the positive or negative impacts on different groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it provide services and facilities that are appropriate to the needs of different groups or communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it be enable access for all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it provide monitoring to ensure all community groups are able to participate and benefit proportionally and fairly?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Core Strategy Options Sustainability Appraisal Matrix

**DATE**
May-06

**PLAN**
Core Strategy Options

**Decision Guiding Questions (DGQ) and baseline situation should inform the appraisal.**

Also see Guidance on Completing an Appraisal (Appendix C4 to SA General Scoping Report)

**NB ST = 0-4 years, MT = 5-9 years, LT = 10+ years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>UDP Baseline</th>
<th>Option A - Pro-Market</th>
<th>Option B - Needs &amp; Opps</th>
<th>Option C - Pro Env’t</th>
<th>Nature of Effect, Explanation of Assessment and Mitigation Opportunities</th>
<th>Comparison of Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support, maintain or enhance the provision of quality local or easily accessible employment opportunities for all in stable or competitive growth sectors</strong></td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>Effect: The regeneration of the local economy is the central focus for the Unitary Development Plan reflecting the need to replace jobs lost in the restructuring of Rotherham’s steel industry and the almost complete closure of Rotherham’s mining industry (except Maibly). The UDP provides a wide range of employment sites but does not specifically address target sectors or local-accessibility issues. The Plan only has a limited influence on the quality of new jobs provided. Furthermore, the UDP has policy deficiencies in safeguarding local employment opportunities.</td>
<td>Effect: This Option seeks to work with and complement selective provision by the market in promoting and providing for employment sites in most locally accessible and attractive locations and sustainable settlements. In the medium term, public sector funding and pump priming of these activities will be maintained. However, the availability of European Funding to this sub-region in the longer term and the amount of subsidy likely to be available from other sources is unknown. The continued role of Regional Development Agency (Yorkshire Forward) funding is likely to be essential in the medium term to enable sites, premises and job creating activities to be brought forward to support the restructuring of the local economy. Investment in skills training of the local workforce will be an essential part of this option to ensure the needs of local people are not enabling participation in work. Mitigation is likely to be best concentrated at marginal locations, which are relatively less attractive to the private sector in order to improve policy stance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **UDP Baseline:**
   - **Assessment of Effect:** (-2, -1, 0, 1, 2)?
   - **ST:** 2
   - **MT:** 1
   - **LT:** 1

2. **Option A - Pro-Market:**
   - **Assessment of Effect:** (-2, -1, 0, 1, 2)?
   - **ST:** 2
   - **MT:** 1
   - **LT:** 0

3. **Option B - Needs & Opps:**
   - **Assessment of Effect:** (-2, -1, 0, 1, 2)?
   - **ST:** 2
   - **MT:** 2
   - **LT:** 2

4. **Option C - Pro Env’t:**
   - **Assessment of Effect:** (-2, -1, 0, 1, 2)?
   - **ST:** 2
   - **MT:** 1
   - **LT:** 1
Main Spatial Effects: The restoration of former colliery sites for a mix of uses (particularly in the identified Strategic Regeneration Areas (SRAs) at Wath Manvers, Templeborough, Waverley and Dinnington) is ongoing. Land at Adwarke was identified as the 5th SRA but is privately owned and little economic activity has occurred here. The identification of Strategic Employment Zones (SEZs) has given clear funding priority to particular sites and promoted the cluster development of the ‘Advanced Manufacturing Park’ at Waverley (a SRA). The overall spatial effects of the UDP’s identified employment sites (both provision of new and protection of existing) is difficult to identify in the absence of an assessment of local employment accessibility.

Mitigation: Investigate possibility of undertaking local employment accessibility assessment.

Main Spatial Effects: Most attractive sites for the market are likely to concentrate in motorway corridors with many sites having limited accessibility to local communities.

Mitigation: Unlikely to be unable to entirely mitigate against shortfalls in provision by the market.

Main Spatial Effects: Employment opportunities provided in settlements identified by the South Yorkshire Settlement (Babtie) Study.

Mitigation: The continued role of Regional Development Agency funding is likely to be essential in the medium to longer term to enable sites, premises and job creating activities to be brought forward to support the restructuring of the local economy. Investment in skills training of the local workforce

Main Spatial Effects: Would seek to maintain a wider range of employment sites and locations.

Mitigation: Local safeguarding emphasis to policies – may not always be upheld in practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>The existing Unitary Development Plan adopted a broad, successful pro-economic strategy in reaction to the need to support restructuring of the local economy following the decline of the area's traditional (coal and steel based) industries. However, this strategy was not particularly discerning over target sectors and not unduly concerned about the environmental impact of economic development. The UDP Strategy also attempts to safeguard existing employment sites serving local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>The private sector is essential to the creation of economic growth and the continued restructuring of Rotherham’s economy and thus to economic sustainability. However, under this Option, economic development is likely to be opportunistic, responding to prevailing (often short term) market trends. It is also likely to have relatively little concern for environmental impact. The ability to mitigate such impact will tend to not extend beyond minimal application of legislative requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Without the involvement of the private sector the South Yorkshire economy would have collapsed completely. However, the public sector has also had considerable influence through reclamation of contaminated sites, provision of grants (through European Union Objective 1 funding) and high quality managed workspace. As the amount of land requiring reclamation by the public sector diminishes, it’s ability to provide the range of high quality sites and units also diminishes. It is thus difficult to predict the long term impact this option will have at the delivery of this Sustainability Appraisal Objective. This Option may lead to more targeting of new technology based growth sectors to maintain long term growth and skills development. There will also be scope for development of environmental industries and generally more integrated mixed use development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>More likely to be noticeable in the five 'Strategic Regeneration Areas' (SRAs) as identified in the UDP. These are based on reclaims land and reasonably well located in relation to bus routes and main centres of population. Three have been reclaimed: Templeborough; Wath Manvers and Dinnington. Restoration of the Orgreave open cast site is ongoing (by UK Coal). However, there could be negative impacts regarding the loss of habitats of conservation significance (in their own right and for species) through the reclamation and redevelopment of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>This Option envisages small scale accessible economic growth and new business formation to meet local needs only. It would most likely lead to the creation of innovative jobs and industries, including green technologies / eco-industries, on a small high quality scale. Following no noticeable effect in the short term, this Option could have a strong positive effect in the medium term reflecting the ethos of providing local jobs for local people. However, in the longer term this Option will do little to promote local economic growth and to support the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>The private sector is essential to the creation of new jobs and the promotion of economic growth. No one Option is particularly favoured above the other options. A hybrid of the Options promoting the best from each would be most appropriate; - brownfield strategy: - variety of sites in size/quality – related to requirements of modern industry / commerce; - protection of key employment sites within local communities well distributed throughout Borough; - provision of managed workspace; - enhancement of clusters where appropriate – new target sectors; - Protection of habitats and species; - Promotion and reuse of employment sites for employment activity within and near to local communities; - Promotion of Rotherham and its potential attributes to inward investors – environmental industries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such sites e.g. Skylarks at Waverley Advanced Manufacturing Park; Great Crested Newts and Little Ringed Plovers at Dinnington. Some loss of local employment sites to other uses have been experienced (e.g. Rawmarsh Yoghurt factory, Kilnhurst Danish Bacon plant).

Mitigation: The public sector, primarily through local authority, to promote and encourage more sustainable economic development and target sectors. The ability to mitigate environmental impact will tend not to extend beyond minimal application of legislative requirements.

Mitigation: Critically re-appraise portfolio with emphasis on providing for requirements of modern industry and target sectors whilst reducing environmental impacts.

**Mitigation:**

The public sector, primarily through local authority, to promote and encourage more sustainable economic development and target sectors whilst reducing environmental impacts. Mitigation: Critically re-appraise portfolio with emphasis on providing for requirements of modern industry and target sectors whilst reducing environmental impacts.

### Table

| Facilitate sustainable transport and movement patterns | Effect: There has been limited impact from early attempts to apply sustainable transport patterns via the existing Unitary Development Plan and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13 - Transport. Without strengthening of policies, this situation will continue to deteriorate. The baseline Option is likely to witness a status-quo / neutral effect in the short term but the situation will worsen over the mid to long term although developers may seek more convenient/ accessible locations as congestion increases. | Effect: This Option is likely to encourage unconstrained travel demand primarily based upon car use. Development locations will worsen congestion and undermine sustainability. There would be a continued decline in more sustainable transport modes. This situation will quickly deteriorate from the short to medium term. | Effect: This Option would entail deliberate targeting of development to the Borough’s town centres and most sustainable settlements with promotion of rapid transit systems and more sustainable transport modes. Road capacity would be optimised. Likely to experience a neutral effect in the short term until policy “kicks in” with gradual improvement in the mid to long term. The Option would seek to provide for a sufficient mix of uses in the most sustainable settlements. | Effect: This Option would entail greater emphasis on locational proximity - reducing the need to travel and encouraging ‘self containment’ of settlements, with the provision of local jobs and new housing opportunities supporting the creation of sustainable communities. Intervention to reduce car use (such as road tolls) would be more likely, as would much greater investment in rapid transit and the bus network. Although relying upon high levels of intervention and funding, this Option would be expected to bring improvement over the short to long term. | Effect: This Option would promote development of sites in sustainable locations easily accessible by more sustainable transport modes such as town centres and the Borough’s sustainable settlements. Development would be targeted to all town and local centres seeking greater ‘self containment’. The Option would involve greater expenditure (such as road tolls) and would be more likely, as would much greater investment in rapid transit and the bus network. Although relying upon high levels of intervention and funding, this Option would be expected to bring improvement over the short to long term. |

**Main Spatial Effects:**

The Unitary Development Plan’s regeneration strategy including, for example, the promotion of re-use of former colliery sites and marshalling. The Pro-Market Option is likely to bring rapid deterioration to a point where mitigation is very expensive and of little use. Although relying upon high levels of intervention and funding implied by the Pro-Environment Option (C) is likely to be unachievable.

The Pro-Market Option (A) is likely to bring rapid deterioration to a point where mitigation is very expensive and of little use. Although relying upon high levels of intervention and funding implied by the Pro-Environment Option (C) is likely to be unachievable. The Needs and Opportunities Option (B) would appear to be most realistic course of action.

In terms of mitigation, the social capital invested in the Borough’s communities needs to be supported through greater investment in infrastructure for public transport, footpath and cycle links. Public sector investment to facilitate the development of sites in sustainable locations will be essential to prevent the dispersal of investment by the private sector.
yards for employment activity at the 5 Strategic Regeneration Areas (SRA), has reinforced the Borough’s predominantly coalfield settlement pattern established in the late 19th early 20th Centuries. This has sought to support an existing dispersed settlement structure which does not encourage sustainable transport and movement patterns. The development of the Wath Manvers SRA, in particular, has not been sufficiently integrated with the community forcing people to travel relatively short distances by car to access jobs. On the other hand, the principle of maintaining a choice of employment opportunities in the Dearne Valley supports the sustainable communities principle as this area is relatively isolated from the main urban centres. The UDP strategy managed to secure some improvement in locational proximity. However, without greater intervention and funding, dispersed movement and development patterns will consolidate with continued growth of car use which is likely to worsen with time.

Mitigation: There is some scope to enhance policies but this is limited in absence of Government intervention regarding road pricing and much higher level of funding for public transport. Maximise opportunities for cycling and walking links from residential communities to, for example, employment opportunities.

Mitigation: As the situation deteriorates, mitigation would become increasingly difficult. Society may only acknowledge problem when it is too late to find sustainable remedies. There may be scope for developer contributions to support public transport and any necessary infrastructure (e.g. Supertram guided buses). However, such mitigation would only reinforce the dispersal of key activities to nationally accessible locations e.g. the Advanced Manufacturing Park at Waverley.

Mitigation: Mitigation prospects likely to be most realistic in seeking more gradual change and deployment of appropriate levels of funding. Particularly in the longer term, specified communities more likely to receive enhancements to their public transport network and, within these communities, there would be greater levels of self-containment and better walking and cycling facilities.

Mitigation: Mitigation prospects likely to be most realistic in seeking more gradual change and deployment of appropriate levels of funding. Particularly in the longer term, specified communities more likely to receive enhancements to their public transport network and, within these communities, there would be greater levels of self-containment and better walking and cycling facilities.

Mitigation: Mitigation prospects likely to be most realistic in seeking more gradual change and deployment of appropriate levels of funding. Particularly in the longer term, specified communities more likely to receive enhancements to their public transport network and, within these communities, there would be greater levels of self-containment and better walking and cycling facilities.

Effect: The effect of the existing Unitary Development Plan on this Sustainability Objective is difficult to assess but existing policies and the employment land portfolio is likely to be insufficiently targeted to modern requirements. In the recent past, planning conditions would also encourage the re-development of the existing urban fabric within ‘rapid transit’ corridors and at interchange nodes. This Option would not encourage urban extensions, such as Waverley, but could witness some consolidation of urban areas along rapid transit corridors implying possible development in some green belt areas in the long term. Whilst this Option scores positively in its impact, it presumes there will be no support for “dispersed” market opportunities and that there will be a sufficient range of all types of job opportunities readily accessible to local communities. In reality, however, the concept of clustering activities in one location, for example, the Advanced Manufacturing Park at Waverley, or research activities in the two Sheffield City Centre universities, still requires people to travel to work. It is highly likely that skilled/professional workers will continue to travel some distance to work – although this option could also promote ‘working at home’.

Effect: This Option has some similarities to the existing Unitary Development Plan baseline. However, this Option’s strategy, which attempts to provide for the needs of modern industry and business (including target sectors), is more likely to be supportive of spatial planning has limited influence on this Sustainability Appraisal Objective and it is difficult to assess which option is most beneficial. The Pro-Market Option (A) would be too selective and opportunistic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengthening its position regionally and nationally</th>
<th>have been attached to the grant of outline planning permission requiring developers to contribute to training opportunities enabling local people lacking appropriate skills to be trained and this improve access to job opportunities. However, whilst the short term effect is particularly difficult to access, the current regime is unlikely to improve the situation in the mid to long term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Spatial Effects: The current Unitary Development Plan regime promotes economic development in five Strategic Regeneration Areas (Manvers, Aldwarke, Templeborough, Waverley and Dinnington) and the safeguarding of local employment sites across the Borough but it is difficult to be spatially specific about educational and skills enhancement. The UDP has, however, supported the redevelopment of existing schools and, for example, allocated two sites at Wath for the development of the Dearne Valley College and the Humphrey Davy (University of Sheffield) School of Nursing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation: Mitigation would be difficult under this Option’s highly selective regime to skills investment (in terms of location and sector). The Pro-Market opportunities might realise some marginal contributions via ‘Planning-Gain’ for training. Partnership working with Yorkshire Forward, ‘Business Link’, training providers, and apprenticeship schemes for their own workforces, will be essential to ensure that incoming or “home grown” job opportunities are available to Rotherham’s workforce. The provision of jobs (for instance at the Advanced Manufacturing Park) which promote long distance commuting should be discouraged through the ‘up-skilling’ of the existing workforce and provision of suitable job opportunities for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation: This Option implies a need for mitigation and intervention that is sensitive to the dynamics of the global market and sectoral changes. Opportunities to enhance linkages between spatial planning and the education providers through the Borough Council’s Children &amp; Young People’s team and the Local Strategic Partnership should be maximised, as should the provision of training opportunities through the planning system (including ‘planning-gain’ s106 agreements).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation: Mitigation in response to rapid skill changes would be more difficult under this Option’s broad based (distributional) strategy. Ensure that any bespoke training that is provided locally is also nationally recognised and can be readily transferred to other companies and locations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Regional Development Agency)), this Option’s highly selective economic development regime is likely to advance education and skills in some sectors and locations but at the expense of others. This would reinforce disparities across the Borough. There could be short term benefits, mid term prospects are unclear but long term effects are unlikely to be beneficial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education and skills enhancement. Immediate effects are difficult to predict but as the regime consolidates, mid to long term effects are likely to be beneficial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In education and skills or strengthen Rotherham’s competitive position. This effect is likely to be neutral or is at least difficult to predict in the short to medium term but in the longer term, deterioration is likely. This Option does not set out to attract the larger entrepreneurs and industrialists but focuses on “growing own” opportunities. Thus, the essential investment needed to create the “step change” in the South Yorkshire economy may not be supported by this approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whilst the Pro-Environment Option (C) is too broad. The Needs and Opportunities Option (B)’s targeted approach is considered most likely to benefit the development of skills required to maintain competitiveness. A combination of broad skills development as well as attainment to support targeted sectors could offer best prospects for achieving the Sustainability Appraisal Objective. Training by local further education colleges will be essential to every approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Main Spatial Effects: Certain locations are likely to be attractive to new innovative sectors (such as Manvers, Waverley Advanced Manufacturing Park, Dinnington and Templeborough helping skills development but it is difficult to predict the spatial effects and locational decisions of firms. The consequential spatial effect of education / skills development is even more unpredictable. |

Mitigation: Mitigation is likely to consolidate an attractive local portfolio in urban centres and economic regeneration areas (such as Waverley, Dinnington and Manvers) with good transport links to the Borough’s most sustainable communities, where facilities for education and skills development will be located. |

Main Spatial Effects: Would lead to provision of employment and education / skills facilities in most of the Borough’s communities. |
| Effect: The current Unitary Development Plan regime seeks to diversify Rotherham’s employment base away from traditional industries which is promoting innovation. The reclamation of former colliery sites by Yorkshire Forward and UK Coal has enabled clean, brownfield sites to be made available for a variety of hard and soft after-uses. Furthermore European Union funding under the Objective 1 Programme for South Yorkshire has assisted the UDP’s attempts to support the development of sites and infrastructure to enable development that is creative and innovative - including the development of more ‘high tech’ industries in Rotherham. The UDP has encouraged the development of the Waverley Advanced Manufacturing Park and also identifies ‘mixed use zones’ to encourage more innovative development. The effect may continue to be positive in the short term but the mid to long term effect is less clear. | Effect: The involvement of the private sector in the local economy is important to innovation and creativity but this approach is generally likely to be highly selective only occurring where technological innovation secures market advantages and profitability. As noted in the Unitary Development Plan Baseline, the involvement of the wider public sector is often essential in South Yorkshire to the creation of appropriate development sites and thus innovation by the private sector – under the Pro-Market Option the provision of the necessary underlying development conditions by the public sector would not be so readily apparent. There may be specific opportunities for the private sector under this Option in the field of waste processing (but noting that the Council has a duty to undertake this role notwithstanding). It is considered difficult to predict the short term effect of market innovation but this is likely to bring benefit in the medium term. Longer term durability, however, remains unclear. | Effect: Similar effects to those under the Unitary Development Plan baseline are likely to be witnessed under this Option but a review of the employment land portfolio would aim to target innovative sectors. Short term effects are difficult to assess but such a targeted strategy stands a good chance of success in the mid to long term (assuming targeting is accurate). | Effect: This Option is likely to have significant emphasis on promoting the development of innovative environmental industries (energy conservation, renewable energy, waste recycling, heat from waste etc.). The scope for such industries is considerable but the rate of development is dependant upon market economics unless primed by public subsidy – accordingly short / medium term effects are difficult to assess but need and success in the longer term is more favourable. | Elements of all Options have a potential role to play. The Unitary Development Plan baseline has encouraged movement away from declining traditional industries with the Pro-Market Option (A) focussing on less risky innovation (such as the Waverley Advanced Manufacturing Park and the growth of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). The Needs and Opportunities Option (B) would seek to consolidate clusters with a portfolio of land responsive to modern requirements, whilst the Pro-Environment Option (C) is likely to seek to promote environmental industries in particular. Option B is supported by elements of Option A and C. The “excesses” i.e. dispersal tendencies of Option A should be mitigated by the provision of attractive sites in sustainable locations and a commitment to appropriate skills training to meet the needs of creative & innovative industries. |

**Main Spatial Effects:** The Sustainability Appraisal Objective is most likely to be achieved in the Borough’s 5 Regeneration Areas (particularly Waverley).  
Main Spatial Effects: Manvers, Waverley and Dinnington would appear to be most attractive to new business development with Waverley having scope for ‘Advanced Manufacturing Park’ innovative cluster development. This Option would be likely to encourage general expansion of information and communication technologies (ICT) with extensive spatial implications. 
Main Spatial Effects: The spatial effects of this Option would be difficult to identify until the outcomes of employment land review are known but this Option is likely to favour existing main centres and most attractive regeneration areas including Waverley and Manvers. 
Main Spatial Effects: There is potential for innovative environmental industries to be located at Manvers, Waverley and Aldwarke (as yet under-developed with both canal and rail access). Although this Option would actively promote this Sustainability Appraisal Objective, the Pro-Environment Option would encourage it to do so at the more local community scale. As such, the Option would not necessarily promote the development of “clusters” that encourage consolidation of like activities and could lead to greater levels of commuting. The local level approach promoted by this Option may not lead to the “step change”
| Mitigation: | More effective mitigation required in promoting / targeting technological innovation. |
| Mitigation: | Consolidate initial innovation by promoting ‘clusters’. Support development of “green” environmental technologies via the public sector. Link any job opportunities to facilitation of training and skill opportunities to better meet Sustainability Objective 4 (education and skills). Provide attractive sites in sustainable locations. |
| Mitigation: | Improved intelligence / monitoring to inform consolidation or re-targeting of sectors depending on market dynamics. Actively seek and target those industries making effective use of sound science and appropriate technology, through for example the Borough Council’s Rotherham Investment and Development Office (RIDO). Encourage higher standards of development (sustainable/ energy efficient/ high quality of design) through the regulatory planning system. Promote & Develop innovative ways of processing waste to generate energy/ recycle & reuse. |

| Effect: | Although the existing Unitary Development Plan has promoted land reclamation, under its regeneration strategy, and has attempted to reduce the need to travel and minimise waste production etc., it has also encouraged green-field low density housing development (although tempered by more recent changes in national planning policy). As such it is difficult to argue that it has had a comprehensive and integrated approach to sustainability. The Plan does not specifically promote an “awareness of” sustainable development. |
| Effect: | Unprompted, the ‘market’ is unlikely to promote awareness of sustainability. However, as sustainability becomes better understood, together with changing national and European legislation, this Option may lead to the private sector promoting more sustainable business practices and encouraging innovation to provide added value to the product/ service provided. The continued globalisation of the world economy and the “distribution” of services and manufacturing to “Third World” countries (to take advantage of cheap labour, the antithesis of sustainable development) will encourage those services and manufacturing activities remaining in the UK to become higher quality and innovative. These activities could potentially cluster e.g. Waverley Advanced Manufacturing Park; Governmental Departments locating in Sheffield; Leeds financial sector in prestigious locations, with varying sustainability effects for Rotherham and the wider region. |

<p>| Effect: | Overall this Option would adopt a more gradual pragmatic and realistic approach to achieving sustainable development, and thus indirectly promoting the awareness of sustainable development. In order to encourage more sustainable lifestyles and business practices, this Option will need to capture the essence of the Pro-Market approach (Option A) and enable the wealth generated by “clustering” to cascade to people and communities - through the control of land use allocations and the promotion of high quality sites in less “likely” locations. |
| Effect: | This Option would most actively promote “awareness” of sustainable development and encourage sustainable lifestyles and business practices, through the development of small scale businesses close to where people live enabling people to walk and cycle to work. This Option would encourage moves to achieve quicker compliance with sustainability through stricter interventions and mandatory actions. However, this “small scale” approach to new business development and the growth of indigenous industries will not necessarily support the level of economic growth that is essential to support a healthy and prosperous local economy and is likely to have a longer term detrimental effect on people’s lifestyles and ultimately the amount of funding available to invest in the delivery of local services and facilities thus threatening the sustainability of local communities as people migrate out of Rotherham to find appropriate work. As such, the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) and the Pro-Environment Option (C) are likely to serve the Sustainability Appraisal Objective the best. However, given the lack of support to inward investors of sufficient size to enable a healthy and prosperous local economy to thrive, Option C may have a longer term detrimental effect on people’s lifestyles and ultimately the amount of funding available to invest in the delivery of local services and facilities thus threatening the sustainability of local communities as people migrate out of Rotherham to find appropriate work. As such, the Needs and Opportunities Option being considered the most realistic Option. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Main Spatial Effects</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mitigation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Main Spatial Effects</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mitigation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Main Spatial Effects</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mitigation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Main Spatial Effects</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mitigation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not possible to be spatially specific.</td>
<td>Reinforce approach in line with more recent guidance.</td>
<td>Market has tended to encourage sporadic and dispersed development which would continue under this Option of minimal application of planning policy requirements.</td>
<td>Difficult to mitigate effects – current Government policy that sustainable development is the core principle underpinning spatial planning would be relatively more difficult to advance under this Option.</td>
<td>Activity and interest would focus upon directing development to the most sustainable settlements and neighbourhoods (as identified principally in the South Yorkshire Settlement (Babbage) Study).</td>
<td>In order to encourage more sustainable lifestyles and business practices, this Option will need to capture the essence of the Pro-Market approach (Option A) and enable the wealth generated by “clustering” to cascade to people and communities - through the control of land use allocations and the promotion of high quality sites in less “likely” locations.</td>
<td>Wider dispersal of growth to all communities to encourage greater self-containment / cohesion and reduced travel.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Improve the health of the people of Rotherham, reduce disparities in health and encourage healthy living for all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The existing Unitary Development Plan has had a general, but not explicitly direct contribution to the promotion of health in Rotherham. The UDP’s general provision of recreation outlets, open space, walking, cycling, pollution control, reducing vehicle emissions and safeguarding water quality and supply have all contributed. Furthermore, by promoting a brownfield regeneration strategy and encouraging all types of economic regeneration throughout the Borough, the longer term effects of the UDP should lead to greater job opportunities and increased health (and hence a healthier population). The legacy of relatively unhealthy occupations from the Borough’s traditional coal and steel-based industries will continue to have an effect. However, in summary, and if continued, the UDP and baseline approach would continue to have moderate benefits to health over the short, medium and long term.</td>
<td>This Option is likely to have relatively little concern about health issues except in a business context – private health care, fitness/ leisure centres, organic food production. Market forces are likely to widen health disparities – limited public transport – poor social- economic intervention and accessibility to social services. Effects likely to seriously deteriorate in the short to medium term with market excess tempered by business opportunity and minimal application of health and safety and environmental health regulations in the longer term.</td>
<td>The mixed private and public sector regime under this Option is likely to seek to reduce health risks and disparities but within the context of resource limitations. Health facilities would be promoted in the most sustainable communities. The option would maintain the status-quo in the short term with prospect of some improvement in the mid to long term.</td>
<td>The Option adopted to best achieve economic benefits was the Pro-Market Option A. The Unitary Development Plan Baseline supports health issues and facilities of general (but not of explicitly spatial) benefit to health. The Pro-Market Option (A) is considered most likely to increase health risks and disparities. The Pro-Environment Option (C) is likely to be of most benefit to healthy living but is subject to the limits of public resources, whereas the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) would represent a compromise between linking resource limitations to health risks (which may not be publicly acceptable). All Options would operate within the context of structural changes to the South Yorkshire economy and the legacy of relatively unhealthy occupations from the Borough’s traditional coal and steel-based industries which will continue to have an effect. The Option adopted to best achieve economic regeneration (see in particular Sustainability Appraisal Objectives 1 and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Main Spatial Effects
The spatial effects are difficult to determine, with the possible exception of Air Quality Management Areas and contribution to reduction of polluted watercourses, and indirect benefits from the provision of recreation outlets and open space etc in specific locations. Mitigation: More specific acknowledgment of health as an issue is required. Further collaborative working with Public Health and Care Trust suggested employing principle of Health Impact Assessment.

### Main Spatial Effects
Difficult to determine but expected to witness widespread risks in health arising from market forces with limited constraints (air and water pollution incidents, increased vehicle emissions caused by growth in car use despite technological innovation etc). Mitigation: Mitigation difficult as situation deteriorates leading to higher health risks.

### Main Spatial Effects
Difficult to determine but expected to more likely witness selective safeguarding of health infrastructure in the Borough’s most sustainable communities.

### Main Spatial Effects
The spatial effects are difficult to determine but this Option would be expected to encourage a general wider availability and access to health infrastructure and facilities throughout the Borough’s communities. Mitigation: The success of mitigation would be closely linked to public resource input.

### Improve access to quality cultural, leisure and recreational activities available to everyone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Option would represent a general development of the Unitary Development Plan approach but with more innovative promotion and interpretation of assets. This Option would seek to maximise contributions from the private sector for the public good and more attention would be likely to be given to encouraging private sector involvement and development catering to local needs – particularly cultural, sports and leisure facilities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the Needs and Opportunities Option (B), this Option would tend to be more specific about local needs and standards of provision but would also emphasise smaller-scale provision more tailored to local needs and sensitive to ‘carrying capacity’. Thus the Option could better support the creation of local facilities as well as local area management by communities of urban green space (positive score given potential for enhancing access to quality areas and facilities). This option would also be more realistic about avoiding competing facilities within other local authority areas or centres.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Unitary Development Plan baseline is relatively weak on provision of protection of culture and promoting private sector projects but has performed more favourably in respect of protection and provision of built and natural heritage cultural assets, despite some noticeable weaknesses. The Pro-Market Option (A) would focus on commercially viable development and be less interested in culture and ‘needs of everyone’. The Needs and Opportunities Option (B) and Pro-Environment Option (C) fair best with the latter most sustainable given its emphasis on smaller-scale provision more tailored to local needs and sensitive to ‘carrying capacity’ (albeit less politically acceptable).**
Council’s Green Space Audit has confirmed existing general surpluses in open space but not necessarily in quality open spaces. In terms of built heritage, the Council was instrumental in the creation of Magna (a national visitor attraction) and the part restoration of the Chesterfield Canal but the importance of green tourism to the local economy is not recognised. The UDP baseline has arguably performed less well on culture and arts.

### Main Spatial Effects:
Most spatially specific about country parks and local greenspace.

### Mitigation:
- Better standards of sport / recreation provision and better policies for promoting private sector projects.

**Mitigation:** Difficult to mitigate adverse effects.

### Effect:
0 1 -1 2
- Effect: This Option recognises the desirability of enhancing vitality and viability of all town centres.
- Effect: Unitary Development Plan Policy RET2 (New Retail Developments) sought to retain vitality and viability of town centres and included a degree of sequential testing following guidance in the earlier version of Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 6 (1996). Also UDP Policy RET6 (Local Shopping Provision) looked to safeguard local centres containing locally accessible facilities – reducing the need to travel. Town Centre enhancements have been promoted e.g. environmental improvements, traffic management and pedestrianisation. Land has also been allocated within and immediately adjacent to town centres for retail development. However, the functions and vibrancy of town centres have not

### Effect:
0 1 -1 -2
- Effect: The ‘market’ is likely to only invest within the most viable centres and then only selectively. This Option is likely to continue to favour out-of-town facilities, exploiting policy weaknesses and abandoning non-viable local centres. Market will focus investment only on sites readily accessible by the car. This Option is likely to lead to a long-term negative impact on this Sustainability Appraisal Objective.

### Effect:
0 1 -1 -2
- Effect: This Option would acknowledge that only the most viable facilities stand a chance of retention and enhancement – this is likely to be best supported in the most sustainable settlements and communities as identified in the South Yorkshire Settlement (Babble) Study.

### Effect:
0 1 -1 2
- Effect: Negative impacts on existing facilities and public transport interchanges – where these coincide. An inherently concern of this Option is that it would lead to dispersal of new development through a non-priority focussed approach to new development. This Option would also rely upon substantial public sector investment and does not
been particularly promoted in the UDP. The UDP Policy has to some extent been undermined by a liberal regime allowing planning permissions for an expanded Retail World through restructuring of current capacity which has allowed retail uses traditionally only seen within town centres. This has compounded the negative effects upon Rotherham’s centres from the Meadowhall development.

**Main Spatial Effects:**

Development has been allowed in the Strategic Regeneration Areas at Templeborough and Wath Manor, Thurgoland, Thurncroft (Malby ongoing), town centre enhancements implemented. Rotherham Town Centre has benefited from environmental improvements and traffic management. Town Centre living not particularly promoted although the Westgate Demonstrator project will deliver town centre apartments (proposals in infancy). Out of town centre developments have also been permitted at Retail World, Cortonwood, Bramley and Express Parks. There are current proposals for the Yorkshire Leisure Centre (YES!) development in Rother Valley Country Park.

**Mitigation:**

Spatial and implementation effects of UDP policies would be clearer if a proper hierarchy of town / district / local centres had been adopted – tighten up policies and introduce proper hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance safety, health and reduce</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance safety, health and reduce</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.

---

Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban living. Seek opportunities for public funding to pump prime investment in the development of vacant / neglected sites and buildings.

**Mitigation:**

Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements of the retail hierarchy. Focused public sector funding and the establishment of clear priorities for action to encourage the private sector to be actively involved in enhancing the function and vibrancy of town and district centres. Careful traffic management and car parking provision to assist making the town and district centres attractive, easily accessible places to visit.

**Mitigation:**

May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities.
| Crime and fear of crime for everyone | Ensuring crime reduction unless prompted to do so or where crime reduction features in design of development provide commercial advantage. | Inclusive communities more likely to address crime issue under this Option. | Needs and Opportunities Option (B) although this Option likely to promote more strongly the need for better quality and managed public realm helping to discourage crime and deterioration in local amenity. The localisation of people and jobs, i.e. working at home and close to where people live, could enhance the perception of safety as there could potentially be greater natural surveillance. | To crime reduction via layout and design of development. Therefore, assessment of the Unitary Development Plan Baseline and the 3 Options under this Sustainability Appraisal Objective is challenging. However, the Pro-Market Option (A) is considered least likely (although perhaps only marginally) to achieve this Sustainability Appraisal Objective given that the ‘market’ is only likely to seek to ensure crime reduction unless prompted to do so, or where crime reduction features in design of development provide commercial advantage. The UDP Baseline would need developing further and would be best achieved in the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) and Pro-Environment Option (C) via better design guidance for buildings, open spaces and general public realm. Arguably the Pro-Environment Option’s focus upon a need for better quality and managed public realm would best help to discourage crime and deterioration in local amenity. |


| Mitigation: Need specific policy addressing crime reduction issue. | Mitigation: Need specific policy addressing crime reduction issue and better design guidance promoting ‘secured by design’ considerations. | Mitigation: Need specific policy addressing crime reduction issue and better design guidance and pre-application discussions with developers. | Mitigation: Need specific policy addressing crime reduction issue and better design guidance and pre-application discussions with developers. |

| conserving & enhancing Rotherham’s habitats, biodiversity & geodiversity. | Effect: The Unitary Development Plan’s biodiversity policies were influenced by the now superseded Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 9 (Nature Conservation) which emphasised the protection of designated sites. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 9 now also gives equal emphasis to the enhancement of biodiversity. The private sector will not have the protection and enhancement of the Borough’s habitats and biodiversity as a significant priority. It will be perceived as a constraint to development and something to be accommodated. The intervention of the planning system would be essential to ensure protection and enhancement of biodiversity. The private sector will not have the protection and enhancement of the Borough’s habitats and biodiversity as a significant priority. It will be perceived as a constraint to development and something to be accommodated. The intervention of the planning system would be essential to ensure protection and enhancement of biodiversity. | Effect: This Option is likely to enhance biodiversity and is likely to have best prospects for achieving a comprehensive approach to optimum achievement of this Sustainability Appraisal Objective. | The Pro-Environment Option (C) is clearly the most beneficial Option to achievement of this Sustainability Appraisal Objective. The Pro-Market Option (A), even with mitigation, will generally undermine the Objective, whereas the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) will be more likely to secure the protection and enhancement of the Borough’s habitats and biodiversity. |

|  | Effect: The private sector will not have the protection and enhancement of the Borough’s habitats and biodiversity as a significant priority. It will be perceived as a constraint to development and something to be accommodated. The intervention of the planning system would be essential to ensure protection and enhancement of biodiversity. The private sector will not have the protection and enhancement of the Borough’s habitats and biodiversity as a significant priority. It will be perceived as a constraint to development and something to be accommodated. The intervention of the planning system would be essential to ensure protection and enhancement of biodiversity. | Effect: This Option is likely to witness effects similar to somewhere within the range of approaches adopted under the existing Unitary Development Baseline and the Pro-Environment Option (C). With time it is envisaged that the protection and enhancement of habitats and biodiversity will become a more | Effect: This Option will have as a central tenet the conservation and enhancement of habitats and biodiversity and is likely to have best prospects for achieving a comprehensive approach to optimum achievement of this Sustainability Appraisal Objective. | Effect: The Pro-Environment Option (C) is clearly the most beneficial Option to achievement of this Sustainability Appraisal Objective. The Pro-Market Option (A), even with mitigation, will generally undermine the Objective, whereas the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) will be more likely to secure the protection and enhancement of the Borough’s habitats and biodiversity. |
Objective. Emphasis would not only be given to more and better protected and managed local designations but to protection and enhancement of biodiversity in all locations based upon recognition that biodiversity is of fundamental concern to sustainability. Biodiversity enhancements are likely to be enthusiastically advocated as part of development proposals, where appropriate. The Option could be supported by an integrated land management approach, more investment in monitoring and data collection and full integration of the planning system with the Local Biodiversity Action Planning process.

Opportunities Option (B) will continue to witness the current difficulties experienced under the Unitary Development Plan baseline in terms of the need to compromise between the needs of economic development and the needs of biodiversity. The existing relatively poor knowledge of biodiversity interest in the Borough will require improvement to secure more effective policy approaches to biodiversity protection and enhancement (as well as detailed assessment of individual planning applications).

Main Spatial Effects: The existing Unitary Development Plan framework is more likely to favour protection of designated sites. Safeguarding of others sites likely to constrained by data limitations. Mitigation and enhancement opportunities often limited in nature and effectiveness.

Mitigation: Stricter adherence to revised national policy (PPS9) and encouragement of best practice in protection, mitigation and enhancement of biodiversity interest based upon increased knowledge of Borough’s biodiversity resource through improved and ongoing data.

Main Spatial Effects: Given that biodiversity interest can be encountered within both rural and urban locations, it is difficult to assess the likely spatial effects of this Option. Threats may be heightened in urban green-space networks and urban fringe sites where pressure for opportunistic development could be increased under this Option.

Mitigation: Given scale of threats involved it may be difficult to mitigate the anticipated detrimental effects of this Option.

Main Spatial Effects: New designations and proposals for biodiversity enhancement are only likely in areas of greatest threat such as green-space networks and urban fringe. Difficult to be spatially specific.

Mitigation: It remains difficult to mitigate all threats to biodiversity under this Option.

Main Spatial Effects: Although it is difficult to be spatially specific, this Option is likely to encourage a significant number of Borough-wide new designations including open countryside and identification of ‘biodiversity enhancement zones’ where areas of currently low biodiversity interest can be enhanced to create wider ecological corridors and networks - thus avoiding an over-concentration on protecting only the best sites for biodiversity interest. Protection and creation of species rich habitats found on brownfield land will be fully recognised.

Mitigation: Mitigation at lowest threat margins.

Main Spatial Effects: Although the existing UDP has limited recognition of the potential importance of brownfield sites as habitats supporting biodiversity.

Mitigation: More investment in monitoring and data collection and full integration of the planning system with the Local Biodiversity Action Planning process.

Main Spatial Effects: Given that the Options, the Pro-Market Option is least likely to contribute to the objective with long term detrimental effects increasing with time.

Mitigation: Given scale of threats involved it may be difficult to mitigate the anticipated detrimental effects of this Option.

Main Spatial Effects: The existing Unitary Development Plan framework was prepared based upon relatively poor knowledge of the Borough’s local biodiversity interest. Rotherham’s Local Biodiversity Action Plan has been prepared but is not well integrated into the Planning process. The UDP has a reasonable and comprehensive approach to habitat and biodiversity conservation and enhancement but does not represent the best of current thinking on these matters. The protection of habitats and biodiversity is often compromised by the need to create development sites particularly given the UDP’s underlying regeneration strategy. The UDP has limited recognition of the potential importance of brownfield sites as habitats supporting biodiversity.

Mitigation: More investment in monitoring and data collection and full integration of the planning system with the Local Biodiversity Action Planning process.

Main Spatial Effects: Given that the UDP protects Green Belt, Areas of High Landscape Value, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and locally designated ‘Areas of interest Outside of Statutorily Protected Sites’. The existing policy framework was prepared based upon relatively poor knowledge of the Borough’s local biodiversity interest. Rotherham’s Local Biodiversity Action Plan has been prepared but is not well integrated into the Planning process. The UDP has a reasonable and comprehensive approach to habitat and biodiversity conservation and enhancement but does not represent the best of current thinking on these matters. The protection of habitats and biodiversity is often compromised by the need to create development sites particularly given the UDP’s underlying regeneration strategy. The UDP has limited recognition of the potential importance of brownfield sites as habitats supporting biodiversity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Efficient consumption of natural resources and optimises the use of renewable energy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect: The Unitary Development Plan baseline approach adopted an initial recognition of the need for safeguarding natural resources and promoting renewable energy, together with use of secondary aggregates and sustainable waste management, but the approach adopted is probably too low key to achieve the longer term benefits required. The cumulative impact of not striving for this Sustainability Appraisal Objective could in the long term have a high negative impact.</td>
<td>Effect: The Option is likely to experience minimal market incentives to limit consumption of natural resources or to invest in renewables. Only limited achievement of the objective is likely in the short term but excesses in consumption may prompt support of objectives and technological innovation in the longer term such as new and cheaper technology and environmental industries involved in energy production, waste processing and recycling. However, in other employment sectors the demand for natural resources could continue until the supply is exhausted.</td>
<td>Effect: This Option would be likely to see encouragement of changes in consumption patterns and renewables technology through financial and promotional policies and favour a pragmatic approach supporting new environmental technologies and renewable energy incorporation (where cost effective) as well as reuse and recycling. It is expected that limited positive effects would be noticeable in the short to medium term but with a gradual achievement of more significant positive effects in the longer term.</td>
<td>Effect: More widespread regulatory intervention is implicit in this Option which would see relatively more significant change over the short to medium term. This option also presumes that intervention through, for example, stricter regulations, will be equally applied across all employment sectors. Thus each sector would be controlled in the same way and no one company would be placed at a competitive disadvantage.</td>
<td>The Unitary Development Plan baseline approach is considered too weak to achieve long term benefits. The Pro-Market Option (A) is likely to be too dependant upon incentives to stimulate action and innovation. Voluntary action stimulated by some incentives and general promotional policies will see some gradual benefits under the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) but it will require the greater intervention and regulation characterised by the Pro-Environment Option (C) to bring about the degree and pace of change required. Whichever Option is adopted, most successful implementation will require reliance upon the private sector to support the development of new efficient and cost effective technologies and the potential opportunities to generate profits and long term benefits of this type of approach. Research by the public sector to support these types of activities is also essential. Closer links between the universities and the public and private sectors would be beneficial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minimise local and global pollution including greenhouse gases and protect or enhance environmental quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Pro-Market option is likely to make minimal contribution to this Sustainability Appraisal Objective. Indeed it may undermine it. This option will promote development on sites within easy access to the national road network enabling the free movement of haulage and increasing commuting to work. This will lead to an increase in local and global pollution and an increase in greenhouse gases. De-contamination of sites will only occur where it is profitable to the private sector but public sector funding will only be required to assist in this process (e.g. the Croda bitumen site at Kilnhurst). The private sector is likely to be only interested in residential development in the Borough and in retail and commercial. Public sector funding is still required to promote other activities. There could be some scope for the ‘market’ to develop clean innovative solutions to assist the local economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Spatial Effects: General promotion and specific spatial effects are difficult to predict and control. Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) have been declared along the M1 corridor. Residential development of green-field sites allocated in the Unitary Development Plan have lead to an increase in local pollution but this may have been counter-balanced by the land reclamation and associated environmental improvements that have taken place. The location of new residential development predominantly in the south of the Borough away from the main employment areas has lead to greater commuting and thus reduced environmental quality. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This option offers a compromise between environmental and economic performance and is likely to try to minimise the impact of local development on local and global pollution through a strong planning policy base. However, in doing so, it would prejudice the ‘precautionary approach’ and by necessity result in increased pollution risking the wider well being of community. The Option’s adoption of more sustainable construction standards, promotion of renewable energy schemes, traffic management and promotion of the concept of creating sustainable communities, where people live close to where they work, or use public transport to access work opportunities, and the re-use of previously developed land in preference to green-field could alternatively lead to a minimisation of pollution and enhancement of environmental quality. This Option could promote a more balanced approach to sustainability aims. It may be more realistic regarding intervention, resources and subsidy and thus may be more desirable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Spatial Effects: Specific spatial effects are difficult to predict at this stage (although groundwater areas, river quality corridors and Air Quality Management Areas could be identified). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Option offers the most comprehensive treatment of all the pollution and general environmental issues advocated by the Sustainability Appraisal Objective but could do so to the detriment of continuing economic growth, thus causing greater deprivation within the Borough, and may require foregoing development in some areas. This may require an unrealistic amount of public investment and subsidy but issues advocated by this Objective are vital for public well being and sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Spatial Effects: Specific spatial effects are difficult to predict at this stage. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Pro-Environment Option (C) is the most desirable and in the short to medium term would have a major positive effect. However, in the longer term, tight controls severely limiting new development, together with tight restrictions on the movement of goods and people will lead to deprivation. Therefore, the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) may be more realistic in Rotherham which still has scope for further economic development (subject to adequate mitigation). The Pro-Market Option (A) is unlikely to achieve the Sustainability Appraisal Objective and, indeed, will undermine it. Baseline information requires enhancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Spatial Effects: As with the other Options, the spatial effects of this Option are difficult to predict but some specific areas and corridors affected can be identified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Rotherham's vulnerability to flooding and to the impacts of climate change</td>
<td>Pollution increases.</td>
<td>This Option is unlikely to support the degree of integration required to temper market actions.</td>
<td>Continuation of strict policy stance where required whilst acknowledging scope for suitable integration elsewhere.</td>
<td>Comprehensive and strict policy coverage but could disadvantage economic growth and development in some areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Spatial Effects: Washlands in river corridors are safeguarded within the Unitary Development Plan. However, more attention needs to be given to opportunities arising from more recent studies, such as the Regional Wetland Feasibility Study. Detailed spatial aspects of flood protection await the Borough Council's pending Strategic Flood Risk Study. Ongoing consideration is being given to flood risk alleviation measures at Templeborough, along the lower Don Valley, and at Catcliffe adjacent to the River Rother</td>
<td>Need for financial incentives and regulatory intervention to achieve desired effects. Designing buildings to</td>
<td>Further compulsion may be needed to achieve rate of change required by the Borough’s economy to reduce vulnerability to</td>
<td>Promotive policies and allocations would help achieve benefits and targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Spatial Effects: It is difficult to identify specific spatial effects but selective and sporadic initiatives are likely under this Option's laissez-faire regime.**

**Main Spatial Effects: As with the Pro-Market Option (A), it is difficult to be specific about the spatial effects of this Option but additional initiatives to Option A are likely within an incentivised but still largely voluntary regime (beyond regulatory minima).**

**Main Spatial Effects: This Option's public-private sector partnership approach could encourage further incentives to plan for reduction of the Borough's vulnerability to climate change and flooding. However, for the most part, this would still remain a voluntary regime (beyond regulatory minima) and is likely to only bring gradual benefits over the mid to long term. This Option may tend to over rely on science and technological-fixes to mitigate, rather than substantial reduction in levels of consumption.**

**Main Spatial Effects: This Option would emphasise regulatory intervention, backed up with subsidies and incentives and is more likely to change current adverse trends more quickly over the mid to long term. More effort is likely to be given to planning-ahead to minimise longer term vulnerability to climate change and flooding events. Regulations would be imposed to guide all future developments and adapt existing. Substantial public funding essential for research and subsequent mitigation. Option likely to rely upon new technology to change methods of construction. The Option is also more likely to promote a sustainable approach that minimises impact on climate change e.g. minimising green house gas emissions through a reduction in consumption.**

**Main Spatial Effects: The Option could encourage more widespread manifestation of renewable energy projects and ‘eco-content’ of developments. Biomass processing and storage facilities in the Green Belt, ancillary to agricultural activities, could be supported.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal and minimise the use of non-reusable materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mitigation: More pro-active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mitigation: Need for public / private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mitigation: Policy regime related to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Pro-Market Option (A) could assist achievement of European Union and Government targets but with little concessions to local interests. The Unitary Development Plan baseline needs to be developed further along the lines of the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) and the Pro-Environment Option (C) if suitable sites can be found, justified and supported politically. Option C is likely to be marginally more likely to meet this Sustainability Appraisal Objective than Option B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
policies to achieve targets and to promote new sites, technologies and collaboration to achieve more sustainable waste management. Change focus of existing policies to include the encouragement and support for waste recycling and the reduction in the amount of "waste" sent to landfill.

### Enhance the built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2</td>
<td>The Unitary Development Plan affords some recognition of the importance of build quality via design, greenspaces, environmental quality and public safety. However, the fragility of the Rotherham economy, and the recent and ongoing major economic restructuring within South Yorkshire, has meant that much new development was not &quot;fettered&quot; by the need to enhance built quality. As the local economy has gained in strength then the planning system has sought to enhance the quality of new build, improve public realm and seek higher standards of landscaping. If the existing regime were to continue, the benefits of this changing approach would be increasingly noticeable with time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Spatial Effects:** As a general issue, the spatial effects are not specific and are thus difficult to assess.

**Mitigation:** More specific policy and Supplementary Planning Document guidance regarding design and quality of built environment.

### Encourage integrated and efficient land use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>The existing Unitary Development Plan regime lacks a comprehensive approach to the efficient use of land given that its preparation was based upon the Pre-Planning Policy Guidance 3 - Housing (2000) approach towards the promotion of greenfield housing sites. However, significant reclamation of brownfield sites and promotion of mixed use zones has assisted regeneration and safeguarding the best agricultural land. Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Spatial Effects:** As a general issue, the spatial effects are not specific and are thus difficult to assess.

**Mitigation:** More stringent design requirements via new policies and Supplementary Planning Document(s).
modest benefits towards the Sustainability Appraisal Objective would be achievable in the long term.

Main Spatial Effects: 5 ‘Strategic Regeneration Areas’, derived from reclaimed derelict sites and various mixed use areas have been advocated by the Unitary Development Plan. It is possible to identify the best and most versatile agricultural land. The UDP approach has been disadvantaged by the development of greenfield housing sites and lack of guidance on development densities.

Mitigation: More comprehensive approach required seeking locational integration and promotion of higher densities. Review all greenfield housing sites and allocate sufficient brownfield land to enable housing needs to be met.

Renewal Pathfinder proposals where substantial investment is required to turn around failing housing markets. Densities will be higher where sites are close to a transport interchange and within urban and local centres but a pragmatic approach to density and parking, to meet a variety of needs and provide housing choice, would be maintained. This Option should achieve positive benefits in the medium to long term.

likely to lead to the dispersal of development to all communities where social capital is invested. This option will not necessarily focus on the consolidation of larger sustainable settlements (where some greenfield releases may be considered) but will support this Sustainability Appraisal Objective strictly i.e. development of all brownfield land first. On balance the long term effect of this approach is likely to positively support the creation of sustainable communities.

Resistance on the part of developers and potential residents may not deliver achievement of the Objective. The Needs and Opportunities Option (B) is seen as the most flexible and realistic to achieve gradual benefits and public acceptance. It is also considered as most likely to achieve the creation of sustainable communities with local services, facilities and job opportunities and most capable of providing choice to incoming investors, house buyers and to meet the needs of young professionals and local graduates thus enabling them to stay and invest their skills and ideas in South Yorkshire.

Main Spatial Effects: Sporadic and dispersed greenfield development.

Mitigation: More intervention and planning policy restraints would direct the development to the most appropriate locations in order to achieve most sustainability benefits.

Main Spatial Effects: This Option would generally achieve brownfield development within existing urban centres (including some integrated mixed use and high density development) and sustainable settlements (as identified in the South Yorkshire Sustainable Settlements (Babtie) Study). The Waverley proposals would be of potential benefit to the Objective despite being an urban extension (subject to provision of sustainable transport links) and release of housing land on a phased basis.

Mitigation: A flexible and realistic approach would be required to deliver this Objective.

Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in decent affordable housing

Effect: The existing Unitary Development Plan Affordable Housing policy and accompanying Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) has had only modest benefits to achievement of this Sustainability Appraisal Objective. There has been some confusion with the operation of the SPG to deliver affordable housing. Housing prices in the Borough are low and in some areas the housing market is failing.

0 0 0

Effect: This Option would continue to prefer greenfield low density mono-tenure offer with minimal affordable provision.

-1 -1 -2

Effect: This Option would tend to enable the provision of a more varied housing offer in the Borough’s most sustainable communities with provision of affordable housing open to negotiation via ‘Planning Gain’ s106 agreements under a flexible policy.

0 1 1

Effect: It is difficult to assess the impact this option may have on the provision of affordable housing. This option could potentially support the development of small housing schemes in a variety of locations and settlements. However, given the potentially small nature of new housing scheme contributions to the provision of affordable housing via S106

0 ? ?

The Unitary Development Plan baseline approach requires updating. The Pro-Market Option (A) is likely to perpetuate the baseline status quo with limited affordable provision but would seek to provide mixed tenure and urban living emphasis with stricter affordable requirements informed by ‘Housing Market Assessments’. The
However, a number of housing associations are keen to maintain involvement in the delivery and management of affordable housing in the Borough. The 2010 ALMO is seeking to improve the quality of its stock to “decent homes” standard but the UDP and S106 affordable housing, Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder initiative and ALMO rented housing requires a more integrated approach.

Main Spatial Effects: Affordable housing provision often related to greenfield housing development which are not always in best location for affordable housing which should be accessible to local facilities and bus services.

Mitigation: Updated policy (employing ‘planning gain’ s106 agreements, related to ‘Housing Market Assessment’, and greater collaborative working with shared interests is required.

Main Spatial Effects: Generally dispersed housing development on periphery of urban area not always well related to facilities and services.

Mitigation: As Unitary Development Plan baseline, i.e. updated policy (employing ‘planning gain’ s106 agreements, related to ‘Housing Market Assessment’, and greater collaborative working with shared interests is required.

Main Spatial Effects: This Option would tend to direct provision towards the Borough’s more sustainable communities as identified in the South Yorkshire Sustainable Settlements (Babtie) Study. The Option is also more likely to favour commitment within the Local Development Framework to the local Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder initiative to create appropriate conditions to enable the regeneration and removal of the older housing areas.

Mitigation: -

Effect: The Unitary Development Plan’s current policy framework is entirely supportive of the Sustainability Appraisal Objective but has some limitations in delivering commitment to historic assets and adequate assessment of locally-distinctive landscape quality (the latter related to the absence of a comprehensive Landscape Character Assessment for the Borough and reliance instead upon an historic assessment of landscape value in certain restricted geographical areas – Areas of High Landscape Value). Modest benefits are likely to be maintained throughout the short, medium and long term.

0 -1 -2

Effect: Under this Option ‘market’ forces are unlikely to assist the Sustainability Appraisal objective in all but a few cases. Although the private sector requires assets such high landscape quality, protected listed buildings and conservation areas to attract inward investors (need to combat “Grim up North” image), it is unlikely to want to invest in this environmental capital by choice. Thus, deterioration is more likely than benefits in the short to medium term.

1 2 1

Effect: This Option is likely to be based upon an updated Unitary Development Plan baseline with review of designations and a more up to date policy framework with some additional resourcing (for example, through possible Rotherham Town Centre Heritage Initiative monies). This Option retains a focus on protection of the existing rather than enhancement through significant public sector investment. Focus will be within the built environment through the preparation of management plans and the delivery of the possible Rotherham Town Centre Heritage Initiative but substantial investment in the environmental capital of the Borough up to 2021 is likely to be

1 2 2

Effect: This Option is likely to have a similar outcome to the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) but with more emphasis on local distinctiveness and additional designations and funding to sustain positive benefits and enhancements into the long term.

The effectiveness of achieving the Sustainability Appraisal Objective under any of the options would be limited by the amount of funding available for this type of activity. The Pro-Market Option (A) is unlikely to be sufficiently supportive of the Sustainability Appraisal Objective. The Unitary Development Plan baseline requires updating under both the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) and Pro-Environment Option (C). Option C is likely to be more desirable with a more comprehensive...
Main Spatial Effects: Spatial effects are related to the current Unitary Development Plans and current designations: i.e. Areas of High Landscape Value (AHLV), listed buildings and conservation areas. No new designations are considered likely in the foreseeable future due to resource limitations. Some notable positive enhancements have occurred (for example, at Anston Stones Wood and the part restoration of the listed locks and corridor of the Chesterfield Canal.

Mitigation: Policy framework would benefit from updating in light of more recent thinking (including more informed evidence base for both the built heritage and through Landscape Character Assessment. The commitment of more funding would also help objective.

Mitigation: Possible scope for some negotiation benefits where market shares achievement of the Objective, such as through new tourism developments.

Mitigation: Additional public resourcing required to sustain this Sustainability Appraisal Objective.

Mitigation: As with the Needs and Opportunities Option (B), additional public resourcing required to sustain this Sustainability Appraisal Objective.

Effect: There is limited recognition of community cohesion as an issue within the Unitary Development Plan but the Plan does address some component issues, such as design, safeguarding community facilities, open space, amenity. The UDP was drafted with the involvement of the community and the Local Planning Authority remains committed to the delivery of the Development Plan at the local level through involvement in local community programmes such as delivery of the Rural Priority Areas, delivery of Objective 1 funds within public realm schemes and housing regeneration schemes alongside other services and the community. As the current UDP reaches the end of its life and allocations are either developed or await removal in line with the brownfield housing weighed against other objectives such as town centre renaissance and job creation. Where these two objectives coincide there will be significant investment in Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas. The Option is likely to achieve adequate benefits over the short to medium term but experience concerns about long term commitment.

Main Spatial Effects: Likely to only focus upon selected assets such as Wentworth Village, stately house and follies and Roche Abbey.

Main Spatial Effects: This Option would retain focus upon existing recognised assets.

Main Spatial Effects: Would encourage more robust landscape designations or protection to protection of landscape character based upon recognition of local distinctiveness. Additional conservation area designations favoured.

Effect: The opportunistic nature of private interventions under this Option are unlikely to contribute to the Sustainability Appraisal Objective and would tend to focus only on the most attractive propositions. The development of new buildings by the private sector could encourage pride in the community, particularly if older derelict buildings are removed or upgraded and vacant plots are developed. This option is unlikely, however, to have a negative impact on the Objective except, if by promoting regeneration in certain areas other areas of need are excluded, and the gap between the “haves” and “have-nots” widens.

Effect: This Option would be likely to witness selective public interventions targeting sustainable communities in greatest need. Whilst the impact of pursuing the option in the medium to long term will most likely not be negative, it is difficult to predict how positive this option will be (if it is positive at all). To build community cohesion is a policy stance and the Local Authority can choose to undertake a leadership role to encourage community cohesion, involvement and pride – this option of marketing needs with opportunities does not necessarily require this Sustainability Appraisal objective to be met.

Effect: Effects under this Option are likely to be similar to the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) but with more comprehensive approach in all but the most affluent communities. Given that this Option promotes the devolution of services and facilities to the local level, it is reasonable to assume that this option envisages the devolution of decision making to the local level and a greater role for parish and town councils and local “area assemblies” of interested groups and people. It is also reasonable to assume that this option will have the greatest impact in delivering community cohesion, involvement and community pride.

Effect: Effects under this Option are likely to be similar to the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) but with more comprehensive approach in all but the most affluent communities. Given that this Option promotes the devolution of services and facilities to the local level, it is reasonable to assume that this option envisages the devolution of decision making to the local level and a greater role for parish and town councils and local “area assemblies” of interested groups and people. It is also reasonable to assume that this option will have the greatest impact in delivering community cohesion, involvement and community pride.

There are limitations of the Development Plan System to achievement of all aspects of this Sustainability Appraisal Objective – influence related more to quality place making, creation of mixed communities, safeguarding local service infrastructure, etc.). This issue is not well covered in the Unitary Development Plan baseline or Pro-Market Option (A). The Needs and Opportunities Option (B) is likely to be most realistic in targeting communities in greatest need for selective public intervention. However, Option C could potentially have the greatest impact as devolution of power to the local level is pursued under this option.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Main Spatial Effects</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Main Spatial Effects</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Main Spatial Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option (A)</td>
<td>Arguably the cumulative effects of all Unitary Development Plan policies are intended to work to make Rotherham a better place to live, work and visit.</td>
<td>Need to identify communities in greatest need (via for example the Borough’s Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy)</td>
<td>Positive effects under this Option are likely to be greatest in coincidence of Regional Spatial Strategy, South Yorkshire Sustainable Settlements (Babtie) Study, Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy and Housing Market Renewal target communities.</td>
<td>This Option is likely to deliver a more pragmatic varied offer and approach. This Option’s focus upon matching needs with opportunities would further collaborative working between the public and private sectors. The “gaps” and non-investment that arises from private sector funding dominated activities would be met by the public sector. Pump-priming and public sector investment is more likely to enhance the public realm where the private sector could only be encouraged to invest through planning conditions and planning gain’s 106 agreements. Investment in environmental improvements and tourism will continue to be a function of this Authority to enhance the image of the Borough and encourage inward investment. This Option may have widest appeal and be more realistic and balanced in the context of sustainability. Likely to be most desirable approach.</td>
<td>Promote attractive opportunities that can also save disadvantaged communities.</td>
<td>Borough wide.</td>
<td>This Option’s approach towards a more ‘green’ offer and approach may be attractive to some (economic-innovation) but is likely to appear dull and austere to others. Could imply some unpopular changes in lifestyle and consumption patterns (recycling discipline, road charging, high density urban living, minimum parking etc). Creating an attractive image of Rotherham would not necessarily be a high priority for this option. The Pro-Environment Option would seek to promote the self-containment of communities, meeting local needs through local job creation activities targeted at geographically specific areas – “grow your own”. Promoting a positive image to encourage investment from outside of the Borough – creating more extensive travel movements, national and international competition, etc. - will not be the aim of this Option. However, the approach</td>
<td>Arguably the cumulative effects of all Unitary Development Plan policies are intended to work to make Rotherham a better place to live work and visit, and this aim would be promoted to varying extents under each of the three Options. The Needs and Opportunities Option (B) is considered most likely to produce the right kind of living conditions and places to visit. The Pro-Market Option (A) and Pro-Environment Option (C) demonstrate both kinds of extreme which may not achieve ideal appeal. Some aspects of Option A could give Rotherham wider publicity and image boost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Effect: This issue is not addressed by the Unitary Development Plan. However, the limitations of the Development Plan’s contribution to this issue should be noted, and may be restricted to, for example, an emphasis on identifying and promoting for special needs – disabled, travellers, BME requirements (such as larger houses, mosques, food preparation/sales) and for aged persons.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Main Spatial Effects: In similar respects to the Unitary Development Plan baseline, the effects of this Option are not readily identifiable as spatially specific. However, this Option is likely to manifest more as an urban than rural emphasis.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mitigation: Need for a broad based and varied offer and approach. Temper excesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 -1 -1</td>
<td>Effect: This Option is considered least likely to contribute to achievement of the Sustainability Appraisal Objective given that selective market interventions are likely to favour majority interests and more affluent sectors of society.</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
<td>Effect: This Option may exhibit a more comprehensive approach to objective based upon the emphasis on identifying and contribution towards local areas of community interest.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mitigation: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the limitations of the Development Plan’s contribution to this Sustainability Appraisal Objective, it is considered that the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) and the Pro-Environment Option (C) are likely to produce most benefit. The former may be more realistic. More attention and effort is required to further specify potential Development Plan contributions to this Sustainability Appraisal Objective. The ability of current expertise to assess
### Cumulative and Synergistic Impacts (Long Term Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Assessment (Sum of all impacts added together)</th>
<th>Quantitative Assessment (Sum of all impacts added together)</th>
<th>Frequency of Rating (Count of occurrence)</th>
<th>Qualitative Assessment (Consider Interactions and Quantitative Frequency Assessments)</th>
<th>Summary of Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Simplistic determination of cumulative impact of this Option, based upon summation of all negative and positive scores implies the UDP Baseline Option would have an overall neutral impact. See box below.</td>
<td>Refer to Core Strategy Options Sustainability Appraisal Commentary for a more considered summary of Appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Simplistic determination of cumulative impact of this Option, based upon summation of all negative and positive scores implies the Option B would have an significant detrimental (negative) overall impact. See box below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Simplicity determination of cumulative impact of this Option, based upon summation of all negative and positive scores implies the Option A would have a significant detrimental (negative) overall impact. See box below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Simplicity determination of cumulative impact of this Option, based upon summation of all negative and positive scores implies the Option A would have a significant detrimental (negative) overall impact. See box below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Simplicity determination of cumulative impact of this Option, based upon summation of all negative and positive scores implies the Option B would have an significant positive overall impact to a marginally greater extent that Option C. See box below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Simplicity determination of cumulative impact of this Option, based upon summation of all negative and positive scores implies the Option B would have an significant positive overall impact to a marginally lesser extent that Option B. See box below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Simplicity determination of cumulative impact of this Option, implies that Options B and C have an overall significant positive effect, Option A a significant negative effect and the UDP Baseline an overall neutral impact See box below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Simplicity determination of cumulative impact of this Option, implies that Options B and C have an overall significant positive effect, Option A a significant negative effect and the UDP Baseline an overall neutral impact See box below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Simplicity determination of cumulative impact of this Option, implies that Options B and C have an overall significant positive effect, Option A a significant negative effect and the UDP Baseline an overall neutral impact See box below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Simplicity determination of cumulative impact of this Option, implies that Options B and C have an overall significant positive effect, Option A a significant negative effect and the UDP Baseline an overall neutral impact See box below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Core Strategy Preferred
Option Sustainability
Appraisal Matrices
E1 Core Strategy Preferred Option Sustainability Appraisal Matrices
Employment opportunities

This Policy Direction will not have a direct effect on the type and scale of development being proposed. Also, it is unlikely that the beneficial effects will be realised in terms of increased employment opportunities and as a consequence this Policy Direction will not result in the creation of jobs.

Economic Growth

The vision of creating sustainable communities is vital to supporting economic growth. The delivery of this Policy Direction could be supported via Area Action Zones or the implementation of the PSA scheme. There is an opportunity to extend the scope of this Policy Direction to consider the potential contributions of developer contributions towards the creation of economic growth. This would help to highlight the potential of this Policy Direction to create sustainable communities and support economic growth. This would help to highlight the importance of developer contributions in relation to the type and scale of development being proposed.

Health

Access to and provision of health care facilities are an important factor in relation to the type and scale of development being proposed. The beneficial effects will be major adverse because developments could contribute to the commissioning of additional healthcare resources. It is likely that the detrimental effects will be realised in terms of increased demand for healthcare resources.

Development and deadlines

The policy direction concentrates more on the social aspects of development and does not include measures to safeguard the environment. As a result, it is unlikely that the beneficial effects will be realised in terms of increased awareness and/or education of RMBC’s standards for good quality building design and Public Realm in the Borough.

Community Safety and Well Being

PD9 Community Safety and Well Being the overall effect on the SA is likely to be minor because the beneficial effects will be major adverse. However, it is likely that the detrimental effects will be realised in terms of increased demand for social services.

Educational and recreation

The appraisal recognises the importance of having sustainable communities and the role that employment opportunities and sustainable communities will play in ensuring that local people can live and/or work outside of the Borough and as a result losing their wider community and drive economic growth rather than choosing to live and/or work in the Borough.

Economy - Industry and Commerce

Economy - Industry and Commerce will have long term major beneficial effects on the SA. The appraisal recognises the importance of having sustainable communities and the role that employment opportunities and sustainable communities will have in providing additional enhancements to support their creation, such as access to public realm or sustainable transport infrastructure.

Sound science

The Policy Direction offers the opportunity to create better designed and more sustainable settlements and reduce the harmful effects of pollution. The predicted effects are minor because the beneficial effects will be realised in terms of reduced pollution. However, it is likely that the detrimental effects will be realised in terms of increased awareness of the importance of the mix and distribution of settlements.

The creation of a sustainable communities should ensure that town and country settlements function well, i.e. meet the needs of the community and sustainability of communities by locating them where people can use and take advantage of them. However, it is likely that the beneficial effects will be realised in terms of increased awareness of the importance of the mix and distribution of settlements.

Economy - Industry and Commerce will have long term major beneficial effects on the SA. The appraisal recognises the importance of having sustainable communities and the role that employment opportunities and sustainable communities will have in providing additional enhancements to support their creation, such as access to public realm or sustainable transport infrastructure.

Community Safety and Well Being will also play an important role in increasing the awareness of the importance of the mix and distribution of settlements.

Economy - Industry and Commerce will have long term major beneficial effects on the SA. The appraisal recognises the importance of having sustainable communities and the role that employment opportunities and sustainable communities will have in providing additional enhancements to support their creation, such as access to public realm or sustainable transport infrastructure.
Impact Analysis

**Outcome of blistering**

- Increased frequency of blistering due to the increased use of developer contributions towards funding community improvements.

**Mitigation Strategies**

- Implementation of community engagement initiatives to address concerns.
- Provision of adequate funding for community projects.

**Assessment of Effect**

- Moderate negative effect on community cohesion.
- Minimal impact on other indicators.

**Assessment of Residuals**

- Slight residual effect on community cohesion.
- No significant long-term impact.

**Assessment of Enhancement Opportunities**

- No enhancement opportunities identified.

**Assessment of Environment and Health Impacts**

- No significant health impacts observed.

**Assessment of Sustainability**

- Potential for improved sustainability achieved through developer contributions.

**Assessment of Economic Impact**

- Moderate positive impact on local economy due to developer contributions.

**Assessment of Social Impacts**

- Minimal social impact due to developer contributions.

**Assessment of Legislative Requirements**

- No legislative requirements impacted by the policy.

**Assessment of Development Opportunities**

- Development opportunities enhanced through developer contributions.

**Assessment of GPR (Goal and Performance Rating)**

- GPR 2: Significant improvement expected.

--

**Policy Direction Details**

- The Policy Direction aims to enhance community cohesion by requiring developer contributions towards funding community improvements.

- The frequency of blistering is expected to increase due to the increased use of developer contributions towards funding community improvements.

- **Mitigation Strategies**
  - Implementation of community engagement initiatives to address concerns.
  - Provision of adequate funding for community projects.

- **Assessment of Effect**
  - Moderate negative effect on community cohesion.
  - Minimal impact on other indicators.

- **Assessment of Residuals**
  - Slight residual effect on community cohesion.
  - No significant long-term impact.

- **Assessment of Enhancement Opportunities**
  - No enhancement opportunities identified.

- **Assessment of Environment and Health Impacts**
  - No significant health impacts observed.

- **Assessment of Sustainability**
  - Potential for improved sustainability achieved through developer contributions.

- **Assessment of Economic Impact**
  - Moderate positive impact on local economy due to developer contributions.

- **Assessment of Social Impacts**
  - Minimal social impact due to developer contributions.

- **Assessment of Legislative Requirements**
  - No legislative requirements impacted by the policy.

- **Assessment of Development Opportunities**
  - Development opportunities enhanced through developer contributions.

- **Assessment of GPR (Goal and Performance Rating)**
  - GPR 2: Significant improvement expected.
DATE: December 2006

Northampton LDF Core Strategy

POLICY PD1: PD1 Housing

5th Short Term, MT = Medium Term, LT = Long Term

1. Employment opportunities

The development of new housing has the potential to have a significant contribution to economic growth. It is an important lever for local economic development policy, particularly when development occurs on the urban fringe, within the green belt. In many cases, the primary purpose of this policy direction is to ensure that there are sufficient opportunities to create jobs in the local area. This can be achieved through the careful location of new housing, as well as the incorporation of development sites that can support local businesses and create new opportunities for employment. The policy direction could also contribute to supporting local and peripheral settlements in the long term.

2. Economic growth

Sustained economic growth, particularly over the long term, cannot be achieved without a sufficient supply of housing at the right time and in the right place. Without sufficient supply, there is a risk that the economy may not have the capacity to meet the demand for new housing. The provision of new housing is an important component of economic growth, as it can help to ensure that there is sufficient supply of housing at the right time and in the right place. The policy direction could also contribute to supporting local and peripheral settlements in the long term.

3. Environmental aspects

The policy direction is designed to ensure that all new developments are sustainable, and that they are designed in such a way that they do not have a negative impact on the environment. This can be achieved through the careful location of new housing, as well as the incorporation of development sites that can contribute to the sustainability of the local area. The policy direction could also contribute to supporting local and peripheral settlements in the long term.

4. Health

The quality and standard of housing can have a significant impact on health. The policy direction is designed to ensure that all new developments are sustainable, and that they are designed in such a way that they do not have a negative impact on the environment. This can be achieved through the careful location of new housing, as well as the incorporation of development sites that can contribute to the sustainability of the local area. The policy direction could also contribute to supporting local and peripheral settlements in the long term.

5. Public access and recreation

Access to public transport and leisure facilities is one of the Policy Direction's site selection criteria, with the exception of cultural, leisure, cultural and recreational sites also need to be considered. The policy direction could also contribute to supporting local and peripheral settlements in the long term.

6. Awareness

There is a delay in any effects occurring because they require significant public transport improvements. This will mean that residents will need to use a different form of transport to access the benefits of the development. The policy direction could also contribute to supporting local and peripheral settlements in the long term.

7. Community

There is a delay in any effects occurring because they require significant public transport improvements. This will mean that residents will need to use a different form of transport to access the benefits of the development. The policy direction could also contribute to supporting local and peripheral settlements in the long term.

8. Employment opportunities

The primary purpose of this policy direction is to ensure that there are sufficient opportunities to create jobs in the local area. This can be achieved through the careful location of new housing, as well as the incorporation of development sites that can support local businesses and create new opportunities for employment. The policy direction could also contribute to supporting local and peripheral settlements in the long term.

9. Natural resource management

The policy direction is designed to ensure that all new developments are sustainable, and that they are designed in such a way that they do not have a negative impact on the environment. This can be achieved through the careful location of new housing, as well as the incorporation of development sites that can contribute to the sustainability of the local area. The policy direction could also contribute to supporting local and peripheral settlements in the long term.
The implementation of this Policy Direction on its own would result in the broad production of water, land, soil, noise and light pollution. Although the Policy Direction does provide means to reduce transport related pollution it does not mean that people will necessarily have to commute long distances and indirectly improve their quality of life.

The standard and quality of the built environment, particularly residential areas are relevant to this Policy Direction. Homes tend to be the places where people spend most of their leisure time and the effects of design quality can affect a great number of people. The type and scale of the development identified for housing within Rotherham has the potential to improve the general level of housing in Rotherham and will be located in sustainable well designed communities.

The overall effects are likely to be beneficial because the Policy Direction encourages new developments that will help to improve access to social facilities, amenities and transport infrastructure. Likewise the interaction between all of the Policy Directions are required to contribute towards improving the quantity and quality of housing across all sectors within the housing market. Promoting the use of low energy materials and locality concepts such as flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways will also help to improve access to social facilities, amenities and transport infrastructure.

It is important that strategies to improve the quantity and quality of housing also consider other key community issues such as: flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways, promoting the use of low energy materials and locality concepts such as flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways. These enhancements could also be supported by more detailed planning arrangements with emphasis on good design.

There are some weaknesses in this policy direction. This could lead to the industry being unable to improve the standards and quality of the built environment. There is the potential for increased water pollution and unacceptable water management practices to occur as a result of this Policy Direction. Construction of houses will increase waste and increasing the total number of housing units will be a residual effect of this Policy Direction that is generated. These combined effects will result in an adverse effect throughout the life of the Core Strategy.

The requirement to produce Design and Access Statements along with Statements of Community Involvement will help to ensure that development process. Likewise the interaction between all of the Policy Directions are required to contribute towards improving the quantity and quality of housing across all sectors within the housing market. Promoting the use of low energy materials and locality concepts such as flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways will also help to improve access to social facilities, amenities and transport infrastructure.

It is important that strategies to improve the quantity and quality of housing also consider other key community issues such as: flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways, promoting the use of low energy materials and locality concepts such as flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways. These enhancements could also be supported by more detailed planning arrangements with emphasis on good design.

There are some weaknesses in this policy direction. This could lead to the industry being unable to improve the standards and quality of the built environment. There is the potential for increased water pollution and unacceptable water management practices to occur as a result of this Policy Direction. Construction of houses will increase waste and increasing the total number of housing units will be a residual effect of this Policy Direction that is generated. These combined effects will result in an adverse effect throughout the life of the Core Strategy.

The requirement to produce Design and Access Statements along with Statements of Community Involvement will help to ensure that development process. Likewise the interaction between all of the Policy Directions are required to contribute towards improving the quantity and quality of housing across all sectors within the housing market. Promoting the use of low energy materials and locality concepts such as flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways will also help to improve access to social facilities, amenities and transport infrastructure.

It is important that strategies to improve the quantity and quality of housing also consider other key community issues such as: flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways, promoting the use of low energy materials and locality concepts such as flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways. These enhancements could also be supported by more detailed planning arrangements with emphasis on good design.

There are some weaknesses in this policy direction. This could lead to the industry being unable to improve the standards and quality of the built environment. There is the potential for increased water pollution and unacceptable water management practices to occur as a result of this Policy Direction. Construction of houses will increase waste and increasing the total number of housing units will be a residual effect of this Policy Direction that is generated. These combined effects will result in an adverse effect throughout the life of the Core Strategy.

The requirement to produce Design and Access Statements along with Statements of Community Involvement will help to ensure that development process. Likewise the interaction between all of the Policy Directions are required to contribute towards improving the quantity and quality of housing across all sectors within the housing market. Promoting the use of low energy materials and locality concepts such as flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways will also help to improve access to social facilities, amenities and transport infrastructure.

It is important that strategies to improve the quantity and quality of housing also consider other key community issues such as: flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways, promoting the use of low energy materials and locality concepts such as flexible design to allow the use in more sustainable ways. These enhancements could also be supported by more detailed planning arrangements with emphasis on good design.

There are some weaknesses in this policy direction. This could lead to the industry being unable to improve the standards and quality of the built environment. There is the potential for increased water pollution and unacceptable water management practices to occur as a result of this Policy Direction. Construction of houses will increase waste and increasing the total number of housing units will be a residual effect of this Policy Direction that is generated. These combined effects will result in an adverse effect throughout the life of the Core Strategy.
| Date: December 2006 | Rotherham LOP Core Strategy | Policy REF: PD3 Economy - Industry and Commerce |

### Employment opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
<td>This policy direction would both support and enable the creation of new employment opportunities and employers to introduce local training, skills strategy and job development by advancing appropriate industrial and commercial opportunities within the borough and in the town centres where the key locations are located. Employment in retail, office &amp; public services, culture and leisure sector is seen as accessible to the majority of people by the form of transport. Strategic employment links also help to introduce accessibility by locating them with access to public and non-car modes of transport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>The supply of employment land provides a major contribution towards economic growth. The expansion and development of new employment land will help to increase accessibility by locating them with access to public and non-car modes of transport.</td>
<td>Although the development of employment land provides long term economic growth, the economic effects may be minor only because other factors are required to support major economic growth, such as good housing stock, employment opportunities, supply of skilled staff and attraction places in which to live and work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safety and Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Crime</td>
<td>This Policy Direction does not have any direct effects on crime or associated health effects.</td>
<td>This Policy Direction would be expected to have an effect on education and training in town centres. The combined effects of these and the other Policy Directions will in the long term help to deliver significant economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education and Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and Skills</td>
<td>This policy direction would be expected to have an effect on education and training in town centres. The combined effects of these and the other Policy Directions will in the long term help to deliver significant economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Innovation and social value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and social value</td>
<td>The potential of the effects from this Policy Direction could be significant. Use of technology increases the opportunities for innovation and partnership working.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment and sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment and sustainability</td>
<td>This policy direction would be expected to have an effect on education and training in town centres. The combined effects of these and the other Policy Directions will in the long term help to deliver significant economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Any cyclic recycling jobs where they could be achieved - this is a major benefit to the development. PD1 might have a major impact as long as they are well managed and the cycle recycling jobs are not repetitive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Culture and recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture and recreation</td>
<td>This policy direction would be expected to have an effect on education and training in town centres. The combined effects of these and the other Policy Directions will in the long term help to deliver significant economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Town centre land uses and relaxing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town centre land uses and relaxing</td>
<td>This policy direction would be expected to have an effect on education and training in town centres. The combined effects of these and the other Policy Directions will in the long term help to deliver significant economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safety and crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety and crime</td>
<td>This policy direction would be expected to have an effect on education and training in town centres. The combined effects of these and the other Policy Directions will in the long term help to deliver significant economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental and sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and sustainability</td>
<td>This policy direction would be expected to have an effect on education and training in town centres. The combined effects of these and the other Policy Directions will in the long term help to deliver significant economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safety and crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety and crime</td>
<td>This policy direction would be expected to have an effect on education and training in town centres. The combined effects of these and the other Policy Directions will in the long term help to deliver significant economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Natural resources consumption / renewable energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Enhanced or Mitigated</th>
<th>Duration (yrs)</th>
<th>Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources consumption / renewable energy</td>
<td>This policy direction would be expected to have an effect on education and training in town centres. The combined effects of these and the other Policy Directions will in the long term help to deliver significant economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pollution

Reducing or avoiding pollution is not the primary aim of this policy, but the adverse environmental effects of certain development proposals would cause some issues that may be likely to attract complaints from local residents and environmental groups. Consequently, development will only occur where the adverse environmental effects are avoided or reduced to an extent that they are not considered adverse.

This prediction will be supported by the proposals set out within PD1, PD2 and PD4. However, the adverse environmental effects will assisted by ensuring that the adverse effects on human beings or the environment as a result of the development proposals are avoided or reduced to an extent that they are not considered adverse. Development applications may state how the adverse environmental effects are avoided from the outset and as a result, the proposed development will be considered as environmentally sustainable.

Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities

Eco-friendly design guidelines may be applied to the proposals set out within PD1, PD2 and PD4. Implementing integrated waste minimization strategies will help to reduce the adverse environmental effects on human beings or the environment as a result of the development proposals. Development applications may state how the adverse environmental effects are avoided from the outset and as a result, the proposed development will be considered as environmentally sustainable.

Risk

Dispersing this policy direction on its own would result in the production of waste being directed towards the mainstream waste stream which would be greater than if development did not occur. However, it does have an adverse environmental impact due to recycling during operation or construction.

This should be avoided in order to maximise benefits and avoid localised impacts. Development contributions should be set in order to ensure that environmental improvements are made.

Enhancement Opportunities

Enhancement Opportunities

Enhancement Opportunities

Efficient Use of Resources contributes to this Policy Direction by ensuring that there is a mix of uses that are appropriate to the local economic and social importance of social issues during layout and design stages of the development process. This will help to reduce or avoid adverse effects on human beings or the environment as a result of the adverse environmental effects. This will help to reduce or avoid adverse effects on human beings or the environment as a result of the adverse environmental effects.
Safety and Crime: This Policy Direction does not have any direct effects on crime or health.

Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on education. This activity can enhance the vibrancy of evening economies by creating opportunities for people to exercise more frequently also improving health.

Transport: The main contribution of the Policy Direction is to concentrate new retail and leisure development into Rotherham town centre, existing town centres, district centres and local centres and existing high streets, where there are already good public transport links. or can be accessed from major routes to the town centres by non-car modes of transport. However, viable town centres and new opportunities may provide public transport links. This could provide more incentive for people to use public transport.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.

Health: Retail and leisure development will not have any direct effects on health and provision of health care. However, there is a possibility that the Policy Direction could have an adverse or beneficial effect on the health of people who use the facilities provided by the Policy Direction.

Education and Skills: This Distribution of new leisure and retail development has an effect on the health and education of local residents. There is a possibility that the Policy Direction could benefit the health and education of local residents.

Environment and sustainability: This Policy Direction is likely to make future development within the town centres. However, the Policy Direction may make future development more efficient. This could also be supported by a significant increase in the use of sustainable design.
### SA Objective: Residual effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Effect</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>The predicted effects will be supported by the proposal set out within PD6 and PD7 and by the requirement to produce additional enhancements in the long term through policy directions.</td>
<td>PD6 ensures the re-use of buildings and materials. This could be supported by more detailed guidance in Area Action Plans or Supplementary Planning Documents. It would also be beneficial to include references in sustainable design which can also contribute to the quality of built environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>It focuses, particularly if it occurs on the urban fringes or impinges into the greenfield sites, retail and leisure developments and does not consider design quality and local disturbances issues.</td>
<td>PD7 ensures the re-use of buildings and materials. This could be supported by more detailed guidance in Area Action Plans or Supplementary Planning Documents. It would also be beneficial to include references in sustainable design which can also contribute to the quality of built environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>As with PD3 (Economy – Industry and Commerce) this Policy Direction contributes to economic growth and the vibrancy and function of town and district centres.</td>
<td>PD7 ensures the re-use of buildings and materials. This could be supported by more detailed guidance in Area Action Plans or Supplementary Planning Documents. It would also be beneficial to include references in sustainable design which can also contribute to the quality of built environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>This appraisal assumes that the Policy Directions would be implemented in isolation from the rest of the Core Strategy and could result in development that significantly detracts from assets character and local disturbances issues.</td>
<td>PD7 ensures the re-use of buildings and materials. This could be supported by more detailed guidance in Area Action Plans or Supplementary Planning Documents. It would also be beneficial to include references in sustainable design which can also contribute to the quality of built environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanation of Assessment

**Strengths**

- Magna helps to give the borough something that is more likely and in use. As a result, the effects over the medium to long term are likely to be minor beneficial.
- The Policy Direction is likely to have a long term beneficial effect. It would also be beneficial to highlight these links within the Core Strategy and to require that retail and leisure development be located in areas that have previously been designated as Conservation Areas.
- The implementation of this Policy Direction is likely to have a significant positive impact on the borough's economic growth and the vibrancy and function of town and district centres. It focuses particularly if it occurs on the urban fringes or impinges into the greenfield sites, retail and leisure developments and does not consider design quality and local disturbances issues.
- The Policy Direction contributes to economic growth and the vibrancy and function of town and district centres. It focuses particularly if it occurs on the urban fringes or impinges into the greenfield sites, retail and leisure developments and does not consider design quality and local disturbances issues.

**Weaknesses**

- The Policy Direction has an impact on urban fringe or greenfield sites, retail and leisure developments and does not consider design quality and local disturbances issues. It focuses particularly if it occurs on the urban fringes or impinges into the greenfield sites, retail and leisure developments and does not consider design quality and local disturbances issues.
- The Policy Direction is likely to have a long term beneficial effect. It would also be beneficial to highlight these links within the Core Strategy and to require that retail and leisure development be located in areas that have previously been designated as Conservation Areas.
- The implementation of this Policy Direction is likely to have a significant positive impact on the borough's economic growth and the vibrancy and function of town and district centres. It focuses particularly if it occurs on the urban fringes or impinges into the greenfield sites, retail and leisure developments and does not consider design quality and local disturbances issues.
- The Policy Direction contributes to economic growth and the vibrancy and function of town and district centres. It focuses particularly if it occurs on the urban fringes or impinges into the greenfield sites, retail and leisure developments and does not consider design quality and local disturbances issues.

**Note:** The type of impact, who it effects, spatial implications and who can be consulted are more likely to result in a lag in effects occurring is evident in the appraisal.

**Causal and Spurious Impacts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal and Spurious Impacts (Long-term Only)</th>
<th>Quantitative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Land use patterns/size of sites</td>
<td>11122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Community involvement / pride</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Environment and recreation</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Equity</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Social support</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Other contributions towards the SA objectives</td>
<td>11111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Appraisal**

As with PD3 (Economy – Industry and Commerce) this Policy Direction contributes to economic growth and the vibrancy and function of town and district centres. In particular, it is the latter that the Policy Direction is likely to have a significant effect on. By focusing the appropriate level of retail and leisure developments towards either town or district centres the Policy Direction helps to support this function. It also provides an opportunity to increase the amount of activity that occurs in town centres and areas within town centres that are currently rundown and performing poorly.

**Weaknesses**

The Policy Direction does not address issues relating to the quality of design which could result in development that hinders the economic growth of town and district centres and makes them more vulnerable to crime. Likewise, without having any reference to sustainable design or standards for the quality of public realms the long term viability of the district and town centres could adversity affect.

**Enhancement Opportunities**

There is a significant opportunity, as part of this Policy Direction, to ensure that developments adopt the principles of "sustainable design" as set out in PD6. Creation of DDOs, SPDs, and design guides for sustainable development and public realms would also help to significantly enhance the development of town and district centres to those that are accessible and attractive places to visit and shop in.
4 Education and skills

The primary purpose of the Policy Direction is to make waste management facilities more accessible to the public, to reduce the number of stressful areas in the community, and to ensure that the community is aware of the need to protect the environment. This policy helps to raise awareness of issues such as waste management, recycling, and sustainable development.

9 Health

Health and safety are the key issues that are not addressed by the Policy Direction. However, the policy direction does refer to sustainable waste management, recycling, and sustainable development in the short term beneficial effect. Links with other environmental improvements are likely to happen within a short period of time. The Policy Direction could be expanded to reflect the importance of health and safety improvements. These enhancements are predicted to have a minor beneficial residual effect.

11 Resource conservation and renewable energy

The Policy Direction potentially affects national goals by shaping the energy and waste policies of the Council. The Policy Direction is also likely to be affected by other Policy Directions that are in place for waste management. The Policy Direction could be expanded to reflect the importance of health and safety improvements. These enhancements are predicted to have a minor beneficial residual effect.

12 Planning and climate change

Planning and climate change are the two Policy Directions that help to ensure that any future developments do not have an adverse effect on flood risk or sustainability. The Policy Direction also helps to ensure that the policies are in line with the wider goals set out in other Policy Directions.

9 Health

Health and safety are the key issues that are not addressed by the Policy Direction. However, the policy direction does refer to sustainable waste management, recycling, and sustainable development in the short term beneficial effect. Links with other environmental improvements are likely to happen within a short period of time. The Policy Direction could be expanded to reflect the importance of health and safety improvements. These enhancements are predicted to have a minor beneficial residual effect.

11 Resource conservation and renewable energy

The Policy Direction potentially affects national goals by shaping the energy and waste policies of the Council. The Policy Direction is also likely to be affected by other Policy Directions that are in place for waste management. The Policy Direction could be expanded to reflect the importance of health and safety improvements. These enhancements are predicted to have a minor beneficial residual effect.

12 Planning and climate change

Planning and climate change are the two Policy Directions that help to ensure that any future developments do not have an adverse effect on flood risk or sustainability. The Policy Direction also helps to ensure that the policies are in line with the wider goals set out in other Policy Directions.

9 Health

Health and safety are the key issues that are not addressed by the Policy Direction. However, the policy direction does refer to sustainable waste management, recycling, and sustainable development in the short term beneficial effect. Links with other environmental improvements are likely to happen within a short period of time. The Policy Direction could be expanded to reflect the importance of health and safety improvements. These enhancements are predicted to have a minor beneficial residual effect.

11 Resource conservation and renewable energy

The Policy Direction potentially affects national goals by shaping the energy and waste policies of the Council. The Policy Direction is also likely to be affected by other Policy Directions that are in place for waste management. The Policy Direction could be expanded to reflect the importance of health and safety improvements. These enhancements are predicted to have a minor beneficial residual effect.

12 Planning and climate change

Planning and climate change are the two Policy Directions that help to ensure that any future developments do not have an adverse effect on flood risk or sustainability. The Policy Direction also helps to ensure that the policies are in line with the wider goals set out in other Policy Directions.
17 Integrated / efficient land use

The spatial elements of this Policy Direction focus on promoting a more integrated approach to the use of waste management development sites, redundant buildings and green belt sites. The selection of these sites will be subject to environmental, amenity, transportation and amenity considerations. In addition, this Policy Direction also promotes the allocation of sites that can take advantage of rail and canal transport infrastructure which would contribute to an improvement in sustainable transport journeys. The Policy Direction also promotes the development of a range of facilities that are appropriate and proportionate to resources available. This helps to support the hierarchy of settlements and should allow the type of development to match the type of settlement within the hierarchy.

Assessment of Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Assessment

In the short term this Policy Direction provides non-land-based development proposals for waste management development that is viable and realistic. In the medium term of this development will be relatively linked. As the result the validation of any impacts is likely to be more difficult. However as time progresses and more development occurs, the Policy Direction is more likely to have effect on the SA objective as waste management facilities are built or enhanced. Although this is likely to have a beneficial effect the magnitude is minor as this Policy Direction will only influence waste management development that is likely to account for a small proportion of future development within the Borough.

Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Decent and Affordable Housing

This Policy Direction has no effect on this objective because there is no type of development or distribution of waste management development.

Assessment of Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Assessment

The predicted effects are neutral.

Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 Landscape quality / historic assets

Historically, waste management developments have a history of having significant visual and landscape impacts. Landfill developments also have significant adverse effects on historic assets. This Policy Direction addresses these short comings by taking provisions that should ensure waste developments are subject to environmental, amenity, transportation and public health considerations.

Assessment of Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Assessment

The predicted effects are neutral. This is because the Policy Direction only wastes to protect existing assets and does not extend this to enhancing the condition of assets. As a result, the condition of landscape quality and historic assets are not expected to change from the neutral effects.

Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Controllability / involvement / public participation

This Policy Direction does not have any adverse effects on the SA objective. There is an opportunity to see the development of a more detailed waste strategy for the Borough as an opportunity to increase community involvement to select the type and location of facilities, especially those that could serve local or district centres. This could also be as the incentive for further community involvement exercises for other DPDs, AAPs, SPDs etc.

Assessment of Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Assessment

If controllability is encouraged as a result of waste management development proposals the effects would occur very early on, during planning and scheme development activities.

Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Rotherham’s external image and perceptions

Historically, waste management developments have a history of down barriers, whether the external image and perceptions are social or physical. This Policy Direction will help to improve the external image and perceptions.

Assessment of Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Assessment

This Policy Direction is intended to have a significant impact on this objective, either positively or negatively. As a result the overall effect is predicted to be neutral.

Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 Policy for Sustainable Communities: requirements of future Government policy

This Policy Direction does not consider community integration issues or groups that may be specifically affected by a lack of access to services or information. As a consequence this has an adverse effect, particularly over the medium to long term as access to services and information becomes more important for local authorities that are trying to meet their waste management targets.

Assessment of Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of Assessment

The spatial extent of this effect is likely to be limited to a small area or number of people. As a consequence the magnitude of future Government policy regarding waste management is difficult to predict, with any certainty, the long-term effects are likely to be neutral.

Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (5 yrs)</th>
<th>MT (10 yrs)</th>
<th>LT (30 yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C:/Documents and Settings/david.edwards/Local Settings/Temporary Internet Files/OLK17C/Appendix E - Core Strategy Preferred Option SA Matrices.xls
| Table 1: Key Objectives of the Core Strategy and their Assessment |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| **Objective** | **Assessment** (1-5) | **Explanation of Assessment** | **Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities** | **Notes** |
| **Economic Growth** | 1 | The transport infrastructure has a critical role by supporting economic growth by making potential employment opportunities accessible to a greater number of people, thereby increasing the number of jobs available to potential employees. Without transport infrastructure, it would not be possible to realize the full economic growth benefits. The type of economic growth that is anticipated is employment growth, which would result in more people being employed and less unemployment. This would be achieved through the development of strategic transport corridors and improved public transport services. | 1 2 2 | The policy direction might have a beneficial effect on other Core Strategy objectives. In particular, it would help to enhance the role of development. This could be achieved through the Policies and Allocations DPDs and PINS Sustainable Communities. |
| **Social Cohesion** | 1 2 2 | The transport infrastructure has a critical role by supporting economic growth by making potential employment opportunities accessible to a greater number of people, thereby increasing the number of jobs available to potential employees. Without transport infrastructure, it would not be possible to realize the full economic growth benefits. The type of economic growth that is anticipated is employment growth, which would result in more people being employed and less unemployment. This would be achieved through the development of strategic transport corridors and improved public transport services. | 1 2 2 | The policy direction might have a beneficial effect on other Core Strategy objectives. In particular, it would help to enhance the role of development. This could be achieved through the Policies and Allocations DPDs and PINS Sustainable Communities. |
| **Quality of Life** | 1 2 2 | The transport infrastructure has a critical role by supporting economic growth by making potential employment opportunities accessible to a greater number of people, thereby increasing the number of jobs available to potential employees. Without transport infrastructure, it would not be possible to realize the full economic growth benefits. The type of economic growth that is anticipated is employment growth, which would result in more people being employed and less unemployment. This would be achieved through the development of strategic transport corridors and improved public transport services. | 1 2 2 | The policy direction might have a beneficial effect on other Core Strategy objectives. In particular, it would help to enhance the role of development. This could be achieved through the Policies and Allocations DPDs and PINS Sustainable Communities. |

NOTES: December 2006

Notes: The Plan Direction has a supporting role for education enhancement by highlighting the importance of the Plan Direction to influence the siting of these developments and to ensure public transport and sustainable transport infrastructure is enhanced to make them a more attractive alternative to car transport. This could be achieved through the Policies and Allocations DPDs and PINS Sustainable Communities.

**Explanation of Assessment**

**Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities**

**Notes**
22 Equality This Policy Direction contributes towards reducing physical exclusion.

15 Waste Transportation has little effect on waste generation or the way in which waste is managed. It does however have the potential to reduce the amount of waste generated and the associated costs. One area of concern is the disposal of waste from large events. This has the potential to create a significant amount of waste that needs to be transported and disposed of in a sustainable manner.

14 Flooding and climate change Rainstorms can also result in water and ground pollution. At this stage it is difficult to predict the magnitude of the effects because it is impossible to predict the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. However, by the medium to long term any adverse effects that could occur if this Policy Direction were implemented will be less severe because of the effects of climate change. For areas that are currently experiencing low demand for transport and non-car transport infrastructure, this is particularly relevant. Flooding and climate change will have a significant effect on people's perception of the borough. By making non-car transport infrastructure accessible to people, this Policy Direction will help to make the borough a more attractive place to live, work and visit. This should, in the long term, help to ensure that Rotherham's image improves.

13 Settlement - neighbourband built quality Urban developments do not have a significant effect on people with mobility difficulties. The Policy Direction does not address sustainable design and construction issues associated with transportation developments. This could for example include use of recycled aggregates and materials with developing new transport infrastructure. PD8 also promotes the use of sustainable materials and recycling of materials, both of which would help to reduce emissions. The Core Strategy could also help to promote the concept of zero waste developments.

12 Waste Transportation is an important factor for areas that are currently experiencing low demand for transport and non-car transport infrastructure. In some cases, such as the development of transport infrastructure, this may be a significant effect on people with an opportunity to enjoy the landscape and historic assets. In others, such as the development of transport infrastructure, this may be a significant effect on people with mobility difficulties. The Policy Direction does not address sustainable design and construction issues associated with transportation developments. This could for example include use of recycled aggregates and materials.

111 Residual effectsEnhancement and Mitigation OpportunitiesPredicted Nature of Effect

112 Magnitude of the effects are predicted to be minor because the development of transport infrastructure is the type of development that is less likely to be affected by the effects of climate change. However, by the medium to long term any adverse effects that could occur if this Policy Direction were implemented will be less severe because of the effects of climate change. For areas that are currently experiencing low demand for transport and non-car transport infrastructure, this is particularly relevant. Flooding and climate change will have a significant effect on people's perception of the borough. By making non-car transport infrastructure accessible to people, this Policy Direction will help to make the borough a more attractive place to live, work and visit. This should, in the long term, help to ensure that Rotherham's image improves.

111 Residual effectsEnhancement and Mitigation OpportunitiesPredicted Nature of Effect

112 Magnitude of the effects are predicted to be minor because the development of transport infrastructure is the type of development that is less likely to be affected by the effects of climate change. However, by the medium to long term any adverse effects that could occur if this Policy Direction were implemented will be less severe because of the effects of climate change. For areas that are currently experiencing low demand for transport and non-car transport infrastructure, this is particularly relevant. Flooding and climate change will have a significant effect on people's perception of the borough. By making non-car transport infrastructure accessible to people, this Policy Direction will help to make the borough a more attractive place to live, work and visit. This should, in the long term, help to ensure that Rotherham's image improves.

111 Residual effectsEnhancement and Mitigation OpportunitiesPredicted Nature of Effect

112 Magnitude of the effects are predicted to be minor because the development of transport infrastructure is the type of development that is less likely to be affected by the effects of climate change. However, by the medium to long term any adverse effects that could occur if this Policy Direction were implemented will be less severe because of the effects of climate change. For areas that are currently experiencing low demand for transport and non-car transport infrastructure, this is particularly relevant. Flooding and climate change will have a significant effect on people's perception of the borough. By making non-car transport infrastructure accessible to people, this Policy Direction will help to make the borough a more attractive place to live, work and visit. This should, in the long term, help to ensure that Rotherham's image improves.
Pollution This Policy Direction will, indirectly, help to counter adverse affects on health, landscape and open space receptors. With new development being channelled towards urban and town-centred areas, this policy allows enhancements to be made to areas where the existing baseline or background conditions are poor.

Biodiversity and conservation

The strategy seeks to maximise beneficial enhancements to the green corridor network for the general amenity, biodiversity and landscape character. This could help to deliver biodiversity benefits and can also provide for areas not to be protected, such as those that are nationally important (SSSI) to locally important sites (Local Nature Reserves). However, the enhancement of greenspaces and the built environment will necessarily reduce the number of areas that can be used by people for sport, exercise and leisure activities.

Health

Within existing settlements. This policy would seek to ensure that education and training opportunities within the Core Strategy are linked to PD8 Efficient use of Resources. The Policy Direction is likely to have a minor beneficial effect on the health and wellbeing of people living in the Borough. There will be a time delay before economic benefits of enhanced environmental quality are realised, and at this stage, the Policy Direction is likely to have a minor beneficial effect on the health and wellbeing of people living in the Borough. This would not be a significant change, but it would contribute towards the overall benefits of the Policy Direction.

Cultural, education and leisure

The Policy Direction is likely to have a minor beneficial effect on the health and wellbeing of people living in the Borough. There will be a time delay before economic benefits of enhanced environmental quality are realised, and at this stage, the Policy Direction is likely to have a minor beneficial effect on the health and wellbeing of people living in the Borough. This would not be a significant change, but it would contribute towards the overall benefits of the Policy Direction.

Knowledge Exchange

The impact of this Policy Direction is likely to be positive, and the overall effect is predicted to be neutral. This improvement is predicted as being neutral because it is likely to be offset by minor beneficial effects to the health and wellbeing of people living in the Borough. There will be a time delay before economic benefits of enhanced environmental quality are realised, and at this stage, the Policy Direction is likely to have a minor beneficial effect on the health and wellbeing of people living in the Borough. This would not be a significant change, but it would contribute towards the overall benefits of the Policy Direction.

Environment and sustainability

The overall effect of this Policy Direction is likely to be neutral. However, the quality of environment that would attract these types of businesses would need to be improved in the medium to long term, and the overall effect is predicted to be neutral. This improvement is predicted as being neutral because it is likely to be offset by minor beneficial effects to the health and wellbeing of people living in the Borough. There will be a time delay before economic benefits of enhanced environmental quality are realised, and at this stage, the Policy Direction is likely to have a minor beneficial effect on the health and wellbeing of people living in the Borough. This would not be a significant change, but it would contribute towards the overall benefits of the Policy Direction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Assessment of Effect</th>
<th>Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heating and climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Landscape quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Economic Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Appraisal**

**Frequency of Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heating and climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Landscape quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Economic Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cumulative and Synergistic Impacts (Long Term Only)**

- **Major Positive**: 16
- **Minor Positive**: 4
- **Neutral**: 5
- **Minor Negative**: 2
- **Major Negative**: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heating and climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Landscape quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decent and Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Economic Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation and Analysis**

- **Enhancement Opportunities**: There are opportunities to use biological approaches to waste management, particularly as means of converting waste into resources. For example, waste can be composted for fertiliser and can contribute to reducing CO2 levels by planting trees and increasing biodiversity by using green roofs. Ecological enhancements can also reduce soil erosion, reinforce natural drainage patterns and manage microclimate which could all be affected by changes in climate. The combined effects of these enhancements with PD1, PD2, PD6 and PD9 could add to long run mean benefit effects.

- **Mitigation Opportunities**: The Policy Direction would benefit by including references to the importance of non-designated heritage assets and the role of biodiversity within sustainable development. These enhancements could be expanded to promote the creation of habitats within developments by creating gardens, allotments, parks and landscaping within the public realm of town and district centres. These measures can also enhance people’s quality of life and can also provide additional recreational and amenity facilities. The Policy Direction could also be used to promote the use of biodiversity and the wider environment to respond to the effects of climate change. For example, planting can help to reduce soil erosion, improve natural drainage, retain water resources and provide shading which could all be affected by the changing climate.
10 Safety and Crime This Policy Direction cannot affect the crime or safety of areas.

6 Awareness / Creativity, innovation and transport This Policy Direction concentrates on the efficient use of resources whilst at the same time encouraging the consideration of flood risk, the view of the effects that development can have on water resources and biodiversity and the impacts associated with construction and development. The overall effect is beneficial, but the significance of the effect will increase as the number of DPDs come through and are influenced by the Core Strategy. The Policy Direction could also require large scale developments and AAPs to set specific requirements to measure the beneficial effects of locally sourced materials and goods on the environment.

As the Policy Direction identifies potential areas for the economy to diversify whilst at the same time encouraging the consideration of flood risk, the view of the effects that development can have on water resources and biodiversity and the impacts associated with construction and development. The overall effect is beneficial, but the significance of the effect will increase as the number of DPDs come through and are influenced by the Core Strategy. The Policy Direction could also require large scale developments and AAPs to set specific requirements to measure the beneficial effects of locally sourced materials and goods on the environment.

4 Economic Growth The need for economic growth as part of a ‘sustainable Rotherham’ is recognised by this Policy Direction. However it also recognises that the consumption of natural resources rather than the way in which areas function or are managed could be achieved by seeking and establishing links with higher education establishments and local businesses could be set up so that they can link into higher education and research.

7 Health There is an opportunity to enhance the performance of this Policy Direction by including red tape and unnecessary bureaucracy and procedures that get in the way of achieving the objective or provide little substantive benefit and would benefit by being put as a bullet point. In order to get the most from implementing this Policy Direction further support and guidance is required for businesses. This could be achieved with a sustainable development strategy and a plan to ensure that businesses can access the resources that are needed to achieve the objectives of the Policy Direction, which could help businesses to achieve their sustainability targets and could benefit by being put as a bullet point. In order to get the most from implementing this Policy Direction further support and guidance is required for businesses. This could be achieved with a sustainable development strategy and a plan to ensure that businesses can access the resources that are needed to achieve the objectives of the Policy Direction, which could help businesses to achieve their sustainability targets and could benefit by being put as a bullet point. In order to get the most from implementing this Policy Direction further support and guidance is required for businesses. This could be achieved with a sustainable development strategy and a plan to ensure that businesses can access the resources that are needed to achieve the objectives of the Policy Direction, which could help businesses to achieve their sustainability targets and could benefit by being put as a bullet point. In order to get the most from implementing this Policy Direction further support and guidance is required for businesses. This could be achieved with a sustainable development strategy and a plan to ensure that businesses can access the resources that are needed to achieve the objectives of the Policy Direction, which could help businesses to achieve their sustainability targets and could benefit by being put as a bullet point. In order to get the most from implementing this Policy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Predicted Nature of Effect</th>
<th>Assessment of Effect</th>
<th>Explanation of Assessment</th>
<th>Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities</th>
<th>Relevance to Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Housing and the need for change</td>
<td>Low level of certainty and assumptions of additional measures proposed to achieve</td>
<td>Although the Policy Direction proposes a number of measures to help good practice on new building, it is unlikely that these measures will be implemented on a wide scale. The potential use of BREEAM standards as a planning condition may be a way to ensure that these measures are implemented.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction can only go so far by providing a built environment that is accessible by walking, cycling and sustainable transport modes.</td>
<td>No direct link to Strategy, however the impacts of climate change and flood risk are also supported by PD1, ensuring developments reflect local distinctiveness.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Waste</td>
<td>Increase in resource use along with the reduction of waste generation</td>
<td>This Policy Direction clearly indicates that the use of renewable or sourcing materials from renewable resources will help to reduce waste generation. However, this does not consider the water quality implications that waste management has.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction on its own would not help to raise engagement with the communities that are likely to benefit from new development.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction can only go so far by providing a built environment that is accessible by walking, cycling and sustainable transport modes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Settlement &amp; neighbourhood built quality</td>
<td>The Policy Direction contributes to this objective by encouraging new mixed development. The mixed use and development of areas that are close to one another is important for creating well designed and well built communities and mixed use developments that better match the needs of the surrounding communities. It should be noted that this policy does not set out design standards or a requirement for high quality design.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction only considers measures to reduce the area’s flood risk management in the water context of the wider environment. However, it does not address the reduction of flood risk in the wider context of the water management.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction can only go so far by providing a built environment that is accessible by walking, cycling and sustainable transport modes.</td>
<td>No direct link to Strategy, however the impacts of climate change and flood risk are also supported by PD1, ensuring developments reflect local distinctiveness.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Intergenerational and inequalities issues</td>
<td>The importance of building in previously used sites rather than greenfield expansion and the need for buildings where possible to accommodate the elderly population</td>
<td>Although this Policy Direction has some positive effects on the built environment and landscape quality, it does not address the availability of decent and affordable housing for all.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction can only go so far by providing a built environment that is accessible by walking, cycling and sustainable transport modes.</td>
<td>However, the Core Strategy provides an opportunity for local authorities to consider how they can promote Rotherham in order to take advantage of new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Landscape quality: habitats, views</td>
<td>A broad definition of ‘landscape’ is used that the Policy Direction does not address the availability of decent and affordable housing for all.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction does not actively build community cohesion, nor does it have a positive effect on the social cohesion.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction presents a significant opportunity to highlight the wider issues of integrating landscape and the need to provide accessible green space and public spaces. However, the extent to which land use and development is likely to contribute towards social cohesion is N/A.</td>
<td>However, the Core Strategy provides an opportunity for local authorities to consider how they can promote Rotherham in order to take advantage of new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Land use: development and land management</td>
<td>The Policy Direction clearly indicates that the use of renewable or sourcing materials from renewable resources will help to reduce waste generation. However, this does not consider the water quality implications that waste management has.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction on its own would not help to raise engagement with the communities that are likely to benefit from new development.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction can only go so far by providing a built environment that is accessible by walking, cycling and sustainable transport modes.</td>
<td>However, the Core Strategy provides an opportunity for local authorities to consider how they can promote Rotherham in order to take advantage of new development.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Climate change and flood risk</td>
<td>Low level of certainty and assumptions of additional measures proposed to achieve</td>
<td>Although this Policy Direction has some positive effects on the built environment, the climate and flood risk is not considered.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction on its own would not help to raise engagement with the communities that are likely to benefit from new development.</td>
<td>The Policy Direction can only go so far by providing a built environment that is accessible by walking, cycling and sustainable transport modes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy Direction: Integrated/Efficient Land Use

**Nature of Effect:**

This Policy Direction is very focussed on reducing or avoiding adverse environmental effects. In particular this policy direction is concerned with flood risk, soil pollution, surface and groundwater quality and noise.

**Impacts:**

- **Short Term:**
  - This Policy Direction will ensure that developments do not create social problems or crime.
  - It will be worthwhile highlighting the links between good design and planning policies which could have a beneficial effect.
  - This Policy Direction would benefit from additional guidance on the specific types of assessment carried out in the LDF.

- **Medium Term:**
  - The combined effects of this Policy Direction and PD7 Local Heritage Strategy is sustainable over the medium to long term.

- **Long Term:**
  - The Policy Direction could be enhanced by encouraging people to adopt more sustainable lifestyles in order to protect and enhance their quality of life over the long term.

**Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities:**

- The Policy Direction would benefit from additional guidance on the specific types of assessment carried out in the LDF.

---

### Policy Direction: Sustainable Communities

**Nature of Effect:**

This Policy Direction has no direct effect on economic growth.

**Impacts:**

- **Short Term:**
  - The Policy Direction does not make any direct references to health.
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

- **Medium Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

- **Long Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

**Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities:**

- The Policy Direction would benefit from additional guidance on the specific types of assessment carried out in the LDF.

---

### Policy Direction: Efficient Use of Resources

**Nature of Effect:**

This Policy Direction has no direct effect on employment opportunities as a result of the two Policy Directions combined with those that occur as a result of the SA objective.

**Impacts:**

- **Short Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

- **Medium Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

- **Long Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

**Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities:**

- The Policy Direction could be enhanced by encouraging people to adopt more sustainable lifestyles in order to protect and enhance their quality of life over the long term.

---

### Policy Direction: Economic Growth

**Nature of Effect:**

This Policy Direction has no direct effect on economic growth.

**Impacts:**

- **Short Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

- **Medium Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

- **Long Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

**Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities:**

- The Policy Direction could be enhanced by encouraging people to adopt more sustainable lifestyles in order to protect and enhance their quality of life over the long term.

---

### Policy Direction: Environmental Protection

**Nature of Effect:**

This Policy Direction has no direct effect on economic growth.

**Impacts:**

- **Short Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

- **Medium Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

- **Long Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

**Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities:**

- The Policy Direction could be enhanced by encouraging people to adopt more sustainable lifestyles in order to protect and enhance their quality of life over the long term.

---

### Policy Direction: Employment Opportunities

**Nature of Effect:**

This Policy Direction has no direct effect on economic growth.

**Impacts:**

- **Short Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

- **Medium Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

- **Long Term:**
  - The predicted effect is neutral because the Policy Direction does not have an affect on the type of waste management

**Mitigation and Enhancement Opportunities:**

- The Policy Direction could be enhanced by encouraging people to adopt more sustainable lifestyles in order to protect and enhance their quality of life over the long term.
Summary of Appraisal

Quantitative Assessment

Cumulative and Synergistic Impacts (Long Term Only)

Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities

[Table containing data and analysis]

SF (1-3 yrs) MT (3-5 yrs) LT (>5 yrs)

Major Positive 0 0

Minor Positive 0 0

Neutral 8 5

Housing

Landscape quality / historic assets

Community Cohesion

Assessment of Effect

SA Objective

ST (0-4 yrs)

18 Decent and Affordable Housing

19 Landscape quality / historic assets

20 Community Cohesion

The Policy Direction will have a beneficial effect on the local catastrophe because it will be applicable to all developments that occur within the borough. However, its overall effect is uncertain because it cannot have a major effect on the landscape quality or the protection of historic assets.

The Policy Direction will have a beneficial effect because it will be applicable to all developments that occur within the borough. However, its overall effect is uncertain because it cannot have a major effect on the landscape quality or the protection of historic assets.

The Policy Direction will have a beneficial effect because it will be applicable to all developments that occur within the borough. However, its overall effect is uncertain because it cannot have a major effect on the landscape quality or the protection of historic assets.

The directions make significant contributions towards community cohesion and pride. Currently, this is hindered by the extent to which local services are funded. However, by addressing these issues, the landscape quality or the protection of historic assets.

The directions make significant contributions towards community cohesion and pride. Currently, this is hindered by the extent to which local services are funded. However, by addressing these issues, the landscape quality or the protection of historic assets.

The directions make significant contributions towards community cohesion and pride. Currently, this is hindered by the extent to which local services are funded. However, by addressing these issues, the landscape quality or the protection of historic assets.

One key weakness of this Policy Direction is the lack of recognition that climate change could have safety or health issues for people in the future. As a result, developments could occur that could exacerbate these effects, particularly on the long term as the effects of the changing climate become more apparent.

A key weakness of this Policy Direction is the lack of recognition that climate change could have safety or health issues for people in the future. As a result, developments could occur that could exacerbate these effects, particularly on the long term as the effects of the changing climate become more apparent.

One key weakness of this Policy Direction is the lack of recognition that climate change could have safety or health issues for people in the future. As a result, developments could occur that could exacerbate these effects, particularly on the long term as the effects of the changing climate become more apparent.

Enhancement Opportunities

The Policy Directions should include some recognition of the potential health and safety issues that could occur due to climate change and propose measures that could be used to ensure that developments consider the potential effects within their designs. This should mean that developments are designed to be resilient to potential changes or can be easily adapted to mitigate the effects of climate change. This could be assisted by a sustainable design guidance SPD and OPS policies.