Decision Guiding Questions (DGQ) and baseline situation should inform the appraisal. Also see Guidance on Completing an Appraisal (Appendix C4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>UDP Baseline</th>
<th>Nature of Effect, Explanation of Assessment and Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities</th>
<th>Option A - Pro-Market</th>
<th>Nature of Effect, Explanation of Assessment and Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities</th>
<th>Option B - Needs &amp; Opps</th>
<th>Nature of Effect, Explanation of Assessment and Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities</th>
<th>Option C - Pro Envt</th>
<th>Nature of Effect, Explanation of Assessment and Enhancement and Mitigation Opportunities</th>
<th>Comparison of Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>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 the Borough's steel industry and the almost complete closure of Rotherham's mining industry (except Maityb). 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>2 1 0</td>
<td>Effect: The Baseline (Unitary Development Plan) approach to regeneration and restructuring of Rotherham's local economy has relied heavily upon public sector involvement by the supply of serviced and subsidised land and buildings to attract private sector investment. The relative impact of the Pro-Market Option would in turn be dependant upon the degree and nature of continued public sector investment. With the benefit of European Union Objective 1 status, the public sector has been able to attract much private sector investment. Public subsidy will continue in the medium term. However, with the decline in availability of European funding it is difficult to predict how much investment the private sector will have in the longer term. The South Yorkshire economy is very fragile and the attractiveness of Rotherham to future private sector investment will be dependant upon its relative competitiveness. Overall this approach may be too selective and generally is unlikely to achieve the Sustainability Appraisal Objective's aim to enable all to have easy accessibility to new employment opportunities.</td>
<td>2 2 2</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 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 will be an essential part of this option to ensure the needs of local people are not being enabled 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>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>Effect: 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 will be an essential part of this option to ensure the needs of local people are not being enabled 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>
<td>The provision, support and maintenance of quality local or easily accessible employment opportunities for all in stable or competitive growth sectors primarily requires investment from the private sector which is key to wealth generation. However, the economic restructuring of the South Yorkshire economy has necessitated essential public sector investment to pump prime the economy and attract private investors. Without the public sector the local economy would fail. It is essential, therefore, that the targeted approach (an essential part of the Borough's Unitary Development Plan) and continued public funding are used to attract private sector investment. Funding from the European Union may not continue 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) funds can be targeted to restructuring the Rotherham local economy. Overall the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) is considered most beneficial to the SA objective as a balance between the creation of a climate favourable to private sector investment without neglecting the needs of local communities. Of the 3 options, this is also considered to be the most realistic. The Pro-Market Option (A) could deliver some competitive targeted opportunities but is unlikely to maximise local accessibility. The Pro-Environment Option (C) aims to address accessibility issues by safeguarding most local opportunities but this may not be realistic. Note: Generally better intelligence, assisted by specialist knowledge of economic development issues, would assist more effective assessment of this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Aldwarke 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 emphasis to policies – may not always be upheld in practice.

2 Maintain or enhance conditions that enable sustainable economic growth and investment without environmental damage

| 0 | 1 | 1 | Effect: The existing Unitary Development Plan adopted a broadly 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. |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | Effect: 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. |
| 0 | ? | 1 | Effect: 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. |
| 0 | 2 | 1 | Effect: 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. |

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.
Main Spatial Effects: Effects most likely to be noticeable in the five 'Strategic Regeneration Areas' (SRAs) as identified in the UDP. These are based on reclaimed 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 reclamations and redevelopment of 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: - 

Main Spatial Effects: This Option is likely to maintain wide employment land portfolios including commercially attractive (but not necessarily economically and socially sustainable) out-of-centre and motorway corridor sites. Under this Option the private development of brown-field regeneration sites is less likely as are the associated environmental improvements of such activity.

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

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

Facilitate sustainable transport and movement patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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 &quot;kicks in&quot; 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Unitary Development Plan baseline regime is considered too weak to achieve the desired change and level of improvements to secure more sustainable transport and movement patterns. The rate and scope of change, intervention and funding implied by the Pro-Market Option (A) is likely to remain unachievable. The Pro-Market Option (A) is likely to bring rapid deterioration to a point where mitigation is very expensive and of little use. The Needs and Opportunities Option (B) would appear to be the 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.

Main Spatial Effects: The Unitary Development Plan’s regeneration strategy including, for example, the promotion of re-use of former colliery sites and marshalling 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.

Main Spatial Effects: The Pro-Market Option will seek to disperse development (including employment, retail and commercial activities) to locations readily accessible by the national road network – enhanced in Rotherham given the proximity to the M1 and M18 road networks. There would also be localised adverse effects arising from more road building and areas devoted to car parking.

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.

Main Spatial Effects: This Option would promote development locations easily accessible by more sustainable transport modes such as town centres and the Borough’s most sustainable settlements (as identified in the South Yorkshire Settlement (Babtie) Study) as well as new sustainable communities at Waverley (subject to provision of rapid transit and incorporation of sustainable modes).

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.

Main Spatial Effects: Development would be targeted to all town and local centres seeking greater ‘self containment’. The Option 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’.

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 would rely upon a more rapid change in policy, including potentially unpopular measures as well as much greater public funding, which is likely to be unrealistic.
### Spatial Planning and Sustainability Appraisal

**Objective:** The current Unitary Development Plan on this Sustainability Appraisal 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 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.

**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.

**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 the 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

| Improve the level of education and skills for all, reducing disparities across Rotherham and strengthening its position regionally and nationally |  | Effect: The effect of the existing Unitary Development Plan on this Sustainability Appraisal 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 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. **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. **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 the 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 |  | 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 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. **Main Spatial Effects:** This Option is likely to consolidate an attractive land 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. **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. |  |  |
| Encourage creativity, innovation and the effective use of sound science and appropriate technology | 1 | Mitigation: More effective mitigation required in promoting | 1 | 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.

Main Spatial Effects: The Sustainability Appraisal Objective is most likely to be achieved in the Borough’s 5 Regeneration Areas (particularly Waverley).

Mitigation: More effective mitigation required in promoting /

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 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” essential for the successful regeneration of the South Yorkshire economy. However, this Option’s potential emphasis on “Growing your own” business is a positive contribution to the principle of sustainable development.

Mitigation: The success of this Option would be dependant on

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 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.

Table:

| Effect: | Suitable job opportunities for graduates from the two Sheffield universities |
| 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.  

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. |
| 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. |
| 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.  

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. |
| 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. |
| 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.  

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. |
| 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. |
| 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.  

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. |
| 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. |
| 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.  

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. |
| 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. |
| 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.  

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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effect:</strong> 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 <em>awareness of</em> sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effect:</strong> 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 products/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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effect:</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mitigation: Reinforce approach in line with more recent guidance and the re-emphasis upon the promotion of sustainable development as the core principle underpinning spatial planning. In doing so this virtually becomes the approach of the Needs and Opportunities Option (B), anticipating most successful industries and market economics. | Mitigation: Activity and interest would focus upon directing development to the most sustainable settlements and neighbourhoods (as identified principally in the South Yorkshire Settlement (Babtie) Study). Mitigation: 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. |
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 Primary Care Trust suggested employing principle of Health Impact Assessment.

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 Primary Care Trust suggested employing principle of Health Impact Assessment.
In terms of safeguarding community facilities (although mainly public sector provision), investment via the PFI (Private Finance Initiative) has occurred to upgrade swimming pools / leisure centres. In respect of open space, the local planning authority through the development plan and development control system sought the provision of Urban Green Space (UGS) as part of new residential development. However, although developers have been willing in new housing developments to provide UGS they have been less willing to take responsibility for long term maintenance and management. More crucially this approach is no longer favoured given that restraints of funding has given preference to the enhancement of existing UGS, rather than acquisition and management of additional land. The Borough 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.

---

This option is anticipated to have limited interest in cultural and sports provision.

**Main Spatial Effects:** This Option would have no set spatial pattern but it would be more likely to encourage continuing interest in unsustainable dispersed out-of-centre and car based facilities despite current national policy constraints.

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

---

Needs – particularly cultural, sports and leisure facilities.

**Main Spatial Effects:** Positive effects likely to be most noticeable in locations of country parks, open space and heritage assets. New facilities need to comply with Planning Policy Statement 6 (Planning for Town Centres) i.e. town centre bias. The Rotherham Town Centre Renaissance plans under the Strategic Development Framework (SDF) could support the creation of a new cultural centre at Forge Island – but funding may be an issue.

**Mitigation:** Need for standards of provision and promotion of sites in line with Planning Policy Statement 6 (Planning for Town Centres) sequential testing. Planning Gain (s106) funding for improvements to greenspace and other facilities would help promote this option.

---

(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.

**Main Spatial Effects:** Specific to locations of existing assets – new facilities should be Planning Policy Statement 6 (Planning for Town Centres) compliant

**Mitigation:** -
### Enhance the function and vibrancy of town or district centres

| Effect | Main Spatial Effects: B1 Office development has been allowed in the Strategic Regeneration Areas at Templeborough and Wath Manvers. Wath, Dinnington, Thurcroft (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 Entertainment Sensation (YES!) development in Rother Valley Country Park. Mitigation: Spatial and implementation effects of UDP policies would be clearer if a | 0 | -1 | -1 |
| Effect | The ‘market’ is likely to only invest within the most viable centres and then only selectively. | 0 | -1 | -2 |
| Effect | The function and vibrancy of town or district centres is most likely in those settlements identified in the South Yorkshire Settlement (Babble) Study. This Option would best serve the existing Westgate Demonstrator Project to bring town Centre living to Rotherham as well as proposals for the redevelopment and civic quarter/ Tesco’s supermarket. It well considered these could enhance the vitality and function of Rotherham Town Centre. Mitigation: Safeguarding and enhancement policies for most sustainable settlements / elements Mitigation: May be unrealistic to achieve total mitigation through stricter safeguarding all facilities. | 0 | 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. | 0 | 1 | ? |
| Effect | This Option recognises the desirability of enhancing vitality and viability of all town, district and local centres through stricter Planning Policy Statement 6 (Planning for Town Centres) adherence and sequential testing. The Pro-Environment Option would aim to focus all new development on previously developed land in locationally close proximity to services, 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 recognise the role that the private development sector needs to play to deliver private development. It also requires a fall in the use of the private car. The Needs and Opportunities Option (B) offers the best prospects for future vitality and viability of centres and provides the most focused and pragmatic approach to delivering this Sustainability Appraisal Objective. The Pro-Market Option (A) capitulates to raw market forces perpetuating the disadvantages and weaknesses of the existing UDP regime. The Pro-Environment Option (C), however desirable, is likely to be commercially unrealistic. The Option chosen would require tighter policies and sequential testing as well as complementary policies for leisure, offices, town centre housing, transportation, and public realm (see objective prompt topics). Option B is 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. | 0 | 1 | ? |

### Enhance the function and vibrancy of town or district centres

| Main Spatial Effects | The function and vibrancy of town or district centres are likely to survive. Continued decline in most local centres and parades likely. Private sector will show interest in developing commercial elements of a new community at Waverley. Should the current Yorkshire Entertainment Sensation (YES!) proposals be implemented, this Option would be likely to further encourage its commercial development and possible expansion. Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban | 1 | 0 | -1 |

### Enhance the function and vibrancy of town or district centres

| Main Spatial Effects | The function and vibrancy of town or district centres are likely to survive. Continued decline in most local centres and parades likely. Private sector will show interest in developing commercial elements of a new community at Waverley. Should the current Yorkshire Entertainment Sensation (YES!) proposals be implemented, this Option would be likely to further encourage its commercial development and possible expansion. Mitigation: Updated policies and hierarchy complementing policies / investment in centres e.g. urban | 1 | 0 | -1 |
proper hierarchy of town / district.
local centres had been adopted –
tighten up policies and introduce
proper hierarchy.

living. Seek opportunities for
public funding to pump prime
investment in the development of
vacant / neglected sites and
buildings.

of the retail hierarchy. Focussed
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.

[0x0]: Not spatially
[0x0]: Need specific policy
[0x0]: Not spatially

Focussed
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.

[0x0]: Not spatially
[0x0]: Need specific policy
[0x0]: Not spatially

Enhance safety,
and reduce crime for
everyone

Effect: Although development
plans can only make a limited
contribution to crime reduction via
layout and design of development it
is an important material
consideration. The existing
Unitary Development Plan makes
only passing reference to
‘secured by design’ concepts
under the supporting justification
to Policy ENV 3.2 ‘minimising the
impact of development’ (para 6.4.73). Emerging design
guidance further promotes this
concept. There is a specific
contradiction between the current
policy of creating permeable
communities and ‘secured by
design’ principles that seem to
prevent the creation of footpaths
through a site.

0 0 -1

Effect: The ‘market’ is unlikely to
make a significant contribution to
ensuring crime reduction unless
prompted to do so or where crime
reduction features in design of
development provide commercial
advantage.

0 0 -1

Effect: New policies for layout and
design and creating mixed tenure
inclusive communities more likely to
address crime issue under this
Option.

0 1 2

Effect: Effects likely to be similar to
those under the 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.

0 2 2

Development plans can only make a
limited contribution 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
deterioration in local amenity.

Mitigation: Need for specific
policy addressing crime reduction
issue.

Main Spatial Effects: Not spatially
specific.

Main Spatial Effects: Not spatially
specific.

Mitigation: Need specific policy
addressing crime reduction issue
and better design guidance
promoting ‘secured be design’
considerations.

Main Spatial Effects: Not spatially
specific – applies to all new
development – retail, leisure,
transportation, employment and
housing.

Mitigation: Need specific policy
addressing crime reduction issue
and better design guidance
pre-application discussions with
developers.

Main Spatial Effects: Not spatially
specific.

Mitigation: Need specific policy
addressing crime reduction issue
and better design guidance
pre-application discussions with
developers.

Conserve and
enhance Rotherham’s
habitats, biodiversity and
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 UDP protects
Green Belt, Areas of High
Landscape Value, Sites of

0 -1 -1

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 but its effectiveness
under this Option is likely to be
restricted given it’s greater

0 -2 -2

Effect: This Option is likely to
witness effects similar to
wherever within the range of
approaches adopted under the
existing Unitary Development
Baseline and the Pro-Environment
Option (C). With time it is
envisioned that the protection and
enhancement of habitats and
biodiversity will become a more
significant aim within the Local
Development Framework, which
could receive encouragement

0 1 1

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.
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

1 2 2

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 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
Special Scientific Interest and locally designated ‘Areas of Interest Outside of Statutory 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.

Main Spatial Effects: The existing Unitary Development Plan framework is more likely to favour protection of designated sites. Safeguarding of other sites likely to be constrained by data limitations. Mitigation and enhancement opportunities are 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 collection and monitoring.

| Efficient consumption of natural resources and optimises the use of renewable energy | 1 | -1 | -2 | 0 | -1 | -2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 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 insufficient. Mitigation: 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 the planning system. Mitigation: Mitigation may be employed to encourage changes in consumption patterns and renewable technology through financial and promotional policies and address a pragmatic approach supporting new environmental technologies and renewable energy incorporation (where cost-effectiveness can be demonstrated). Effect: This Option would be likely to contribute to the objective with long term detrimental effects increasing with time. Under this Option. A greater awareness of the Local Biodiversity Action Plan, linkages to the planning system, and greater penalties imposed by Central Government and the European Union will raise the profile of this matter within the development industry. However, new designations are likely only where threats are greatest and this Option may give less emphasis on integrated land management and to opportunities for biodiversity enhancement (despite national planning policy requirements) due to resource limitations. Thus, this Option may not control all threats in long term. Mitigation: Mitigation at lowest threat margins. Effect: This Option would be likely to contribute to the objective with long term detrimental effects increasing with time. Under this Option. A greater awareness of the Local Biodiversity Action Plan, linkages to the planning system, and greater penalties imposed by Central Government and the European Union will raise the profile of this matter within the development industry. However, new designations are likely only where threats are greatest and this Option may give less emphasis on integrated land management and to opportunities for biodiversity enhancement (despite national planning policy requirements) due to resource limitations. Thus, this Option may not control all threats in long term. Mitigation: Mitigation at lowest threat margins. Effect: The Option is likely to give less emphasis on integrated land management and to opportunities for biodiversity enhancement (despite national planning policy requirements) due to resource limitations. Thus, this Option may not control all threats in long term. Mitigation: Mitigation at lowest threat margins. Effect: The Option is likely to give less emphasis on integrated land management and to opportunities for biodiversity enhancement (despite national planning policy requirements) due to resource limitations. Thus, this Option may not control all threats in long term. Mitigation: Mitigation at lowest threat margins. Effect: The Option is likely to see encouragement of changes in consumption patterns and renewable technology through financial and promotional policies and favour a pragmatic approach supporting new environmental technologies and renewable energy incorporation (where cost-effectiveness can be demonstrated). Effect: The Option is likely to see encouragement of changes in consumption patterns and renewable technology through financial and promotional policies and favour a pragmatic approach supporting new environmental technologies and renewable energy incorporation (where cost-effectiveness can be demonstrated). Effect: The Option is likely to see encouragement of changes in consumption patterns and renewable technology through financial and promotional policies and favour a pragmatic approach supporting new environmental technologies and renewable energy incorporation (where cost-effectiveness can be demonstrated). 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 increase.
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.

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. 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.

The cumulative impact of not striving for this Sustainability Appraisal Objective could in the longer term have a high negative impact. The Pro-Environment Option (C) is expected with some expansion of waste processing facilities (at Wath, Barbot Hall, Carr Hill, Thurcroft). Some wind generation and mine gas recovery sites likely. Otherwise it is difficult to be more spatially specific.

Main Spatial Effects: Under this Option, restrictions on the quarrying of primary aggregates (Harry Crofts) is expected with some expansion of waste processing facilities. Mitigation: Additional incentives and policy development would be required to secure more effective achievement towards this Sustainability Appraisal Objective. Without substantial public sector support this option may not be as cost effective in the short to medium term as pro-regional companies at a disadvantage.

Main Spatial Effects: Existing quarrying operations (such as at Harry Crofts) are likely to be restricted. More renewable energy sites, areas of search and expansion of waste processing capacity, including new sites, are likely. It is difficult to be spatially specific at this stage.

Main Spatial Effects: The Unitary Development Plan’s ‘Environmental’ (ENV) policies have sought to upgrade general environmental quality and to counteract various types of pollution (air, noise, light) as well as to treat contaminated land. The Plan also includes ‘Utilities’ (UTL) policies to safeguard groundwater and water quality and promote energy efficiency. In addition, the UDP’s Transport (T) policies look to reduce vehicle emissions. However, the existing regime has limited control on clean technologies and Air Quality Management. The current UDP policies do not reduce emissions by greenhouse gases and ozone depleters to any great extent. Despite the existence of the above policies it has been

Mitigation: More positive and comprehensive promotion of policy objectives is needed including encouraging the reuse and recycling in the first instance. Support should be given in principle for the proposals facilitating the production of biomass, short rotation coppice, wind turbines and solar panels. Mitigation: Mitigation needs to be prompted by incentives to change consumption preferences and to re-use and recycle.

Mitigation: More proactive policies and selection of waste and renewable sites. This option offers the most beneficial.

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.
difficult to monitor their actual effectiveness and the relative positive or negative impact is difficult to assess. Negative effects arising from pollution associated with the scale of new development associated with the Plan’s regeneration strategy, may be counter-balanced by the land reclamation and environmental improvements that have taken place. There have been some measured increase in environmental quality, such as improvements to water quality or biodiversity, but the relative influence of the planning system is difficult to measure.

Main Spatial Effects: General promotion and specific spatial effects are either too numerous or difficult to predict. 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 pollution increases.

Mitigation: There is a need for a suite of separate policies dealing with each sub-topic rather than the current Unitary Development Plan’s approach to consideration of these issues in combination or dispersal over various topics. More attention needed on Air Quality Management and clean technologies.

Reduce Rotherham’s vulnerability to flooding and to the impacts of climate change

0 0 1 Effect: The Unitary Development Plan baseline has some acknowledgement of flood protection, energy conservation and the benefits of renewable energy but not in a comprehensive manner in the context of climate change. The current regime is not achieving positive benefits in terms of reducing vulnerability to climate change, in the short to medium term, and may only achieve long term marginal improvement. 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. 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.

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).

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

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.

Mitigation: This Option is unlikely to support the degree of integration required to temper market actions.

Mitigation: Continuation of strict policy stance where required whilst acknowledging scope for suitable integration elsewhere.

Mitigation: Comprehensive and strict policy coverage but could disadvantage economic growth and development in some areas.

0 -1 -2 Effect: Under this Option, and in the absence of incentives and market demand, only modest benefits are likely to be achieved in response to global warming and climate change. Similarly, attempts to reduce vulnerability to flooding will only be secured to meet regulatory minima. This will not prevent deterioration in the mid to long term and the potential negative effects in the longer term will be greater because of the reluctance to plan ahead now.

0 1 1 Effect: 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, but, for the most part, this would still remaining 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.

0 1 2 Effect: 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

Only the Pro-Environment Option (C) is 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 the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) may be the only realistic course of action in the short and medium term. The continuation of the Unitary Development Plan baseline or the Pro-Market Option (A) is unlikely to
respect of the reduction of vulnerability to flooding, the Borough Council’s has tightened controls over development in flood prone areas in light of revised national planning policy guidance. It is also undertaking a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to guide development of policy and identification of land allocations within the Local Development Framework.

**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.

**Mitigation:** Climate change needs to be addressed more comprehensively. Renewables, Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), water management, energy conservation and sustainable building techniques need to become standard features in all development. Implementation of flood alleviation measures should be secured at Templeborough, Waverley and any other sites where required. Flood Risk Study currently underway to guide policies and site allocations in emerging Local Development Framework.

| 15 | Reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal and minimise the use of non-reusable materials | -1 | 0 | Effect: The existing Unitary Development Plan baseline provides the preliminary framework for more sustainable waste management but without any particular urgency and is still reliant on landfill. In recent years greater consideration has been given to recycling and re-use of materials. However, the degree of change and innovation required is unlikely to be achieved quick enough in the mid to long term. See also analysis under Sustainability Appraisal Objective 12. | 7 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Effect: Under this Option, the ‘market’ would respond to European Union and Government intervention and incentives but this may not coincide with Rotherham’s more local interests or requirements in the mid to long term. This Option may encourage the development of new environmental technologies to promote re-use of waste materials at a profit. Without financial incentives or the imposition of taxes to prevent the depletion of non-reusable materials this option would continue to use reserves of the material until the supply is | 7 | 1 | Effect: The public-private sector collaboration inherent to this Option would seek to achieve more sustainable waste management in line with local interests and requirements and would tend to promote a comprehensive package of fiscal measures to support development of alternative technology to facilitate re-use of waste materials as an alternative to using non-renewable material. This Option may encourage the re-use of aggregates, bricks, tiles, lead and composting of green waste – local sale of recycled material to enable re-use within the borough. | 7 | 1 | Effect: The effects of this Option are likely to be similar to the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) but with acceptance that facilities serving wider than local needs may be located in Rotherham. Longer term positive effects may take longer to achieve due to local opposition to some facilities. In addition to the measures listed under the Needs and Opportunities Option (B), this option is also more likely to support a reduction in consumption patterns – through awareness raising of the damage caused by consumption. However, such changes are difficult to achieve, and the success of this 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 greenhouse gas emissions through a reduction in consumption. | 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. |
### Main Spatial Effects: General

Reliance on current disposal methods and sites. No new sites identified (except Thurcroft) with reliance on criteria-based policies to assess new proposals.

**Mitigation:** More pro-active 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.

### Mitigation

- **More specific policy** to achieve targets and to promote new sites, technologies and collaboration to achieve more sustainable waste management.
- **More stringent design** policies to achieve targets and to promote new sites, technologies and collaboration to achieve more sustainable waste management.
- **New design policies and mitigation** policies to achieve targets and to promote new sites, technologies and collaboration to achieve more sustainable waste management.

### Mitigation

- **Need for public / private sector collaboration** to meet targets without prejudicing local amenity and other interests.
- **Policy regime related to local needs and amenity safeguards**. Identification of appropriate sites.

### Effect

- **Some exemplary developments** are likely under favourable market conditions but this Option is likely to generate general mediocrity in design of development unless prompted via the intervention of the planning system and through for example, ‘planning gain’.
- **This Option is more likely to encourage improved design of buildings and spaces through selective public interventions (Housing Market Renewal (HMR), the Renaissance Towns Initiative) as well as enhanced quality and management of open spaces via rationalisation schemes. The focus on priority areas could lead to slightly higher positive scores in the longer term.**

### Main Spatial Effects: Mitigation

- **As a general issue, the spatial effects are not specific and are thus difficult to assess.**
- **Improvements likely to manifest most noticeably with Housing Market Renewal (HMR) areas and Rotherham Town Centre (Renaissance Towns).**
- **New design policies and mitigation** policies to achieve targets and to promote new sites, technologies and collaboration to achieve more sustainable waste management.

### Mitigation

- **As with the Needs and Opportunities Option (B) but with the additional identification of ‘waste clusters’ and strategic facilities possibly with canal and or road access (possibly including Aldwarke). Possibility of composting plants in green belt ancillary to agricultural operations.**
- **Acceptance of need to accommodate wider than local needs and identification of more strategic sites. Fiscal incentives and penalties; education; research; substantial funding to create an environmental technologies growth industries.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17 Encourage integrated and efficient land use</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1 Effect: The existing Unitary Development Plan regime lacks a comprehensive approach to the efficient use of land given that its dispersion was based upon the Pre-Planning Policy Guidance 3 - Housing (2000) approach towards the promotion of greenfield housing sites. However, significant reclaimed brownfield sites and promotion of mixed use zones has assisted regeneration and safeguarding best agricultural land. Only modest benefits towards the Sustainability Appraisal Objective would be achievable in the long term.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2 Effect: A preference for the development of greenfield sites would remain under this Option but there would be some move to housing redevelopment of brownfield sites and higher densities post Planning Policy Guidance 3 – Housing (2000). There would be limited achievement of truly integrated mixed use development, with the private sector preferring to locate in the most attractive and desirable locations (for residential development) and to locate close to motorway junctions (for industry &amp; commerce) and out of town locations with sufficient car parking to meet requirements (for retail purposes). This option would promote the dispersal of activities and the development of greenfield development without being limited to meet the aspirations of house buyers and future users. This ‘laissez faire’ regime would be unlikely to deliver the changes required over short, medium and long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Effect: This Option would be generally supportive of the achievement of this Sustainability Appraisal Objective but consolidation of sustainable communities (as identified in the South Yorkshire Sustainable Settlements (Babtie) Study) may require some greenfield development and some local development policies may temper density increases. This private-public sector partnership approach is best likely to support the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder proposals where substantial investment is required to turn around falling housing markets. Densities will be greater 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 vary how this is achieved rather than have a focus on the consolidation of larger sustainable settlements (where potential releases may be considered) will support this Sustainability Appraisal Objective strictly 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2 Effect: This Option could entail optimum delivery of the Sustainability Appraisal Objective given a focus on brownfield land, integrated mixed use / high density development in existing urban centres, with positive benefits in the long term (subject to site accessibility, availability and popularity). However, unlike the Needs and Opportunities Option (B), the Pro-Environment Option (C) is 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 potential releases may be considered) but will support this Sustainability Appraisal Objective strictly 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18 Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in decent affordable housing | 0 | 0 | 0 Effect: The existing Unitary Development Plan Affordable Housing Policy accompanied with the accompanying Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) has had only modest benefits to }
| | | | 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. |
| | -1 | -1 | -2 Effect: This Option would continue to prefer greenfield low density planning and provision with minimal affordable provision. |
| | 0 | 1 | 1 Effect: This Option would tend to enable the provision of a more varied housing offer with the Borough's most sustainable communities with provision of affordable housing open to |
| | 0 | ? | ? 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. |
| | | | 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 sites for new homes.
and urban living emphasis with stricter affordable requirements informed by ‘Housing Market Assessments’. The Needs and Opportunities Option (B) would:

- Affordable housing scheme contributions to the provision of affordable housing via S106 Agreements, it is likely to be limited. However, in pursuing the creation of sustainable communities a strong policy base would promote a mix of house types and prices linked to the release of green-field locations (exceptions?) in return for some affordable housing (rented / shared equity). A stricter policy requirement (assisted by Supplementary Planning Document) would serve to achieve mixed tenure and affordable housing related to local requirements informed by the new requirements to undertake Housing Market Assessments.

Main Spatial Effects: This Option would serve the Sustainability Appraisal Objective best in the most sustainable communities (as identified in the South Yorkshire Sustainable Settlements (Babtie) Study) with particular emphasis on high density urban housing within town centres.

Environment Option (C) is considered most desirable in policy terms but the Needs and Opportunities Option is probably more realistic in the short term.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 weighed against other objectives and urban living emphasis with stricter affordable requirements informed by ‘Housing Market Assessments’. The Needs and Opportunities Option (B) 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. The Pro-Environment Option (C) is considered most desirable in policy terms but the Needs and Opportunities Option is probably more realistic in the short term.

The effectiveness of achieving the Sustainability Appraisal Objective under any of the three 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 policy framework leading to additional designations and more resource commitment.

| Mitigation | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ...
Main Spatial Effects: Spatial effects are related to the current Unitary Development Plans 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: Possible scope for some negotiation benefits where market shares achievement of the Objective, such as through new tourism developments.

20 Build community cohesion, involvement and encourage a pride in the community

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 remained 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 principles promoted by central government its ability to promote community cohesion and involvement weakens. (The development plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 pursing 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 a 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 more 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. It should be noted that a positive policy stance to promote community cohesion could be adopted by the Local Authority for all potential options.
| Effect | Mitigation: Need to identify communities in greatest need (via for example the Borough’s Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy) | Effect | Mitigation: Promote attractive opportunities that can also save disadvantaged communities. | Effect | Mitigation: Identify communities in greatest need (best fit from Regional Spatial Strategy, South Yorkshire Sustainable Settlements (Babtie) Study, Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy and Housing Market Renewal target communities. | Effect | Mitigation: - | Effect: The Pro-Environment 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 promoted is likely to be attractive to those supporters of sustainable development. Some aspects of this Option’s offer and approach may not suit everyone and some aspects of this Option’s approach may be short lived. | Effect: The Pro-Market led approach to invest in the more sensational, fashionable and lucrative propositions and developments would be favoured by this Option which could be more attractive to more impressionable consumers. Although the focus of the private development sector on attractive development sites could lead to further investment in Rotherham by the private sector, this interest is likely to concentrate only in residential and limited commercial activities. Investment in employment generating activities is likely to be relatively limited and would rely upon public sector pump priming. The economic sector in Rotherham remains fragile. The private sector can only be encouraged to invest in Rotherham in the short – medium term through the continued investment by the public sector. Innovation can pay off and give Rotherham a ‘Unique Selling point’ (for example, Magna). The ‘market’ offer may not suit everyone and some aspects of this Option’s approach may be short lived. | Effect: 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. | Effect: 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 promoted is likely to be attractive to those supporters of sustainable development. Some aspects of this Option’s offer and approach may not suit everyone and some aspects of this Option’s approach may be short lived. | Effect: 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’ s106 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. | Effect: 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’ s106 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. | Effect: 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. | Effect: 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’ s106 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. | Effect: 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. | Effect: 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’ s106 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. | Effect: 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’ s106 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. | Effect: 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. |
restoration to hard and soft after uses, e.g. Templeborough, Wath Manvers, Waverley; and environmental improvements to town centres: Rotherham, Wath, Dinnington, Thurstaston, Malby.

Other examples, include the creation of mixed use areas supporting a variety of retail and industrial activities and some housing (e.g. Express Parks), Cotterwood former colliery site, Brampton; development of managed workspace to support creation of new business; creation of country parks and part restoration of the Chesterfield Canal; creation of the Magna experience; and protection of the countryside and conservation areas through environment and heritage protectionist policies.

Mitigation: -

| Mitigation | Need for a broad based and varied offer and approach. Temper excesses. |
| Mitigation | - |
| Mitigation | - |

Mitigation: Opportunities should be investigated for more specific policy (and Supplementary Planning Document guidance) to address contribution by the Development Plan.

Main Spatial Effects: Not spatially specific.

Mitigation: Only marginal contributions likely to be realistic via possible Planning Gain s106 agreements.

Main Spatial Effects: Not spatially specific.

Mitigation: In a similar manner to mitigation under the existing Unitary Development Plan baseline, opportunities should be investigated for more specific policy (and Supplementary Planning Document guidance) to address contribution by the Development Plan.

Main Spatial Effects: Not spatially specific.

Mitigation: Comprehensive policy stance, supported by Supplementary Planning Document guidance to address this Objective's issues.
Qualitative Assessment (Consider Interactions and Quantitative and Frequency Assessments)

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.

Simplistic determination of cumulative impact of this Option, based upon summation of all negative and positive scores implies the Option A would have an significant detrimental (negative) overall impact. See box below.

Simplistic determination of cumulative impact of this Option, based upon summation of all negative and positive scores implies the Option B would have a significant positive overall impact to a marginally greater extent that Option C. See box below.

Simplistic determination of cumulative impact of this Option, based upon summation of all negative and positive scores implies the Option C would have a significant positive overall impact to a marginally lesser extent than Option B. See box below.

Simplistic determination of cumulative impact of the Options, 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. Refer to Core Strategy Options Sustainability Appraisal Commentary for a more considered summary of Appraisal.