

**Site: SGA6 - West of Borrowash**

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	1. Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?	The delivery of approx. 630 residential units would be expected to deliver more diversity in housing stock across the rural fringe area of the Borough. The ability to deliver affordable housing in an area where house prices are generally high is likely to make a positive impact in increasing the affordability of residential stock.	Major positive +2	Major positive +3
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	2. Will it provide sufficient pitches and plots for gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople?	The site has the potential to provide space for the Borough's evidenced needs for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople accommodation, however this site is not proposing plots for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	Neutral 0	
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	3. Will it reduce homelessness?	The site may make small impacts in reducing homelessness by expanding the quantity of housing stock in the Borough. Whilst it is not expected that any homes on-site will directly house the homeless, the provision of additional housing may create more fluidity in the Borough's housing market that could free up accommodation at the lower end of the spectrum. This would only be the case however when combined with interventions from relevant organisations and agencies.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	4. Will it reduce the number of unfit/vacant homes?	The site could potentially reduce the number of unfit/vacant homes by contributing to an enlargement of the overall stock of residential accommodation in Erewash. The delivery of a sizeable number of new homes may focus attention elsewhere on those homes in the existing stock that are unfit for occupancy/long-term vacant - although the development of approx. 630 homes is not expected to show a strong relationship to this SA question.	Neutral 0	
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	5. Will it provide the required infrastructure?	SGA6 adjoins the western edge of Borrowash. It is anticipated that a site of 630 units is unlikely to provide significant new infrastructure to support the development. Focus would expect to be made on the expansion of local school capacity, any necessary highway improvements to the local road network to maintain acceptable traffic flows and the delivery of green spaces on-site to establish high levels of residential amenity and create biodiversity.	Minor positive +1	
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment Opportunities.	1. Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs?	Short-term, development will generate jobs on site for the construction, marketing and sales of the dwellings. Long term, beyond the completion of the site, it is not expected to improve the diversity and quality of jobs available.	Minor positive +1	Minor positive +1
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment	2. Will it reduce unemployment?	There is potential for this site to reduce unemployment in the short term as development will generate jobs on site in the construction, marketing and sales sectors. These jobs, however, are highly likely to move to other	Minor positive +1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
Opportunities.		sites once the site is complete and all units are sold.		
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment Opportunities.	3. Will it improve rural productivity in terms of employment opportunities?	It is expected that there will be no improvement as a result of development on rural productivity in terms of employment opportunities. As the site is agricultural land of a good to moderate quality, there is the risk that development of this site would lead to the loss of employment opportunities. Although the site is not currently used for agriculture, the land is of a good to moderate quality, therefore the permanent loss of this land means that there will be no future potential to improve rural productivity employment opportunities.	Minor negative -1	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	1. Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses?	The size of SGA6 does not lend itself to being a mixed-use site. It is therefore not expected that any land will be provided for buildings of a type required by business on this site.	Neutral 0	Neutral 0
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic	2. Will it provide business/university clusters?	Due to SGA6 being located away from town and city centres, and due to the site size, it is not expected to provide business or university clusters. These clusters are more appropriate on larger sites of mixed use development.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.				
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	3. Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors?	The size of SGA6 does not lend itself to being a mixed use site. It is therefore not expected that any jobs will be created in high knowledge sectors.	Neutral 0	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	4. Will it encourage graduates to live and work within the Plan area?	The size of SGA6 does not lend itself to being a mixed-use site. It is therefore not expected to encourage graduates to work within the plan area. The site itself is located away from town and city centres, therefore located away from a large portion of graduate job locations meaning graduates may look for somewhere closer to their work/recreation locations to live; although there is not a strong relationship between the site and this SA question.	Neutral 0	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b>	5. Will it provide the required infrastructure?	The size of SGA6 does not lend itself to being a mixed use site. It is therefore not expected that required employment infrastructure will be provided as a direct	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.		result of this site		
<b>4. Shopping Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of existing shopping centres.	1. Will it encourage the vitality of the city centre, town centre, district centre or local centre?	The nearest Local Centre within Erewash is Borrowash Local Centre. Due to the small distance between SGA6 and Borrowash Local Centre, it is expected that development will have a positive impact on the vitality of the local centre through the new residents shopping local and using local services. Borrowash Local Centre is of a small size compared to town centres within Erewash, therefore there is a risk that issues may arise surrounding the Local Centre being over-capacity in the future, meaning residents have to travel further afield for services.	Minor positive +1	Minor positive +1
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	1. Will it reduce health inequalities?	The location of the site adjacent to Borrowash means that an increased proportion of the population within the plan area will be able to access services and facilities through active means (walking and cycling) and this will help to promote healthy lifestyle choices. Notwithstanding the value of this, the effect on this criteria question would be limited; the development of the site would be highly unlikely to sustain health or sport/ recreation facilities due to its limited scale and associated viability constraints.	Neutral 0	Neutral 0

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	2. Will it improve access to health services?	Health facilities would not be expected to form part of the development of the site and therefore it would not improve access to health services through direct provision.	Neutral 0	
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	3. Will it increase the opportunities for recreational physical activity?	The site is adjacent to Borrowash, where established community recreational groups currently operate. The construction of 630 dwellings at this location would increase opportunities for recreational physical activities within these community groups, along with the neighbouring countryside for walks. This however would not expand the recreational opportunities as no new opportunities would be created directly as a result of development.	Neutral 0	
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	4. Will it provide new open space or improve the quality of existing open space?	SGA6 would be expected to provide a small amount of open space as a result of its development. This open space would likely take the form of Local equipped areas for play and green space for residents to use. The loss of the site to development would remove greenfield land from the local environment, however the public right of way which runs along the western extent of the site would be preserved.	Minor positive +1	
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	5. Will it improve access to local food growing opportunities?	The land upon which the site would be constructed is not thought to be in arable use in present form. However, the land is of moderate to good quality for agriculture, therefore the development of this land will lead to a loss in opportunity for local food growing.	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>6. Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.	1. Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	Delivery of around 630 dwellings at this location would result in the urbanising of private greenfield land and convergence of additional population in the locality. As a result of this incidences of crime are very likely to increase and with it the fear of crime in the locality as would be expected with an expanded population. The opportunity to reduce incidences and fear of <i>rural</i> crime is outweighed by the effects of urbanising the land, particularly when considering the site is already in a largely urban environment.	Minor negative -1	Major negative -2
<b>6. Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.	2. Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	The land upon which this site would be delivered does not have anything within it that would classify as 'built environment'. Consequently, safety and security of the built environment is not an existing concern. However, delivery of the site would introduce an expanded built environment with new additional risks and hazards. Notwithstanding that new development would seek to address safety and security concerns in the design and implementation stages, it would not be able to alleviate all and as such delivery of the site would result in a net-negative effect on levels of safety and security concerns associated with the built environment.	Minor negative -1	
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close	1. Will it protect and enhance existing cultural assets?	Development of the site would not put at direct risk any existing cultural assets. On the contrary, associated increase in population adjacent to the conurbation means that existing assets in the locality are likely to be further supported and, consequently, protected. Development of the site would not directly lead to	Minor positive +1	Major positive +2

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.		enhancement of existing assets, though an increase in the number of users resulting from development is likely to provide the impetus for such enhancements.		
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	2. Will it improve access to, encourage engagement with and residents' satisfaction in community activities?	Delivery of this site would result in an increase in population adjacent to Borrowash. This will increase the proportion of the overall plan area population able to easily access and engage with community activities at facilities within the conurbation. The site would be too limited in scale to provide any additional facilities however and the extent to which an improvement in resident's satisfaction with such activities would result from the development is unknown.	Minor positive +1	
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	3. Will it increase the number of facilities e.g. shops, community centres?	The site is unlikely to provide any additional facilities due to its scale and likely viability constraints associated with this.	Neutral 0	
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close	4. Will it provide for the educational needs of the population?	The site would not be of the scale required to provide a new school, however it would be expected to make sufficient contribution to the existing educational system to support the additional population generated by the site.	Neutral 0	



<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.				
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	1. Will it use and enhance existing transport infrastructure?	Development of the site would result in a new population making use of existing transport infrastructure provided by the conurbation. The site would not be of a scale to warrant large-scale enhancement to the existing network.	Minor positive +1	Minor positive +1
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	2. Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment?	The location of the site adjacent to the conurbation would enable access to existing facilities and services to be via sustainable forms of travel – including walking and cycling. Given the largely urban surrounds of the site, expansion of the network into the site itself would not result in a significant depletion of environmental conditions locally.	Neutral 0	
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve	3. Will it reduce journeys undertaken by private car by encouraging alternative modes	The location of the site adjacent to the conurbation will enable access to facilities and services to be achieved via means other than the private car. Ultimately however, the development would result in additional car usage relating to an expanded local population.	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	of transport?			
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	4. Will it increase accessibility to services and facilities?	The site would be unlikely to provide any additional facilities due to its limited scale and likely viability constraints associated with this. However, due to the sites location adjacent to the conurbation and the facilities it provides, development of the site would result in an increased proportion of the Borough's population able to easily access conurbation provided facilities.	Minor positive +1	
<b>9. Brownfield Land</b> To make efficient use of brownfield land and recognise biodiversity value where appropriate.	1. Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?	SGA6 is currently agricultural land, greenfield in classification within the green belt, therefore its development would not make efficient use of brownfield land.	Major negative -2	Major negative -3
<b>9. Brownfield Land</b> To make efficient use of brownfield land and recognise biodiversity value where appropriate.	2. Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity interests of land?	Development of the site could pose a threat to biodiversity interests and assets present on or adjacent to it. However, the land's current arable usage could likely lead to a reduction of the impacts on biodiversity arising from the site's possible development.	Minor negative -1	
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop	1. Will it result in additional energy use?	SGA6 would result in 630 new dwellings, all of which will use energy, therefore resulting in a consistent increase in energy use. Residential energy schemes could be used to reduce the additional energy arising	Major negative -2	Neutral 0

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.		from the site, however these schemes would not completely eliminate all additional energy use created as a result of development.		
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	2. Will it improve energy efficiency of the building stock within the Plan area?	The construction of 630 new dwellings would result in an improvement in energy efficiency of the building stock within the immediate area as the current building stock is majority over 25+ years old in the surrounding area.	Minor positive +1	
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	3. Will it support the generation and use of renewable energy?	Whilst major development sites have the potential to support the generation and use of renewable energy because of the scale of housing promoted, it will be for detailed master planning of the site to fully explore embedding such measures within any future scheme. Provisionally, the larger the development, the more scope exists to explore the practicalities and feasibility of generating renewable energy through measures such as solar panels mounted on the roofs of new properties that can be supplied back to energy networks. However, master planning will be required to understand the level of potential.	Neutral 0	
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop	4. Will it support the development of community energy systems?	Similar to the points made above in 10(1) and 10(3), development of significantly sized schemes comprising many new homes and other facilities do offer much greater opportunities to explore the practicalities of	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.		introducing community energy systems where scale can be maximised. However, viability of such systems, aided by a masterplanning process to understand the level of scope for the development of a system, will be a key consideration in whether these can be provided in combination with any major development opportunity.		
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	5. Will it ensure that buildings are able to deal with future changes in climate change?	Homes and other facilities that could be provided at this location would be required to be constructed to current standards against building regulations. Regulations set at a national level need to address the predicted change in climatic conditions expected over the coming decades and influence the building of domestic and commercial properties that show greater resilience and are able to adapt to the effects of climate change. The addition of a sizeable number of homes at this location would create a significant amount of new domestic properties that would be expected to demonstrate heightened resilience to climate change than the majority of Erewash's existing housing stock.	Minor positive +1	
<b>11. Pollution and Air Quality</b> To manage air quality and minimise the risk posed by air, noise and other types of pollution.	1. Will it increase levels of air, noise and other types of pollution?	Development of this scale would inevitably result in recorded increases in all types of pollution. Efforts to mitigate this would reduce the levels omitted by buildings, occupants and the introduction of vehicular trips to a previously undeveloped site. However, construction and the occupancy of on-site buildings would see a rise in pollution omissions. Although all of new buildings likely to be domestic, there is thought to	Minor negative -1	Minor negative -1

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
		be adequate scope to limit increases through innovate construction techniques and better specification materials. Pollution increases on SGA6 are likely to be of lower levels than some of the larger strategic sites.		
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	1. Will it minimise or mitigate flood risk?	The location of the site would be unlikely to result in a worsening of flood risk owing to 100% of the land being situated within Flood Zone 1 with a 1-in-1,000 year risk of flooding.	Neutral 0	Minor negative -1
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	2. Will it improve water quality?	Development of the site would be unlikely to improve water quality within the wider water cycle. However, it is also unlikely that development would have a detrimental impact on water quality due to the lack of watercourses in the immediate vicinity to the site.	Neutral 0	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	3. Will it conserve water?	SGA6 is unlikely to assist with the conservation of water given the likely demand arising from domestic properties. Development would not therefore help to conserve water in any way and would see a relatively large net increase in local usage.	Major negative -2	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	4. Will it improve or help to promote water efficiency?	Following directly on from 12(3) above, there is little scope for water conservation owing to the scale of development to the number of homes this site could support. However, the construction of new domestic properties does offer opportunities to promote a more efficient use of water and water resources. Greater	Minor positive +1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
		efficiency is required by building regulations, and the development of such a large number of homes would see each property benefit from passive water efficiency measures and technology.		
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	5. Will it cause a deterioration of Water Framework Directive status or potential of on-site watercourses?	There are no watercourses within the site therefore it is anticipated that it will not cause a deterioration of Water Framework Directive status or potential of onsite watercourses.	Neutral 0	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	6. Will it cause any harm to a Source Protection Zone or the water environment?	SGA6 is not covered by any Source Protection Zones or located close to any Source Protection Zones therefore there will be no impact on these zones as a result of development.	Neutral 0	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	1. Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?	Development of the site would have a notable impact on the current biodiversity and ecological species networks across SGA6. New housing across the entirety of the site could threaten a diverse range of species.	Major negative -2	Major negative -3

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	2. Will it allow for biodiversity net gains?	The site size of SGA6 would allow for some biodiversity net gain to be achieved. Whilst not yet enshrined in law, good practice (including the use of Natural England's biodiversity metric tool) strongly encourages major new development to deliver net gains either on or off-site. There are no statutory environmental designations on or adjoining the site however there are two Local Wildlife Sites nearby which development of SGA6 could theoretically lead to the expansion or enhancement of. There is also potential for some biodiversity net gains on site, due to the size of SGA6.	Neutral 0	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	3. Will it conserve and enhance the geological environment?	Development of the site could result in a limited impact on the geological environment due to the construction and engineering works necessary to prepare for housebuilding (insertion of foundations, remediation works, laying out of highways etc.). Whilst no Regionally Important Geomorphological Site is present within the site's boundaries, the alterations to land levels to facilitate development across a relatively large area of land could influence modest alterations to the geological environment.	Minor negative -1	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue	4. Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?	The site itself does not display any extensive areas of woodland cover and any resulting need for its management. Trees are evident along some of the boundary, with the rest of the boundary being made up of hedge rows. A general absence of woodland cover means that development would not result in the loss of coverage	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
Infrastructure and the natural environment.		across the site; however, the potential for hedgerow trees to be removed to accommodate a new development would have a negative impact. Compensatory net gain could involve tree planting to improve the overall number of trees, but details around this mitigation measure are currently unplanned/unknown.		
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	5. Will it provide new open space or green space?	Development of this scale would be expected to provide some small open/green space. Provision would be required to support resident's informal leisure and recreational activities whilst the incorporation of green space would contribute towards a 'greening' of the site and offer scope for the creation of biodiversity. This would also benefit a high quality urban realm.	Minor positive +1	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	6. Will it improve the quality of existing open space?	Currently there is no formally designated open space within the boundaries of the site. As such, any development would help to create new areas of open space which as described at 13(5) display a range of benefits.	Neutral 0	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b>	7. Will it encourage and protect or improve Green	There is potential to encourage and protect blue/green infrastructure as a result of development on this site, however any improvements will be relative to the site's	Neutral 0	



<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	and/or Blue Infrastructure networks?	size.		
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	1. Does it respect or preserve identified landscape character?	Strategic development at this site would undoubtedly alter to a substantial degree the landscape character evident in this part of the Borough, currently an interconnecting network of agricultural fields separating the settlements of Borrowash and Spondon.	Major negative -2	Major negative -4
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	2. Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity?	Development of the site would have a notable impact on visual amenity to the current appearance consisting of enclosed agricultural fields. Whilst a larger development across an expansive areas would have the potential to make a negative impact visually, the thoughtful and creative landscaping of green spaces, creation of new habitat and positive design of new buildings can help create a positive layout.	Minor negative -1	
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character,	3. Will it maintain and/or enhance the local distinctiveness of the townscape or	SGA6 would directly adjoin Borrowash. The fabric of this area is a mixture of development largely from the 1900-onwards. Some properties which back on to the site date back as far as the early-c20th. Good masterplanning and design would be required to	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	settlement character?	minimise the impact of development on the surrounding built environment.		
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	4. Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between the landscape and the built environment?	Development of the site could play a positive role in creating a softer, more blended transition between the landscape and the outer extent of the built environment. The site is located near the boundary with Derby City, where Spondon is closely situated. Development should be sympathetic to the close distance between Borrowash and Spondon, along with the relationship between Borrowash and the A52.	Neutral 0	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	1. Will it conserve and enhance the historic environment, designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings?	No designated or non-designated heritage assets are to be found in the immediate proximity to SGA6's location, as such, development of this site would not harmfully impact on the historic environment.	Neutral 0	Minor positive +1
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	2. Will it respect, maintain and strengthen the local character and distinctiveness e.g. landscape/ townscape	Development of SGA6 on the edge of Borrowash is likely to have a negative impact on the local character and distinctiveness due to the probable density of development. Some impacts could be mitigated through positive site design and respecting the current urban grain when planning development.	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
	character?			
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	3. Will it provide better opportunities for people to access and understand local heritage and to participate in cultural activities?	An increased population within this area of Erewash allows opportunities for new residents to better access and understand local heritage. Nearby heritage assets include Ockbrook Village and Ockbrook Moravian Settlement.	Minor positive +1	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	4. Will it protect or improve access and enjoyment of the historic environment?	Similarly to 15(3) above, the site can play a part in improving access and enjoyment of the historic environment. Development of SGA6 could provide a location with easy access via public transport or existing green infrastructure networks between the site and heritage assets.	Minor positive +1	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	5. Will it conserve and enhance the archaeological environment?	No recorded archaeological assets or designations exist on or immediately off-site so it is unlikely that development would have any negative impact on the archaeological environment.	Neutral 0	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the	1. Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	Development of this site, which would mainly consist of residential properties, would not lead to the reduced consumption of raw materials. The development's construction, reaffirmed by the extensive size of the site, would in all likelihood see an increase in the	Minor negative -1	Major negative -6

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.		consumption of raw materials across a long period of housebuilding.		
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	2. Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques?	Development of this site would not specifically promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques. These are largely controlled by nationally set building regulations, although local planning policy does look to encourage sustainable design in recognition of the increasing threat of climate change and advocating suitable mitigation. Promoters may wish to pursue the use of sustainable construction methods to demonstrate enhanced building performance and reduce a scheme's overall impact on the environment.	Neutral 0	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	3. Will it result in additional waste?	Development of the site would be expected to have a sizeable impact in additional waste being created from all domestic and non-domestic buildings given the scale of new development possible.	Major negative -2	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils,	4. Will it reduce hazardous waste?	Development of this site would not be expected to have any impact on the production of hazardous waste locally.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
safeguarding minerals and waste.				
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	5. Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land?	The site spans an expanse of good to moderate quality farmland as assessed and presented by the agricultural land classification. This means any development would result in the loss of good agricultural land, albeit not the best and most versatile.	Minor negative -1	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	6. Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	Development of the site would not prevent the loss of greenfield land. The site encompasses a sizeable area of agricultural land that has been previously undeveloped. Whilst green spaces would be incorporated into a development, it would not mitigate against a substantial loss of greenfield land.	Major negative -2	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	7. Will it sterilise mineral resources?	SGA6 is not located within any identified Coal Authority Zones, therefore no impact on mineral resources is expected.	Neutral 0	

**Site: SGA7 - Land North of Cotmanhay**

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	1. Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?	The delivery of approx. 250 residential units would be expected to deliver more diversity in housing stock within the plan area albeit to a limited extent given the restricted scale. The ability to deliver a range of house types including an element of affordable housing is likely to be favourable on increasing the accessibility of housing to a range of social groups.	Minor positive +1	Major positive +2
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	2. Will it provide sufficient pitches and plots for gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople?	As with any prospective housing development site, it has the potential to provide space for the Borough's evidenced needs for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. At this stage any contribution to need is not specified.	Neutral 0	
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	3. Will it reduce homelessness?	The site may make small impacts in reducing homelessness by expanding the quantity of housing stock in the Borough. Whilst it is not expected that any homes on-site will directly house the homeless, the provision of additional housing may create more fluidity in the Borough's housing market that could free up accommodation at the lower end of the spectrum. This would only be the case however when combined with interventions from relevant organisations and agencies.	Neutral 0	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	4. Will it reduce the number of unfit/vacant homes?	The site would provide a limited contribution to an enlargement of the overall stock of 'fit for purpose' homes within the Borough but it is unlikely to directly lead to positive interventions with existing homes which are unfit or vacant. Specifically, delivery of homes on this site which is greenfield and does not contain any known existing unfit or vacant dwellings does not present a direct opportunity to reduce the number of <i>existing</i> unfit or vacant homes. There is potential that development of the site would encourage investment in neighbouring urban areas and that this would lead to positive change, but this is unlikely to be a strong link.	Neutral 0	
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	5. Will it provide the required infrastructure?	Whilst the site would provide infrastructure required to service it, the provision of any additional infrastructure such as education or retail facilities would not be expected to emerge. The site would still be required to make contributions to existing facilities where necessary but the new population would ultimately be reliant on existing infrastructure provision within Ilkeston rather than provision resulting from development of the site.	Minor positive +1	
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment Opportunities.	1. Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs?	The site would not be of a scale to provide for land or uses that might improve diversity and quality of jobs in the long term. However, construction activity associated with implementing the site would be likely to provide a short-term boost to the diversity and quality of jobs locally but this would be unlikely to result in strong effect on this criteria question given the limited scale of	Neutral 0	Neutral 0

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
		related development.		
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment Opportunities.	2. Will it reduce unemployment?	The site would not be of a scale to provide for land or uses that might help to reduce unemployment in the long term. However construction activity associated with implementing the site would be likely to provide a short term boost to employment opportunities locally but this would be unlikely to result in strong effect on this criteria question given the limited scale of development.	Neutral 0	
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment Opportunities.	3. Will it improve rural productivity in terms of employment opportunities?	Some temporary job opportunities would be expected to arise through delivery of the site as considered at 2(2) however such opportunities are unlikely to benefit rural productivity specifically. No other facilities or services are likely to form part of the site which would contribute to rural productivity in terms of employment opportunities. Development of arable land poses a risk against this criteria question however because the land is rated as 'poor' in agricultural land classification, this risk is very minor.	Neutral 0	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support	1. Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses?	The site would not be of a scale to provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses.	Neutral 0	Neutral 0



<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
the use of new technologies.				
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	2. Will it provide business/university clusters?	Development at the site would not be of a scale or type to provide for business or university clusters.	Neutral 0	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	3. Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors?	The site would not be of a scale to accommodate the creation of new jobs in the long term, including in high knowledge sectors.	Neutral 0	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high	4. Will it encourage graduates to live and work within the Plan area?	The population in general – including graduates – would be afforded a greater opportunity to live and work within the plan area because of a boosted supply of new dwellings. The link between attracting graduates specifically and provision of new dwellings on this site	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.		however is weak.		
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	5. Will it provide the required infrastructure?	The site would not provide any economic structure and innovation related infrastructure because it would not be expected to provide for related land-uses.	Neutral 0	
<b>4. Shopping Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of existing shopping centres.	1. Will it encourage the vitality of the city centre, town centre, district centre or local centre?	Development of this site would result in additional population that would be reliant on the use of existing nearby facilities including at the nearest retail centre of Ilkeston. This is because the site would not be in a position to accommodate retail provision due to its limited scale and associated viability constraints. This would provide additional expenditure capacity to nearby retail centres, albeit on a modest scale.	Minor positive +1	Minor positive +1
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce	1. Will it reduce health inequalities?	The location of the site adjacent to the town of Ilkeston means that an increased proportion of the population within the plan area will be able to access services and facilities through active means (walking and cycling)	Minor positive +1	Major positive +5

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
health inequalities.		and this will help to promote healthy lifestyle choices. Whilst the site is not of a scale likely to support health facilities, a housing development would be expected to provide a network of green space (particularly in considering the need to adequately buffer between development and the adjacent woodland) which is publically available and not provided by the land in its current form. This would provide additional opportunities for active movement and travel across the site.		
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	2. Will it improve access to health services?	Health facilities would not be expected to form part of the development of the site and therefore it would not improve access to health services through direct provision. The sites location adjacent to a town that contains an extensive range of existing facilities does provide for enhancing the proportion of the Borough's population who can easily access facilities, resulting in minor improvement to overall access.	Minor positive +1	
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	3. Will it increase the opportunities for recreational physical activity?	The site itself would be adjacent and close by to recreational opportunities at the Erewash Canal, Erewash Valley and Nutbrook Trails. This would result in benefit to the incumbent population but would not expand existing opportunities. There may be the possibility of better utilising existing woodland adjacent to the site to provide for recreational activity which currently does not exist, however due to the biodiversity sensitivities of the woodland and its part Ancient Woodland status, effects of this would likely be limited.	Minor positive +1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
		The fact that the site will need to provide some element of green/ open space to facilitate the needs of the incumbent population on land which is currently inaccessible to the public also presents additional opportunity which may result in some net gain for existing populations also.		
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	4. Will it provide new open space or improve the quality of existing open space?	No formal open space is present within the site so development of the site would not improve existing open space. Given the very limited size of the site, the ability to provide new open space becomes more complex owing to the need to incorporate sufficient homes to ensure positive development viability. However, the site is private land and not currently accessible to the public. As a result any open space provided as part of the development would result in net gain. Furthermore, an appropriate buffer would need to be incorporated between development and the adjacent ancient woodland and this provides additional and specific opportunity for the incorporation of open space within the site.	Major positive +2	
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	5. Will it improve access to local food growing opportunities?	The land upon which the site would be constructed is largely arable and able to accommodate food growing opportunities. However the land is classified as 'poor' in its agricultural classification so the negative effect of this is limited.	Neutral 0	
<b>6. Community Safety</b> To improve community	1. Will it reduce crime and the fear	Delivery of around 250 dwellings at this location would result in the urbanising of rural land and convergence	Neutral 0	Minor negative

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.	of crime?	of additional population in the locality. As a result of this incidences of crime are very likely to increase and with it the fear of crime in the locality associated with an expanded population. However development of the site does present an opportunity to mitigate current crime issues associated with the adjacent woodland by introducing natural surveillance and other controls over the use and upkeep of the woodland. The opportunity to reduce incidences and fear of rural crime therefore would provide some mitigation to the effect from an expanded population.		-1
<b>6. Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.	2. Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	The land upon which this site would be delivered does not have anything within it that would classify as 'built environment'. Consequently, safety and security of the built environment is not an existing concern and development of the site would result in a much expanded built environment with its associated issues. Whilst new development would seek to address safety and security concerns in the design and implementation stages, it would not be able to alleviate all and as such, delivery of the site would result in a net-increase in potential for safety and security issues relating to the built environment when compared with the existing scenario.	Minor negative -1	
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital	1. Will it protect and enhance existing cultural assets?	Development of the site does not put at direct risk any existing cultural assets. On the contrary, associated increase in population adjacent to the town means that existing assets in the locality are likely to be further	Minor positive +1	Major positive +2

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.		supported and, consequently, protected. Development of the site would not directly lead to enhancement of existing assets, though an increase in the number of users resulting from development is likely to provide the impetus for such enhancements.		
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	2. Will it improve access to, encourage engagement with and residents' satisfaction in community activities?	Delivery of this site would result in a modest increase in population adjacent to the town. This will increase the proportion of the overall plan area population able to easily access and engage with community activities at facilities within the town. The site would be too limited in scale to provide any additional facilities however and the extent to which an improvement in resident's satisfaction with such activities would result from the development is unknown.	Minor positive +1	
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	3. Will it increase the number of facilities e.g. shops, community centres?	The site is unlikely to provide any additional facilities due to its limited scale and likely viability constraints associated with this however development of the site would not put at risk any existing facilities either.	Neutral 0	
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital	4. Will it provide for the educational needs of the population?	The site would not be of the scale required to provide a new school, however it would be expected to make sufficient contribution to the existing educational system to support the additional population generated	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.		by the site.		
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	1. Will it use and enhance existing transport infrastructure?	Development of the site would result in a new population making use of enhanced transport infrastructure provided by the town however will be unlikely to be in a position to provide specific new infrastructure measures which result in wider network benefit given the relatively modest scale of development and need to maintain positive viability.	Minor positive +1	Major positive +3
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	2. Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment?	The location of the site adjacent to the town would enable access to a significant range of existing facilities and services at its defined retail centre via sustainable forms of travel – including walking and cycling and this would significantly contribute to development of a transport network which minimises impact on the environment. However, this positive effect is constrained in view of the sites likely inability to provide new facilities internally and the required expansion of the network into the countryside which will result in some adverse risk to the environment.	Minor positive +1	
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of	3. Will it reduce journeys	The location of the site adjacent to the town will enable access to jobs, facilities and services to be achieved	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	undertaken by private car by encouraging alternative modes of transport?	via means other than the private car. Ultimately however, the development would result in additional car usage relating to an expanded local population on land which currently does not contain any significant car use – generating uses; the proximity to facilities and limited scale of the site however limits this effect relatively.		
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	4. Will it increase accessibility to services and facilities?	The site is unlikely to provide any additional facilities due to its limited scale and the need to retain positive viability. However, due to the sites location adjacent to the town and the wide range of provision within it, development of the site would result in an increased proportion of the Borough's population able to easily access facilities.	Minor positive +1	
<b>9. Brownfield Land</b> To make efficient use of brownfield land and recognise biodiversity value where appropriate.	1. Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?	The site would not make efficient use of brownfield land owing to it being greenfield in its entirety.	Major negative -2	Major negative -3
<b>9. Brownfield Land</b> To make efficient use of brownfield land and recognise biodiversity value where appropriate.	2. Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity interests of land?	Development of a greenfield site would inevitably alter the current ecosystems that exist across the land. Survey of the site point towards the hedgerow, which encloses the several separate fields, has having biodiversity merit. Given the layout and positioning of the hedgerow, this would almost inevitably be lost –	Minor negative -1	



<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
		affecting the ecology this habitat feature supports.		
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	1. Will it result in additional energy use?	A development scheme on a site of this size would inevitably result in additional energy use owing to the land's current greenfield status. The potential provision of several hundred new homes would see a notable increase in energy usage by occupants of all domestic buildings across the site. Whilst renewable energy schemes could be pursued to offset the impact, this would still result in a large increase in energy use in excess of the current baseline.	Minor negative -1	Minor positive +1
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	2. Will it improve energy efficiency of the building stock within the Plan area?	The construction of this number of new homes would make a small, but positive contribution to the energy efficiency of building stock within the plan area. Proposed development size would constitute less than 0.5% of the current number of dwellings in Erewash, and it would be expected that each new property at this location would be constructed to higher levels of energy efficiency in line with national building regulations.	Minor positive +1	
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	3. Will it support the generation and use of renewable energy?	Whilst major development sites have the potential to support the generation and use of renewable energy because of the scale of housing promoted, it will be for detailed masterplanning of the site to fully explore embedding such measures within any future scheme. Provisionally, the larger the development, the more scope exists to explore the practicalities and feasibility of generating renewable energy through measures such as solar panels mounted on the roofs of new	Neutral 0	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
		properties where energy can be supplied back to energy networks. However, masterplanning will be required to understand the exact level of potential.		
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	4. Will it support the development of community energy systems?	Similar to the points made above in 10(1) and 10(3), development of significantly sized schemes comprising many new homes do offer much greater opportunities to explore the practicalities of introducing community energy systems where scale can be maximised. However, viability of such systems, aided by a masterplanning process to understand the level of scope for the development of a system, will be a key consideration in whether these can be provided in combination with any major development opportunity. The proposed size of this site is unlikely to support the rolling out of a community energy system, but further technical work would be necessary to confirm this view.	Neutral 0	
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	5. Will it ensure that buildings are able to deal with future changes in climate change?	Homes potentially built at this location would be required to be constructed to current building regulations standards. Regulations set at a national level need to address the predicted change in climatic conditions expected over the coming decades and influence the building of domestic properties that show greater resilience and are able to adapt to the effects of climate change. The addition of several hundred new homes at this location would give rise to a reasonably large amount of new domestic properties, all of which would be expected to demonstrate heightened resilience to climate change than the majority of	Minor positive +1	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
		Erewash's existing housing stock.		
<b>11. Pollution and Air Quality</b> To manage air quality and minimise the risk posed by air, noise and other types of pollution.	1. Will it increase levels of air, noise and other types of pollution?	Development of this size would inevitably result in recorded increases in all types of pollution. Efforts to mitigate this would reduce the levels omitted by buildings, occupants and the increase of vehicular trips made to and from the site. However, construction and the occupancy of on-site buildings would see a rise in pollution omissions. Although with all new buildings likely to be domestic, there is thought to be adequate scope to limit increases through innovative construction techniques and better specification materials.	Minor negative -1	Minor negative -1
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	1. Will it minimise or mitigate flood risk?	The site is wholly located within the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 1 area given the elevated level of land around this part of the Borough. As such, it is unlikely that potential development would heighten flood risk. However, development of sloping greenfield land which allows rainwaters to naturally permeate and soakaway into the ground alters the hydrology of the area and suitable drainage, combining engineered sewers and natural forms (SuDS) should ensure flood risk is not worsened locally.	Neutral 0	Major negative -2
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water	2. Will it improve water quality?	Development of the site would be unlikely to improve water quality within the wider water cycle. It is located some way from the nearest waterways (River Erewash & the Erewash Canal) so the prospects of any surface water run-off making its way to these are extremely slim. It would be expected that development would see	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
quality.		a standard sewer and drainage system established to control the movement of water. There would however be an altered subterranean hydrology that could no longer fully rely on the undeveloped terrain associated with the fields west of Cotmanhay Wood that help to absorb rainwaters through natural drainage processes.		
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	3. Will it conserve water?	Development of a strategic housing growth site is extremely unlikely to assist with the conservation of water given the likely demand arising from every domestic property. Development would not therefore help to conserve water in any way and would see a relatively large net increase in localised usage.	Major negative -2	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	4. Will it improve or help to promote water efficiency?	Following directly on from 12(3) above, there is little scope for water conservation owing to the scale of development to the number of homes this site could support. However, the construction of new domestic properties does offer opportunities to promote a more efficient use of water and water resources. Greater efficiency is required by building regulations, and the development of a notably large number of homes would see each property benefit from passive water efficiency measures and technology.	Minor positive +1	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water	5. Will it cause a deterioration of Water Framework Directive status or potential	The site currently consists entirely of greenfield land in the form of enclosed fields west of Cotmanhay Wood. As discussed at 12(2), the distance between the site and nearby watercourses (there are none on-site, although a ditch does run in parallel to a hedgerow	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
quality.	of on-site watercourses?	defining the northern boundary) makes it extremely unlikely that development at this location would result in compromising the Water Framework Directive for local main rivers or streams.		
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	6. Will it cause any harm to a Source Protection Zone or the water environment?	The site does not form any part of the three main SPZs so development would not adversely impact aquifers. It is highly unlikely that the site's possible development would harmfully affect the water environment, with sustainable drainage systems anticipated to control the capture and safe discharge of rainwater.	Neutral 0	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	1. Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?	Further to 9(2) earlier in this assessment, the site itself is not considered to support sizeable concentrations of wildlife and ecology. Furthermore, ecological survey of the site suggests development of the grassland would not give rise to any ecological constraints. Survey has highlighted the presence of protected species (bats) that may be impacted by development and further survey work may be necessary. The site does support a number of species, so despite the low biodiversity quality of the grassland, development would remove/reduce the site's ability to continue serving this function.	Minor negative -1	Minor negative -1
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity	2. Will it allow for biodiversity net gains?	Whilst the site itself is relatively low quality in terms of its biodiversity value, what is present might be difficult to compensate due to the area's smallness. Nevertheless, there is scope to deliver net gains outside of the site and this could involve additional	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.		woodland planting in the vicinity of Cotmanhay Woods. Whilst land east of the Woods falls under different land ownership, ecological survey suggests the land could become a useful receptor site to offset development impacts on biodiversity.		
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	3. Will it conserve and enhance the geological environment?	Development of the site could result in a limited impact on the geological environment due to the construction and engineering works necessary to prepare for housebuilding (insertion of foundations, remediation works, laying out of highways etc.). Whilst no Regionally Important Geomorphological Site is present within the site's boundaries, the alterations to land levels to facilitate development across a relatively large area of land could influence modest alterations to the geological environment.	Minor negative -1	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	4. Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?	Whilst no woodland cover exists across the site, some small trees are to be found located along hedgerows which follow the edges of fields that help enclose the land. Development would in all likelihood remove sections of internal hedgerows to allow for housing; something which would result in the loss of a small number of trees. These could be replaced with the planting of trees elsewhere within the site as a compensatory measure. Also of note here is the adjoining Cotmanhay Wood. Whilst the site does not extend into the Woods, it is important that any future development does not threaten the continued health of this important habitat.	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	5. Will it provide new open space or green space?	The site is relatively small in size, therefore new open/green space would likely be restricted to incidental areas contributing to the residential amenity across the development. However, given that the land is currently privately-owned with no public access, the creation of open/green space – albeit small parcels, would constitute a gain of space.	Minor positive +1	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	6. Will it improve the quality of existing open space?	Currently there is no formally designated open space within the boundaries of the site. As such, any development would help to create small parcels of open space which because of their size as described at 13(5) would only display limited benefits. As referred to elsewhere, the site is currently privately owned and not accessible to the public. Whilst the various hedgerows and trees contribute to biodiversity, the fact that the land cannot be publically accessed means it makes no contribution to the Borough's network of open space.	Neutral 0	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	7. Will it encourage and protect or improve Green and/or Blue Infrastructure networks?	Development at this site offers some opportunities to link to important elements of the existing blue and green infrastructure at the northern-most point of the Borough in order to connect the site to the nearby network of assets. Scope exists to develop the relationship between the site and the neighbouring Cotmanhay Wood, and a number of public rights of way are to be found in the nearby vicinity. Some of these extend out into the adjacent countryside and offer opportunities to link the site to Shipley Park and the	Minor positive +1	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
		Erewash Valley.		
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	1. Does it respect or preserve identified landscape character?	The site is located within the South Yorkshire, Notts and Derbyshire Coalfield character area, and more specifically, forms part of the Coalfield Estate lands landscape type. Currently, the site encompasses several fields separated by hedgerow and hedgerow trees. This is typical of the landscape type found in this part of the County. Therefore housing development would fundamentally alter the character of landscape here, and whilst any new development should look to replicate the predominate building styles evident throughout the rest of the Coalfield Estate lands, the urbanising nature of development would make it difficult to respect or preserve the identified landscape character.	Major negative -2	Major negative -2
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	2. Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity?	Development of the site would, as described by 14(1) alter the appearance and landscape character of land immediately north of Ilkeston. Adjoining housing development on three sides of the site is varied in type, size and age – so potential new development would add to the diversity of the stock in the wider locality. New homes would be expected to add visual interest to the land, but would not be expected to make a positive impact on visual amenity given development would be at the expense of the current open landscape.	Minor negative -1	
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b>	3. Will it maintain and/or enhance the	As explained elsewhere within this assessment, the built form surrounding the site to the west, east and	Neutral 0	



<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	local distinctiveness of the townscape or settlement character?	south is diverse in nature with various styles of housing built to different densities and layouts. As such, there is no predominant local distinctiveness of note – so new development should it occur would not be maintaining any clear distinguishable townscape or settlement character.		
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	4. Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between the landscape and the built environment?	Development at this could potentially enhance the interrelationship between the landscape and the built environment. As the site is located between the current extent of urbanised development in north Ilkeston and Cotmanhay Wood, a thoughtfully designed scheme with creative layout recognising the proximity of the adjoining Wood may help it to play a stronger role in defining the surrounding landscape. A suitably designed scheme could also help with the long-term management of the Woodland by providing it with an enhanced setting that benefits both the Woods and the nearby development.	Minor positive +1	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	1. Will it conserve and enhance the historic environment, designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings?	The site is located rather distantly from local historic environment assets, both designated and non-designated. The nearest listed structure, Bennerley Viaduct, is located around 1.3km away on the opposite side of the Cotmanhay area. As such, development will neither conserve and enhance, or act detrimentally to any listed building, building of local interest, conservation area or the settings of any such assets.	Neutral 0	Minor positive +1

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	2. Will it respect, maintain and strengthen the local character and distinctiveness e.g. landscape/ townscape character?	The site adjoins existing housing on two sides, with lower density residential homes located to the site's west and the northern-most homes built as part of the Cotmanhay Estate during the 1950s immediately south and east. Collectively, it is felt that the surrounding form of built development around the site offers little towards a strong sense of historic local character and distinctiveness.	Neutral 0	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	3. Will it provide better opportunities for people to access and understand local heritage and to participate in cultural activities?	An enlarged population at the site offers opportunities for new residents to better access and understand local heritage – albeit such heritage as explained at 15(1) is situated further away from the site. This could be achieved through the creation of digital materials that every household would have access to in order to learn more about local heritage present in the wider locality.	Minor positive +1	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	4. Will it protect or improve access and enjoyment of the historic environment?	As described at 15(1), the site is located rather distantly from any nearby assets that contribute to the wider historic environment. As a result, potential development would be unlikely to protect or improve access and enjoyment of the historic environment – but would not contribute to a lesser level of access or enjoyment either.	Neutral 0	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for	5. Will it conserve and enhance the archaeological environment?	It is understood that no recorded archaeological assets are present on site. Whilst the possibility of on-site archaeology has been raised, no evidence of workings have been presented to the Borough Council to	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
people to enjoy culture and heritage.		demonstrate this. No designations protecting scheduled ancient monuments exist on or immediately off-site.		
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	1. Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	Development of this site, which would consist solely of residential properties, would not lead to the reduced consumption of raw materials. The development's construction, reaffirmed by the size of the site, would in all probability, see an increase in the consumption of raw materials across a period in which housebuilding activity occurred.	Minor negative -1	Major negative -5
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	2. Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques?	Development of this site would not specifically promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques. These are largely controlled by nationally set building regulations, although local planning policy does look to encourage sustainable design in recognition of the increasing threat of climate change and advocating suitable mitigation. Promoters may wish to pursue the use of sustainable construction methods to demonstrate enhanced building performance and reduce a scheme's overall impact on the environment.	Neutral 0	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils,	3. Will it result in additional waste?	Development of the site would be expected to have a relatively large impact in additional waste being generated by occupants of all domestic buildings given the scale of new development possible and the current status of the land within the site's boundaries.	Major negative -2	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
safeguarding minerals and waste.				
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	4. Will it reduce hazardous waste?	Development of this site would not be expected to have any impact on the production of hazardous waste locally.	Neutral 0	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	5. Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land?	Land within the site is situated within Grade 4 quality agricultural land, classified as being poor in its classification. Therefore development would not see the loss of good quality land in Erewash.	Neutral 0	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	6. Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	No. The site is currently greenfield in its entirety and whilst some pockets of a developed area would remain open to fulfil an amenity green space function, the development would not be able to prevent the loss of greenfield land to a new housing development.	Major negative -2	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b>	7. Will it sterilise mineral resources?	The site forms part of the Coal Mining Reporting Area which spans much of the north of the Borough. This, along with other datasets available from the Coal	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.		Authority, suggests coal reserves under the site. However, the site's proximity to housing immediately south strongly suggests open cast extraction operations would be wholly unsuitable at this location. Potential development would not conflict with any site-based policies in the current Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Plan.		

**Site: SGA10 – South of Little Eaton**

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	1. Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?	The delivery of approx. 250 residential units would be expected to deliver more diversity in housing stock within the plan area albeit to a limited extent given the restricted scale. The ability to deliver a range of house types including an element of affordable housing is likely to be favourable on increasing the accessibility of housing to a range of social groups.	Minor positive +1	Major positive +2
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	2. Will it provide sufficient pitches and plots for gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople?	As with any prospective housing development site, it has the potential to provide space for the Borough's evidenced needs for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. At this stage any contribution to need is not specified.	Neutral 0	
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	3. Will it reduce homelessness?	The site may make small impacts in reducing homelessness by expanding the quantity of housing stock in the Borough. Whilst it is not expected that any homes on-site will directly house the homeless, the provision of additional housing may create more fluidity in the Borough's housing market that could free up accommodation at the lower end of the spectrum. This would only be the case however when combined with interventions from relevant organisations and agencies.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	4. Will it reduce the number of unfit/vacant homes?	The site would provide a limited contribution to an enlargement of the overall stock of 'fit for purpose' homes within the Borough but it is unlikely to directly lead to positive interventions with existing homes which are unfit or vacant. Specifically, delivery of homes on this site which does not contain any known existing unfit or vacant dwellings does not present a direct opportunity to reduce the number of <i>existing</i> unfit or vacant homes. There is potential that development of the site would encourage investment in neighbouring urban areas and that this would lead to positive change, but this is unlikely to be a strong link particularly when considering the limited extent of housing provision in neighbouring Little Eaton.	Neutral 0	
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	5. Will it provide the required infrastructure?	Whilst the site would provide infrastructure required to service it, the provision of any additional infrastructure such as education or retail facilities would not be expected to emerge. The site would still be required to make contributions to existing facilities where necessary but the new population would ultimately be reliant on existing infrastructure provision within Little Eaton rather than provision resulting from development of the site.	Minor positive +1	
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment Opportunities.	1. Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs?	The site would not be of a scale to provide for land or uses that might improve diversity and quality of jobs in the long term. However, construction activity associated with implementing the site would be likely to provide a short-term boost to the diversity and quality of	Neutral 0	Neutral 0

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
		jobs locally but this would be unlikely to result in strong effect on this criteria question given the limited scale of development. Additional population provided by the development may help provide long-term support to the adjacent employment uses that may result in a diversification of uses within it; however this is not considered a strong enough link to influence the overall effect on this criteria question due to the sites limited scale and presence of existing population to resource the site in Little Eaton.		
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment Opportunities.	2. Will it reduce unemployment?	The site would not be of a scale to provide for land or uses that might help to reduce unemployment in the long-term. However, construction activity associated with implementing the site would be likely to provide a short-term boost to employment opportunities locally but this would be unlikely to result in strong effect on this criteria question given the limited scale of development. Development of the site may help provide long-term support to the adjacent employment uses that may result in its expansion/ intensification and thus creation of additional jobs; however this is not considered a strong enough link to influence the overall effect on this criteria question due to the sites limited scale and presence of existing population at Little Eaton which is able to resource the employment site.	Neutral 0	
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment	3. Will it improve rural productivity in terms of	Some job opportunities would be expected to arise through delivery of the site as considered at 2(2) however such opportunities are unlikely to benefit rural	Neutral 0	



<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
Opportunities.	employment opportunities?	productivity specifically. No other facilities or services are likely to form part of the site which would contribute to rural productivity in terms of employment opportunities. Development of the site would not require the use of arable land so any effect on this criteria question is further neutralised.		
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	1. Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses?	The site would not be of a scale to provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses.	Neutral 0	Neutral 0
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	2. Will it provide business/university clusters?	Development on the site would not be of a scale or type to provide for business or university clusters.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	3. Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors?	The site would not be of a scale to accommodate the creation of new jobs in the long-term, including in high knowledge sectors.	Neutral 0	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	4. Will it encourage graduates to live and work within the Plan area?	The population in general – including graduates – would be afforded a greater opportunity to live and work within the plan area because of a boosted supply of new dwellings. The link between attracting graduates specifically and provision of new dwellings on this site however is weak.	Neutral 0	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support	5. Will it provide the required infrastructure?	The site would not provide any economic structure and innovation related infrastructure because it would not be expected to provide for related land-uses.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
the use of new technologies.				
<b>4. Shopping Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of existing shopping centres.	1. Will it encourage the vitality of the city centre, town centre, district centre or local centre?	Development of this site would result in additional population that would be reliant on the use of existing nearby facilities including within Little Eaton (not currently defined as a retail centre) and Derby (with a range of defined retail centres). This is because the site would not be in a position to accommodate retail provision due to its limited scale and associated viability constraints. This would provide additional expenditure capacity to limited provision within Little Eaton, but there would not be a strong link between this site and increasing expenditure capacity at existing designated retail centres given the sites location which is isolated from the nearest defined retail centre.	Neutral 0	Neutral 0
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	1. Will it reduce health inequalities?	The location of the site is relatively distant from the conurbation however Little Eaton provides good range of facilities and services at its undesignated centre within close proximity to the site. This means that an increased proportion of the population within the plan area will be able to access services and facilities through active means (walking and cycling) and this will help to promote healthy lifestyle choices. Whilst the site is not of a scale likely to support health facilities, a housing development would be expected to provide a network of green space which is publically available and not provided by the land in its current form which would provide additional opportunities for active	Minor positive +1	Major positive +4

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
		movement and travel across the site. Whilst a public right of way provides access through the existing land, designated green spaces are not and the known previous use of the site as a landfill significantly constrains opportunities for safe interaction with the land in its current form.		
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	2. Will it improve access to health services?	Health facilities would not be expected to form part of the development of the site and therefore it would not improve access to health services through direct provision. The sites location adjacent to Little Eaton which is a particularly well provisioned village does provide the potential for enhancing the proportion of the Borough's population who can access health services given the presence of health facilities within the village.	Minor positive +1	
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	3. Will it increase the opportunities for recreational physical activity?	A public right of way travels through the site but its onward accessibility is limited as it encounters the A38 to the south and a factory building in the north on Duffield Road. As a result its value in providing opportunities for recreational physical activity – and particularly through connectivity into the wider countryside - is limited especially when considering the condition of the site as a former land fill and with no existing green space provision, limiting prospects for 'general interaction' with the land safely. Nearby opportunities for connectivity into green and blue infrastructure assets such as the River Derwent and disused canal which flanks the eastern boundary of the site do exist and may provide opportunity for enhancing	Minor positive +1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
		offer through development of the site. Enhancements in open/ green space offer will also result from development albeit on a limited scale given the extent of the site.		
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	4. Will it provide new open space or improve the quality of existing open space?	No formal open space is present within the site so development of the site would not improve existing open space. Given the very limited size of the site, the ability to provide new open space becomes more complex owing to the need to incorporate sufficient homes to ensure positive development viability. However, the site is private land and not currently accessible to the public aside from a Public Right of Way to which any users would be restricted to. As a result any open space provided as part of the development would result in net gain. There is the potential that appropriate buffering between the A38, industrial site to the south and future housing development will be required and this may provide additional opportunity for incorporating open space beyond what would be expected for a site of this site.	Minor positive +1	
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	5. Will it improve access to local food growing opportunities?	The land upon which the site would be constructed is primarily former landfill and as such is unable to accommodate food growing opportunities in its current condition. As a result, development of the site would not influence access to food growing opportunities.	Neutral 0	
<b>6. Community Safety</b> To improve community	1. Will it reduce crime and the fear	Delivery of around 200 dwellings at this location would result in the urbanising of undeveloped land. This will	Minor negative	Neutral 0

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.	of crime?	result in the convergence of additional population in the locality. As a result of this incidences of crime are very likely to increase when compared with the current scenario and with it the fear of crime in the locality associated with an expanded population. There are no obvious opportunities to mitigate impact on this criteria question by reducing effects from existing crime on the site.	-1	
<b>6. Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.	2. Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	The land upon which this site would be delivered does contain some abandoned artefacts including those associated with the remains of a skip rental business. The land in question was previously for landfill use and thus there is a significant contamination concern which would need to be addressed should the site be redeveloped. Consequently, there are a range of avenues through which redevelopment of the site would be expected to improve the general safety and security of the built environment.	Minor positive +1	
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	1. Will it protect and enhance existing cultural assets?	Development of the site does not put at direct risk any existing cultural assets. On the contrary, associated increase in population adjacent to Little Eaton which contains a range of cultural assets means that existing assets are likely to be further supported and, consequently, protected. Development of the site would not directly lead to enhancement of existing assets, though an increase in the number of users resulting from development is likely to provide the impetus for such enhancements.	Minor positive +1	Major positive +2

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	2. Will it improve access to, encourage engagement with and residents' satisfaction in community activities?	Delivery of this site would result in a modest increase in population adjacent to a village which does provide for some facilities which deliver community activities. Development of the site will therefore increase the proportion of the overall plan area population able to easily access and engage with community activities at facilities within the village albeit to a limited extent. The site would be too limited in scale to provide any additional facilities directly however and the extent to which an improvement in resident's satisfaction with such activities would result from the development is unknown.	Minor positive +1	
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	3. Will it increase the number of facilities e.g. shops, community centres?	The site is unlikely to provide any additional facilities due to its limited scale and likely viability constraints associated with this.	Neutral 0	
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the	4. Will it provide for the educational needs of the population?	The site would not be of the scale required to provide a new school, however it would be expected to make sufficient contribution to the existing educational system to support the additional population generated by the site. Evidence indicates that the nearest primary school in Little Eaton is currently over-subscribed.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
most deprived areas within the plan area.				
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	1. Will it use and enhance existing transport infrastructure?	Development of the site would result in a new population making use of existing transport infrastructure present in Little Eaton and the surrounding area. The site would not be of a scale to warrant large-scale enhancement to the existing network although it will be required to mitigate impacts on the local highway network that result from its development where appropriate.	Neutral 0	Minor negative -1
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	2. Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment?	The location of the site adjacent to a village which provides some facilities would enable access to existing facilities and services to be via sustainable forms of travel – including walking and cycling, albeit to a limited extent when compared with a location neighbouring the town or conurbations which provide for a much richer spectrum of facilities. Although the site is a former landfill, much of it has become naturalised over time and as such an expansion of the transport network into it would neutralise any limited benefits as considered above in relation to this criteria question.	Neutral 0	
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help	3. Will it reduce journeys undertaken by private car by	The location of the site away from a town or conurbation means the range of jobs, facilities and services available to new residents through means of travel other than the private car is very limited. An	Minor negative -1	



<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	encouraging alternative modes of transport?	increase in population resulting from development of this site would result in increased car usage relative to the current situation in any case, but the limited access to jobs, facilities and services as described provides little mitigation.		
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	4. Will it increase accessibility to services and facilities?	The site is unlikely to provide any additional facilities due to its limited scale and likely viability constraints associated with this. Although the site would be located adjacent to a village which provides limited service and facility provision, the effect on the criteria question in this instance is weak given the very limited range of offering from the village particularly against the context of sites which benefit from direct connection to the conurbations or town.	Neutral 0	
<b>9. Brownfield Land</b> To make efficient use of brownfield land and recognise biodiversity value where appropriate.	1. Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?	Whilst former uses across the site would have seen the land being classified as brownfield, its re-wilding over a number of decades has seen the site largely return to greenfield status supporting pockets of self-seeding tree growth. As such, development would not make efficient use of brownfield land.	Major negative -2	Major negative -3
<b>9. Brownfield Land</b> To make efficient use of brownfield land and recognise biodiversity value where appropriate.	2. Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity interests of land?	As described at 9(1), the greening over of the site will have also prompted the land developing ecological support for grass-based habitats. Whilst no formal surveying has occurred, it is evident that a site with emerging woodland will support increasing levels of biodiversity that development would threaten.	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	1. Will it result in additional energy use?	A development scheme on a site of this size would inevitably result in additional energy use owing to the land's current greenfield status. The potential provision of a couple of hundred of new homes would see a notable increase in energy usage by occupants of all domestic buildings across the site. Whilst renewable energy schemes could be pursued to offset the impact, this would still result in a large increase in energy use in excess of the current baseline.	Minor negative -1	Minor positive +1
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	2. Will it improve energy efficiency of the building stock within the Plan area?	The construction of this number of new homes would make a small, but positive contribution to the energy efficiency of building stock within the plan area. Proposed development size would constitute less than 0.5% of the current number of dwellings in Erewash, and it would be expected that each new property at this location would be constructed to higher levels of energy efficiency in line with national building regulations.	Minor positive +1	
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	3. Will it support the generation and use of renewable energy?	Whilst major development sites have the potential to support the generation and use of renewable energy because of the scale of housing promoted, it will be for detailed masterplanning of the site to fully explore embedding such measures within any future scheme. Provisionally, the larger the development, the more scope exists to explore the practicalities and feasibility of generating renewable energy through measures such as solar panels mounted on the roofs of new properties where energy can be supplied back to energy networks. However, masterplanning will be	Neutral 0	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
		required to understand the exact level of potential.		
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	4. Will it support the development of community energy systems?	Similar to the points made above in 10(1) and 10(3), development of significantly sized schemes comprising many new homes do offer much greater opportunities to explore the practicalities of introducing community energy systems where scale can be maximised. However, viability of such systems, aided by a masterplanning process to understand the level of scope for the development of a system, will be a key consideration in whether these can be provided in combination with any major development opportunity. The proposed size of this site is unlikely to support the rolling out of a community energy system, but further technical work would be necessary to confirm this view.	Neutral 0	
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	5. Will it ensure that buildings are able to deal with future changes in climate change?	Homes potentially built at this location would be required to be constructed to current building regulations standards. Regulations set at a national level need to address the predicted change in climatic conditions expected over the coming decades and influence the building of domestic properties that show greater resilience and are able to adapt to the effects of climate change. The addition of approx. 200 new homes at this location would give rise to a reasonably large amount of new domestic properties, all of which would be expected to demonstrate heightened resilience to climate change than the majority of Erewash's existing housing stock.	Minor positive +1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>11. Pollution and Air Quality</b> To manage air quality and minimise the risk posed by air, noise and other types of pollution.	1. Will it increase levels of air, noise and other types of pollution?	Development of this size would inevitably result in recorded increases in all types of pollution. Efforts to mitigate this would reduce the levels omitted by buildings, occupants and the increase of vehicular trips made to and from the site. However, the process of construction and the subsequent occupancy of on-site buildings would see a rise in pollution omissions. Although with all new buildings likely to be domestic, there is thought to be adequate scope to limit increases through innovative construction techniques and better specification materials.	Minor negative -1	Minor negative -1
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	1. Will it minimise or mitigate flood risk?	The extent of flood modelling of the River Derwent on extends as far north as the A38 west of the roundabout junction with the A61. This means reliance falls upon the Environment Agency's flood risk mapping to understand the site's links with nearby watercourses. This mapping sees the entire site located within Flood Zone 2 with around half of the northern section of the site also situated within the more prone Flood Zone 3. This suggests the land, located in close proximity to the River Derwent and a network of minor channels and ditches, is highly vulnerable to flooding. Given the extensive coverage of Flood Zone 2 across the entire site, development would struggle to demonstrate that it could minimise or mitigate flood risk even with extensive sustainable drainage features.	Major negative -2	Major negative -7
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b>	2. Will it improve water quality?	Following on from above, the heightened threat of flooding at the site could contribute to a risk to water	Major negative	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.		quality in the event of flooding. Should the nearby River Derwent overtop and flood surrounding land, including that within this site, then this risks acting as a pathway for pollutants to join floodwaters and make their way back into the water cycle and hydrology in place around SGA10. With a network of drainage channels and ditches around and bordering the site, these too could contribute to the moving of pollutants back to the main river network.	-2	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	3. Will it conserve water?	Development of a strategic housing growth site is extremely unlikely to assist with the conservation of water given the likely demand arising from every domestic property. Development would not therefore help to conserve water in any way and would see a relatively large net increase in localised usage.	Major negative -2	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	4. Will it improve or help to promote water efficiency?	Following directly on from 12(3) above, there is little scope for water conservation owing to the scale of development to the number of homes this site could support. However, the construction of new domestic properties does offer opportunities to promote a more efficient use of water and water resources. Greater efficiency is required by building regulations, and the development of a notably large number of homes would see each property benefit from passive water efficiency measures and technology.	Minor positive +1	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b>	5. Will it cause a deterioration of	Of concern here is the site's vulnerability to flooding as demonstrated by its position within Flood Zones 2 and	Minor negative	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	Water Framework Directive status or potential of on-site watercourses?	3. Any instances of flooding across the site, prompted by the development across re-established greenfield land, has the ability to see contaminants transported by flood waters over to the nearby River Derwent. A number of drainage channels and streams also offers scope for flood waters to make their way back to the nearby watercourse.	-1	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	6. Will it cause any harm to a Source Protection Zone or the water environment?	The site forms part of Zones 2 (Outer Protection Zone) and 3 of the SPZ areas, suggesting the location has heightened sensitivity to activities affecting aquifers. Zone 1 (Inner Protection Zone) is only metres west of the site boundary. As such, development here would be require care through construction phases with all relevant infrastructure needing to conform to Environment Agency guidance concerning the relationship between development and SPZs.	Minor negative -1	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	1. Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?	The site, further to its description at 9(2), has no statutory or non-statutory biodiversity designations on or immediately within its setting. Nevertheless, the recovering greenfield status of the site is expected to have given rise to grassland habitats and the self-seeded tree growth evident at pockets across the land demonstrates growing biodiversity value. Development would undoubtedly threaten the continued blossoming of ecological networks across the site, and whilst it is unknown if protected species are present, it is likely that animal and insect species (but particularly the latter) are likely to use the site as habitat.	Minor negative -1	Minor negative -1

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	2. Will it allow for biodiversity net gains?	Potential development at this location does have the ability to build in biodiversity net gains on the site, should this be necessary, owing to its large size and the relatively low density of built layout suggested as suitable. With emerging habitats evident across the site, development may be able to work with such areas of the site to formalise the biodiversity and deliver gains.	Neutral 0	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	3. Will it conserve and enhance the geological environment?	Development of the site could result in an impact on the geological environment due to the construction and engineering works necessary to prepare for housebuilding (insertion of foundations, remediation works, laying out of highways etc.). The presence of landfill across much of the site has resulted in an altered topography, and development would have to respect the current land levels due to the presence of heightened flood risk, and the removal of landfill would lower ground levels.	Minor negative -1	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	4. Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?	As described, the site is undergoing a return to nature after its use as a landfill facility. Self-seeded tree growth is notable particularly in the east of the site and this has begun to form links with established wooded areas which line its eastern boundary close to Alfreton Road. Development would have the ability to avoid this area of the site, but would impact on the overall numbers of housing that could be delivered if the emerging woodland was to be retained. Development	Neutral 0	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
		of the site may make it possible to bring the emerging woodland into formal management and stewardship.		
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	5. Will it provide new open space or green space?	Currently the site is private, and despite a public right of way crossing the site, there is no formal open space or green space set out across the land for the benefit of the local population. Development would be expected to provide open space within site boundaries; both to help provide an attractive housing scheme and to offer amenity space for future residents. Given the size of the site, it is expected that sufficient space exists to provide for green space assets.	Minor positive +1	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	6. Will it improve the quality of existing open space?	Following on from 13(5), there is no open space existing across the site at current – although a public right of way stretches across the land, the land itself is private. As such, development would not have any bearing or influence in improving the quality of existing open space.	Neutral 0	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue	7. Will it encourage and protect or improve Green and/or Blue Infrastructure networks?	The site's location sees it sit relatively close to the River Derwent, although a passenger railway line severs any access between the site and the riverside environment. This reduces the scope to link a future development directly to the blue and green infrastructure network extending throughout the local area - although access is possible by leaving the site in	Neutral 0	



<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
Infrastructure and the natural environment.		a southerly direction and travelling alongside a short section of the A38 on a separated pedestrian/cycle lane.		
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	1. Does it respect or preserve identified landscape character?	The site is located within the Derbyshire Peak Fringe and Lower Derwent character area, and more specifically, forms part of the Riverside Meadows landscape type. Due to former landfill operations, the site has little in association with the general landscape qualities evident throughout other land throughout the Riverside Meadows. Development would therefore not be fundamentally altering (and damaging) the assessed landscape characteristics across the site owing to historic land uses which has impacted notably on site appearance.	Neutral 0	Neutral 0
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	2. Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity?	Further to 14(1), the site itself is now seeing a return to more natural character with the emergence of self-seeding tree growth and other more wild forms of vegetation and grassland. Development would impact on the appearance of the site, although views into and out of the area of potential development are severely restricted as a result of tall screens of trees which bound the site on its eastern and northern sides. This contributes to the site enjoying a degree of privacy, and should any future development maintain surrounding screens of trees then new housing at this location would be largely obscured from view negating any impact on visual amenity.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	3. Will it maintain and/or enhance the local distinctiveness of the townscape or settlement character?	The immediate surrounds of the potential development site are varied and collectively do not contribute to any local distinctiveness of built form. East of the site is an established garden centre, north are ponds with an employment site further beyond, south sees an area of static caravan homes and west is a busy rail line. As such, development would not be likely to adversely impact any distinctiveness evident within the immediate or wider townscape. Development would also find it difficult to enhance local distinctiveness owing to the incoherent range of land uses in the immediate vicinity of this site.	Neutral 0	
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	4. Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between the landscape and the built environment?	As explained by both 14(2) and 14(3), the site is poorly connected to its most immediate surroundings. Therefore it is unlikely that development would influence any enhancement between the site and the built environment in the south of Little Eaton. The site's former use has seen its landscape character altered, although development is unlikely to help restore land to forming part of a Riverside Meadows character type.	Neutral 0	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	1. Will it conserve and enhance the historic environment, designated and non-designated heritage assets	The riverside meadows immediately beyond the railway line which bounds the site on its western side sits within the extent of the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site. Whilst the railway line acts as a physical barrier, development would form part of the setting to the World Heritage Site. This offers an opportunity to enhance the designation's current setting, particularly with the site	Minor positive +1	Minor positive +1

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
	and their settings?	displaying evidence of former landfill activities with a lower quality environment within its western parts.		
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	2. Will it respect, maintain and strengthen the local character and distinctiveness e.g. landscape/ townscape character?	As discussed at 14(3) and 14(4), development would find it difficult to respect, maintain and strengthen any local character and distinctiveness of the historic environment. Whilst the World Heritage Site lies just beyond SGA10, there are no actual statutory or non-statutory heritage assets that development could help to enhance it or the settings of.	Neutral 0	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	3. Will it provide better opportunities for people to access and understand local heritage and to participate in cultural activities?	An enlarged population at the site offers opportunities for new residents to better access and understand local heritage. A logical opportunity is to heighten the awareness of the World Heritage Site and the industrial activities that resulted in the area along the River Derwent being recognised for its historic significance. This could be achieved through the creation of digital materials that every household would have access to in order to learn more about local heritage present in the wider locality. Other options may involve appropriate street naming and interpretation boards. It is unlikely however that development would on its own help to enhance opportunities to participate in cultural activities.	Neutral 0	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide	4. Will it protect or improve access and enjoyment of	Further to commentary above, the site's isolated, fragmented relationship with surrounding land and development means potential development at this	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	the historic environment?	location would find it difficult to improve access or enjoyment of the historic environment. However, development would not threaten to negatively impact to the historic environment.		
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	5. Will it conserve and enhance the archaeological environment?	No recorded archaeological assets or designations exist on or immediately off-site so it is unlikely that development would have any negative impact on the archaeological environment.	Neutral 0	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	1. Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	Development of this site, which would likely consist only of residential properties, would not lead to the reduced consumption of raw materials. The development's construction, reaffirmed by the size of the site, would in all probability, see an increase in the consumption of raw materials across a period in which housebuilding activity occurred.	Minor negative -1	Major negative -5
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	2. Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques?	Development of this site would not specifically promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques. These are largely controlled by nationally set building regulations, although local planning policy does look to encourage sustainable design in recognition of the increasing threat of climate change and advocating suitable mitigation. Promoters may wish to pursue the use of sustainable construction methods to demonstrate enhanced building performance and reduce a scheme's overall impact on	Neutral 0	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
		the environment.		
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	3. Will it result in additional waste?	Development of the site would be expected to have a relatively large impact in additional waste being generated by occupants of all domestic buildings given the scale of new development possible and the current status of the land within the site's boundaries.	Major negative -2	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	4. Will it reduce hazardous waste?	The site sits partly on top of a former landfill facility. The components of the fill are largely unknown, but some of the content may be hazardous. Whilst the housing element itself would not be expected to generate hazardous waste, site preparation ahead and during construction would require the potential removal of such waste.	Minor negative -1	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	5. Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land?	Development at this site would occur on land assessed as Grade 4 (Poor) in Agricultural Land Classification. As such, development would not bring about any loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.	Neutral 0	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b>	6. Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to	No. As discussed previously within this assessment, development would be occurring on a site that has mainly returned to a greenfield condition. Therefore	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	development?	development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land.		
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	7. Will it sterilise mineral resources?	The site sits outside the Coal Mining Reporting Area monitored by the Coal Authority. No data exists suggesting either past mining activity or that reserves exist under or close by to the site. Potential development would not conflict with any site-based policies in the current Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Plan.	Neutral 0	

**Site: SGA11 – Risley Village extension**

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	1. Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?	The delivery of approx. 100 dwellings is not expected to promote a tangible effect on the overall range and affordability of housing for all social groups within the plan area as a whole due to the very limited scale of proposed development.	Neutral 0	Minor positive +1
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	2. Will it provide sufficient pitches and plots for gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople?	As with any prospective housing development site, it has the potential to provide space for the Borough's evidenced needs for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. At this stage any contribution to need is not specified.	Neutral 0	
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	3. Will it reduce homelessness?	The site may make small impacts in reducing homelessness by expanding the quantity of housing stock in the Borough. Whilst it is not expected that any homes on-site will directly house the homeless, the provision of additional housing may create more fluidity in the Borough's housing market that could free up accommodation at the lower end of the spectrum. This would only be the case however when combined with interventions from relevant organisations and agencies.	Neutral 0	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	4. Will it reduce the number of unfit/vacant homes?	The site would provide a limited contribution to an enlargement of the overall stock of 'fit for purpose' homes within the Borough but it is unlikely to directly lead to positive interventions with existing homes which are unfit or vacant. Specifically, delivery of homes on this site which does not contain any known existing unfit or vacant dwellings does not present a direct opportunity to reduce the number of <i>existing</i> unfit or vacant homes. The potential for addressing this issue through encouraging investment in existing urban areas is limited given the sites location adjacent the small village of Risley as well as the very limited scale of development potential of the site in question.	Neutral 0	
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the population, including gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople.	5. Will it provide the required infrastructure?	Whilst the site would provide infrastructure required to service it, the provision of any additional infrastructure such as education or retail facilities would not be expected to emerge. The site would still be required to make contributions to existing facilities where necessary but the new population would ultimately be reliant on existing infrastructure provision within nearby settlements including Risley rather than provision resulting from development of the site.	Minor positive +1	
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment Opportunities.	1. Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs?	The site would not be of a scale to provide for land or uses that might improve diversity and quality of jobs in the long-term. However, construction activity associated with implementing the site would be likely to provide a short term boost to the diversity and quality of jobs locally but this would be unlikely to result in strong	Neutral 0	Minor negative -1



<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
		effect on this criteria question given the limited scale of development.		
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment Opportunities.	2. Will it reduce unemployment?	The site would not be of a scale to provide for land or uses that might help to reduce unemployment in the long-term. However construction activity associated with implementing the site would be likely to provide a short term boost to employment opportunities locally but this would be unlikely to result in strong effect on this criteria question given the limited scale of development.	Neutral 0	
<b>2. Employment and Jobs</b> To create employment Opportunities.	3. Will it improve rural productivity in terms of employment opportunities?	Some job opportunities would be expected to arise through delivery of the site as considered at 2(2) however such opportunities are unlikely to benefit rural productivity specifically. Development of arable greenfield land would more likely result in detriment to rural productivity particularly when considering the land's 'good to moderate' agricultural land classification.	Minor negative -1	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new	1. Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses?	The site would not be of a scale to provide for land and buildings of a type required by businesses.	Neutral 0	Neutral 0

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
technologies.				
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	2. Will it provide business/university clusters?	Development on the site would not be of a scale or type to provide for business or university clusters.	Neutral 0	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	3. Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors?	The site would not be of a scale to accommodate the creation of new jobs in the long-term, including in high knowledge sectors.	Neutral 0	
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic	4. Will it encourage graduates to live and work within the Plan area?	The population in general – including graduates – would be afforded a greater opportunity to live and work within the plan area because of a boosted supply of new dwellings. The link between attracting graduates specifically and provision of new dwellings on this site however is weak.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.				
<b>3. Economic Structure and Innovation</b> To provide the physical conditions for a high quality modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.	5. Will it provide the required infrastructure?	The site would not provide any economic structure and innovation related infrastructure because it would not be expected to provide for related land-uses.	Neutral 0	
<b>4. Shopping Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of existing shopping centres.	1. Will it encourage the vitality of the city centre, town centre, district centre or local centre?	Development of this site would result in additional population that would be reliant on the use of existing nearby facilities, particularly at Sandiacre local centre. This is because the site would not be in a position to accommodate retail provision due to its limited scale and associated viability constraints. Whilst this would provide a theoretical increase in available expenditure capacity for existing centres, it would be on such a relatively minor scale that positive tangible effects on any particular defined centre (the nearest in this case being Sandiacre Local Centre which is not immediately in the vicinity of the site) would be unlikely to occur.	Neutral 0	Neutral 0

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	1. Will it reduce health inequalities?	The site's location is relatively distant from facilities provided by the conurbation and options for connectivity to it are extremely limited, with the presence of the M1 motorway and A52 trunk road acting as a significant limitation on levels of permeability. This severely limits prospects for active travel; for example to make use of existing services and facilities - whilst a public right of way straddles the western extent of the site, the direction of this link is north-south and does not provide active travel connectivity into the conurbation to the east. The very minor scale of the site means that it would not support new health facilities nor would it be likely to provide a network of green spaces to encourage internal active travel on a scale that would provide a positive effect on this criteria question. That being said, the site would utilise land which is not currently publically accessible and therefore its development would not result in a depletion of such a network.	Neutral 0	Major negative -2
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	2. Will it improve access to health services?	Health facilities would not be expected to form part of the development of the site and therefore it would not improve access to health services through direct provision. The site's location is relatively distant from facilities provided by the conurbation and options for connectivity to it are limited, with the presence of the M1 motorway and A52 trunk road acting as a limitation on levels of permeability. The quality of access to existing health services is not therefore expected to improve through this option.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	3. Will it increase the opportunities for recreational physical activity?	The site is distant from the nearest section of Erewash's strategic blue and green infrastructure network but is adjacent to an established public right of way along its western boundary. This does enable access over the A52 and southwards towards the former Derby & Sandiacre Canal – now a multi-user recreational trail, although this is around 1km beyond the A52. The limited scale of the site means its development would result in minimal effect on access to the open countryside for existing residents when considering that public access across the land in its current form is not provided. Equally though, the very limited scale of the site means it would be unlikely to provide a network of green or open spaces to the extent that it would directly and tangibly increase opportunities for recreational physical activity internally.	Neutral 0	
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	4. Will it provide new open space or improve the quality of existing open space?	Given the very limited size of the site, the ability to provide new open space becomes more complex owing to the need to incorporate sufficient homes to ensure positive development viability. Although some element of green space will be required to compliment the development, this will likely be incidental in type and scale and would be unlikely to provide a tangible positive effect on this criteria question. There is no open space situated within the site's boundaries so development would not have any impact or effect in enhancing the quality of existing open space.	Neutral 0	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
<b>5. Health and Wellbeing</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	5. Will it improve access to local food growing opportunities?	The land upon which development would occur is classified arable and able to accommodate food growing opportunities. As a result, development on this land would directly reduce local food growing opportunities. Though this would be a relatively modest scale, the land is classified in agricultural terms as 'good to moderate' and this compounds the negative effect on this criteria question.	Major negative -2	
<b>6. Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.	1. Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	Although relatively limited in scale, delivery of around 100 dwellings at this location would result in the urbanising of private greenfield land and convergence of additional population in the locality. As a result of this incidences of crime are very likely to increase and with it the fear of crime in the locality as would be expected with an expanded population. The opportunity to reduce incidences and fear of <i>rural</i> crime is outweighed by the effects of urbanising the land.	Minor negative -1	Major negative -2
<b>6. Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.	2. Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	The land upon which this site would be delivered has very little within it that would classify as 'built environment'. Consequently, safety and security of the built environment is not an existing concern and development of the site would result in a much expanded built environment on predominantly rural land. Whilst new development would seek to address safety and security concerns in the design and implementation stages, it would not be able to alleviate all and as such, delivery of the site would result in a net-increase in potential for safety and security issues	Minor negative -1	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
		relating to the built environment when compared with the existing scenario.		
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	1. Will it protect and enhance existing cultural assets?	Development of the site does not put at direct risk any existing cultural assets. On the contrary, associated increase in population nearby to the Nottingham conurbation – albeit with limited accessibility - means that existing assets in the locality are likely to be further supported and, consequently, protected. Development of the site would not directly lead to enhancement of existing assets, though an increase in the number of users resulting from development is likely to provide some – albeit limited given the small size of the site - impetus for such enhancements.	Minor positive +1	Minor positive +1
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	2. Will it improve access to, encourage engagement with and residents' satisfaction in community activities?	Delivery of this site would result in a modest increase in population nearby to the Nottingham conurbation. This will increase the proportion of the overall plan area population able to access and engage with community activities at facilities within it, although the positive effect from this is limited by the presence of the M1 motorway and A52 trunk road between the site and conurbation, acting as a cause of severance, limiting general permeability. The site would be too limited in scale to provide any additional facilities and the extent to which an improvement in resident's satisfaction with such activities would result from the development is unknown.	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	3. Will it increase the number of facilities e.g. shops, community centres?	The very limited scale of the site means it would not be expected to provide any facilities. It would therefore not contribute to increasing the number of facilities but also would not result in the loss of facilities.	Neutral 0	
<b>7. Social Inclusion</b> To promote and support the development and growth of social capital and to improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas within the plan area.	4. Will it provide for the educational needs of the population?	The site would not be of the scale required to provide a new school, however it would be expected to make sufficient contribution to the existing educational system to support the additional population generated by the site.	Neutral 0	
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	1. Will it use and enhance existing transport infrastructure?	Development of the site would result in a new population making use of existing transport infrastructure present within Risley the capacity of which is already limited given its existing role serving traffic through to and from the nearby strategic road network. The site would not be of a scale to warrant large-scale enhancement to the existing network although it will be required to mitigate impacts on the local highway network which result from its development where appropriate. In any case, the potential for improving connectivity between the site	Minor negative -1	Major negative -4



Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
		and the nearby Nottingham conurbation would be extremely limited given the presence of the strategic road network on the sites western and southern sides.		
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	2. Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment?	Risley Village has limited service/ facility provision thus an incumbent population would be reliant on use of those provided within the detached Nottingham conurbation. Notwithstanding the presence of a bus service within the village, the presence of the M1 motorway to the east and A52 trunk road to the south as well as separation between the site and Nottingham conurbation is unlikely to encourage access to such facilities and services through sustainable means of travel; not least because of the physical limitations imposed by the presence of the strategic road network, severely limiting the potential for new or enhanced walking and cycling friendly infrastructure and permeability in general. Furthermore, the site would not be of a scale to deliver large scale improvements to existing transport infrastructure within Risley which is already under strain. These factors, as well as the fact that the existing network would be required to expand into the countryside to accommodate the site, is likely to result in adverse risk to the environment.	Major negative -2	
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel	3. Will it reduce journeys undertaken by private car by encouraging	Risley Village has limited service/ facility provision thus an incumbent population would be reliant on use of those provided within the detached Nottingham conurbation which is detached from the site. Notwithstanding the presence of a bus service within	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	alternative modes of transport?	the village, the presence of the M1 motorway to the east and A52 trunk road to the south as well as separation between the site and Nottingham conurbation is unlikely to encourage access to such facilities and services through sustainable means of travel as considered at 8.2. Whilst any housing development – regardless of location – is likely to result in increased car usage resulting from population uplift, the specific factors outlined above and at 8.2 are likely to provide additional cause for increased car usage.		
<b>8. Transport</b> To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to improve travel choice and accessibility.	4. Will it increase accessibility to services and facilities?	The site is of such a scale that it would be unlikely to provide any additional facilities or services. Given the detachment of the site from the Nottingham conurbation and access constraints considered elsewhere in this section, it would be unrealistic to suggest the site would act to tangibly increase accessibility to services and facilities.	Neutral 0	
<b>9. Brownfield Land</b> To make efficient use of brownfield land and recognise biodiversity value where appropriate.	1. Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?	No, the site is almost exclusively greenfield in its classification so development would not be making efficient use of brownfield land.	Major negative -2	Major negative -4
<b>9. Brownfield Land</b> To make efficient use of brownfield land and	2. Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity	The site is subject to further internal enclosure with an extensive section of hedgerows situated throughout and around the periphery. These features would be	Major negative -2	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
recognise biodiversity value where appropriate.	interests of land?	expected to support biodiversity, but particularly the presence of birds relying on the numerous hedgerow trees as habitat. The site itself is predominantly used for horse grazing as part of a stable facility, with the higher intensity of land management likely to diminish the biodiversity value of the wider site somewhat. However, the habitats described above would be affected by development and give rise to minor levels of harm.		
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	1. Will it result in additional energy use?	A development scheme possible on a site of this size would inevitably result in additional energy use owing to the land's current greenfield status. The potential provision of new homes would see a small, but still notable increase in energy usage by occupants of all domestic buildings across the site. Whilst renewable energy schemes could be pursued to offset the impact, this would still result in a large increase in energy use in excess of the current baseline.	Minor negative -1	Minor positive +1
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	2. Will it improve energy efficiency of the building stock within the Plan area?	The construction of this number of new homes would make a small contribution to the energy efficiency of domestic building stock within the plan area. Proposed development size would constitute less than 0.2% of the current number of dwellings in Erewash, and it would be expected that each new property at this location would be constructed to higher levels of energy efficiency in line with national building regulations.	Minor positive +1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	3. Will it support the generation and use of renewable energy?	Whilst major development sites have the potential to support the generation and use of renewable energy because of the scale of housing promoted, it will be for detailed masterplanning of the site to fully explore embedding such measures within any future scheme. Provisionally, the larger the development, the more scope exists to explore the practicalities and feasibility of generating renewable energy through measures such as solar panels mounted on the roofs of new properties that can be supplied back to energy networks. However, more detailed masterplanning will be required to understand the level of potential.	Neutral 0	
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b> To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	4. Will it support the development of community energy systems?	Similar to the points made above in 10(1) and 10(3), development of significantly sized schemes comprising many new homes and other facilities do offer much greater opportunities to explore the practicalities of introducing community energy systems where scale can be maximised. However, viability of such systems, aided by a masterplanning process to understand the level of scope for the development of a system, will be a key consideration in whether these can be provided in combination with any major development opportunity. The proposed size of this site is unlikely to support the rolling out of a community energy system, but further technical work would be necessary to confirm this view.	Neutral 0	
<b>10. Energy and Climate Change</b>	5. Will it ensure that buildings are	Homes that might potentially be built at this location would be required to be constructed to current building	Minor positive	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
To minimise energy usage and to develop low-carbon energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	able to deal with future changes in climate change?	regulations standards. Regulations set at a national level need to address the predicted change in climatic conditions expected over the coming decades and influence the building of domestic properties that show greater resilience and are able to adapt to the effects of climate change. The addition of new homes at this location would give rise to a reasonably large number of new domestic properties, all of which would be expected to demonstrate heightened resilience to climate change than the majority of Erewash's existing housing stock.	+1	
<b>11. Pollution and Air Quality</b> To manage air quality and minimise the risk posed by air, noise and other types of pollution.	1. Will it increase levels of air, noise and other types of pollution?	Development of this size would inevitably result in recorded increases in all types of pollution. Efforts to mitigate this would reduce the levels omitted by buildings, occupants and the increase of vehicular trips made to and from the site. However, construction and the occupancy of on-site buildings would see a rise in pollution omissions. Although with all new buildings likely to be domestic, there is thought to be adequate scope to limit increases through innovate construction techniques and better specification materials. Proximity to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) closer to M1 J25 and the southern end of the site adjacent to the A52 slip road (and stationary queuing traffic at peak times) could also in combination with pollution from the site, exacerbate its air quality condition.	Minor negative -1	Minor negative -1
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b>	1. Will it minimise or mitigate flood	The site is wholly located within the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 1 area given the elevated level of	Neutral 0	Major negative

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	risk?	land around this part of the Borough. As such, it is unlikely that potential development would heighten flood risk. However, development of greenfield land on the edge of Risley, which fulfils a role in enabling rainwaters to naturally permeate and soakaway into the ground, would likely contribute to an altered hydrology which may see localised flooding events. Suitable drainage, combining engineered sewers and natural forms (SuDS) involving permeable ground should ensure flood risk is not worsened locally.		-2
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	2. Will it improve water quality?	Development of the site would be unlikely to improve water quality within the wider water cycle. It is located some way from the nearest waterways (Golden Brook) so the prospects of any surface water run-off making its way to it is extremely slim. It would be expected that development would see a standard sewer and drainage system established to control the movement of water. There would however be an altered subterranean hydrology that could no longer fully rely on the undeveloped terrain associated with the current grassland paddocks that help to absorb rainwaters through natural drainage processes.	Minor negative -1	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water	3. Will it conserve water?	Development of a strategic housing growth site is extremely unlikely to assist with the conservation of water given the likely demand arising from every domestic property. Development would not therefore help to conserve water in any way and would see a relatively large net increase in localised usage.	Major negative -2	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
quality.				
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	4. Will it improve or help to promote water efficiency?	Following on from 12(3) above, there is little scope for water conservation owing to the scale of development to the number of homes this site could support. However, the construction of new domestic properties does offer opportunities to promote a more efficient use of water and water resources. Greater efficiency is required by building regulations, and the development of a notably large number of homes would see each property benefit from passive water efficiency measures and technology.	Minor positive +1	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	5. Will it cause a deterioration of Water Framework Directive status or potential of on-site watercourses?	The site currently consists almost entirely of greenfield land in the form of enclosed fields that are used for equine purposes. As discussed at 12(2), the distance between the site and nearby watercourses (there are none on-site, although a small drainage channel runs across the site following hedgerow and trees) makes it extremely unlikely that development at this location would result in compromising the Water Framework Directive for rivers or streams.	Neutral 0	
<b>12. Flooding and Water Quality</b> To minimise the risk of flooding and to conserve and improve water quality.	6. Will it cause any harm to a Source Protection Zone or the water environment?	The site does not form any part of the three main SPZs so development would not adversely impact aquifers. It is highly unlikely that the site's possible development would harmfully impact the water environment, with sustainable drainage systems anticipated to control the capture and safe discharge of rainwater.	Neutral 0	

Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective	Question	Performance: Policy Criteria Questions	Ratings: Criteria Question	Ratings: Objective
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	1. Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?	Further to commentary included at 9(2), the biodiversity value of the site has not been comprehensively assessed. Records show no statutory or non-statutory biodiversity assets are either directly on or located just off-site. Whilst this should not be a definitive metric of the ecological value of the site, the absence of recognised designations show the site as one that does not support extensive habitats. Nevertheless, the landscape features evident here, including the hedgerow and in places, dense corridors of trees, will carry importance to supporting biodiversity. The development of a relatively small site inevitably means that forms of internal enclosure such as the trees present may require felling. This would prove to be contrary to the area's priority status for the re-emergence of lapwing and redshank bird species. Further assessment would need to be made to understand whether protected species would be impacted by development.	Minor negative -1	Major negative -2
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	2. Will it allow for biodiversity net gains?	As stated at 13(1) above, without further detailed assessment it is difficult to fully understand the biodiversity value of the site and then set about exploring ways in which biodiversity net gains can be delivered. However, a small site adds difficulty to securing gains due to the lack of flexibility in area that can support the planting of woodland or creating of specialist ground-based habitats.	Neutral 0	



<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	3. Will it conserve and enhance the geological environment?	Development of the site could result in a limited impact on the geological environment due to the construction and engineering works necessary to prepare for housebuilding (insertion of foundations, remediation works, laying out of highways etc.). Whilst no Regionally Important Geomorphological Site is present within the site's boundaries, the alterations to land levels to facilitate development across a relatively large area of land could influence modest alterations to the geological environment.	Minor negative -1	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	4. Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?	As mentioned already at 9(2) and 13(1), a relatively large number of trees can be found across the site, helping in part to enclose the fields across it. The central belt of trees divides the site into northern and southern parcels. Should development occur, internalised vehicular access around the site would in all likelihood require gaps to be established in this belt to connect and integrate the two parcels. This would affect tree coverage across the whole site and mean replacement planting would be necessary in order to demonstrate biodiversity net gains.	Minor negative -1	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue	5. Will it provide new open space or green space?	With the site relatively small at only 5.6 hectares in size, the ability to provide new open/green space becomes more complex owing to the need to incorporate sufficient homes to ensure positive development viability. Whilst open space would likely to be required owing to the number of residents, utilising greater amounts of land will leave less developable	Minor positive +1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
Infrastructure and the natural environment.		area. However, even small parcels of green space across the site would represent new assets available for use by site residents and the public in general.		
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	6. Will it improve the quality of existing open space?	Currently, the site is private land and not accessible to the public. In any event, there is no open or green space situated within the site's boundaries so development would not have any impact or effect in enhancing the quality of existing open space.	Neutral 0	
<b>13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</b> To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green and Blue Infrastructure and the natural environment.	7. Will it encourage and protect or improve Green and/or Blue Infrastructure networks?	The site sits rather distant from the nearest section of Erewash's strategic blue and green infrastructure. Development would therefore make limited impact in encouraging enhancements to the network as a whole. The local public rights of way network does enable access over the A52 and southwards towards the former Derby & Sandiacre Canal – now a multi-user recreational trail, although this is around 1km beyond the A52. The site's small size limits the scope for any notable financial contribution that would lead to improved facilities along the line of the route.	Neutral 0	
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and	1. Does it respect or preserve identified landscape	The site is located within the Trent Valley Washlands area, and more specifically, forms part of the Lowland Village Farmlands type. The site displays some conformity with the specified characteristics identified	Minor negative -1	Major negative -3

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	character?	by work undertaken by Derbyshire County Council. However, with the site situated within a small band between the A52 and the current extent of built development in Risley, the site is slightly obscured in its visibility from surrounding areas – with the exception of being viewed from the access road leading to Sandboro Fields Farm where an excellent vista eastwards exists. Attributes such as scattered trees along hedgerows and ditches, sparsely scattered, isolated farmsteads and flat flood plains are evident from this viewpoint. As such, development would struggle to respect or preserve the identified landscape character given the urbanising effect new housing would have in infilling land between Risley village and the nearby A52.		
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	2. Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity?	Further to 14(2), development would undoubtedly alter the character of the land south of Sawley. The construction of approx.100 homes would have an impact on visual amenity – particularly when viewed from the west of the site looking back eastwards. At the northern end of the farm access track, the view is open and unobscured – whereas further south, the hedgerow lining the track ensures the land beyond is more private. However, the line of trees which sit in the distance act as a partial visual break to the land beyond where new housing would be located. As such, development would be visible from some locations – but the surrounding built environment offers the site some visual privacy.	Minor negative -1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	3. Will it maintain and/or enhance the local distinctiveness of the townscape or settlement character?	The site forms some of the land between Derby Road and Bostocks Lane. It most closely relates to the built environment that developed during the intra-war period with housing of no particular architectural style. Because of this, there is no strong local distinctiveness evident in the townscape nearest the development site. Therefore, development is unlikely to maintain local distinctiveness on account that there is no strong character evident in surrounding areas. The layout of new housing would be of major relevance to this element of assessment. A dense scheme would represent a lack of conformity with the fabric of built environment found immediately north and east of the site.	Neutral 0	
<b>14. Landscape and Built Environment</b> To protect and enhance the landscape and townscape character, including heritage and its setting and enhancing the place through good design.	4. Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between the landscape and the built environment?	The site would struggle to achieve any enhancement in the interrelationship between the landscape and the built environment because development would extend the built-up extent of Risley more comprehensively down to the A52. By extending the settlement as far as a major dual-carriageway road, there is little scope to create a blended, gradual morphing of urban development into the surrounding rural landscape. As such, development would also remove the current relationship between the built-up area of Risley and the undeveloped fields which sit between it and the A52, affecting the setting of the village.	Minor negative -1	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's	1. Will it conserve and enhance the	The nearest heritage asset to the site is the Risley Conservation Area which at its closest point is around	Neutral 0	Minor positive

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	historic environment, designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings?	250m from SGA11. This consists of a single field enclosure, although a screen of trees at the edge of the Conservation Area ensures visibility between the two locations would be restricted. Development would therefore not have too great a bearing on the existence of the Conservation Area, with sufficient buffer existing to maintain an appropriate setting for the designated heritage asset. Few other designated or non-designated heritage assets are found in the immediate vicinity of the site, with the largely concentration clustered within the boundaries of the Conservation Area.		+1
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	2. Will it respect, maintain and strengthen the local character and distinctiveness e.g. landscape/ townscape character?	As described at 14(3), the relative absence of local character derives from no strong overriding sense of uniform design in the closest parts of the built-up area – owing to a mix of modern (c20th) housing styles. As such, there is little local character to help maintain, although development would be unlikely to strengthen the distinctiveness of the nearby built environment given the weak baseline.	Neutral 0	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	3. Will it provide better opportunities for people to access and understand local heritage and to participate in cultural activities?	An enlarged population at the site offers opportunities for new residents to better access and understand local heritage – however, the local heritage in the vicinity of this site would be that found within and adjacent to Risley Conservation Area which has Risley Hall at its core. This could be achieved through the creation of digital materials that every household would have access to in order to learn more about local heritage	Minor positive +1	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
		present in the wider locality.		
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	4. Will it protect or improve access and enjoyment of the historic environment?	Development would be unlikely by itself to help achieve this objective. Given the distance in which those living on the site would have to travel to reach the assets within the Conservation Area (around 1km by following the highways linking the two locations) then development would not have any positive bearing on the improvement of access to Risley Conservation Area. Regarding enjoyment of the historic environment, again, it is unlikely that a modestly-sized development would result in greater enjoyment of heritage assets already present elsewhere within the village.	Neutral 0	
<b>15. Heritage</b> To conserve the area's heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage.	5. Will it conserve and enhance the archaeological environment?	No recorded archaeological assets or designations exist on or immediately off-site so it is unlikely that development would have any negative impact on the archaeological environment.	Neutral 0	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	1. Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	Development of this site, which would consist only of residential properties, would not lead to the reduced consumption of raw materials. The development's construction, reaffirmed by the extensive size of the site, would in all likelihood see an increase in the consumption of raw materials across a long period of housebuilding.	Minor negative -1	Major negative -5

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	2. Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques?	Development of this site would not specifically promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques. These are largely controlled by nationally set building regulations, although local planning policy does look to encourage sustainable design in recognition of the increasing threat of climate change and advocating suitable mitigation. Promoters may wish to pursue the use of sustainable construction methods to demonstrate enhanced building performance and reduce its impact on the environment.	Neutral 0	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	3. Will it result in additional waste?	Development of the site would be expected to have a sizeable impact in additional waste being created from all domestic buildings given the scale of new development possible. Even with investments in local recycling facilities, this in itself would not be expected to minimise the amount of waste generated.	Major negative -2	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	4. Will it reduce hazardous waste?	Development of this site would not be expected to have any impact on the production of hazardous waste locally.	Neutral 0	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste</b>	5. Will it protect the best and most	The site is situated in an area of farmland assessed as good to moderate in terms of its agricultural quality	Neutral 0	

<b>Performance: Sustainability Appraisal Objective</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Performance: Policy Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Ratings: Criteria Question</b>	<b>Ratings: Objective</b>
<b>Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	versatile (BMV) agricultural land?	(Grade 3). This suggests the arable land in the vicinity and care of Goldenbrook and Sandboro' Fields Farms has moderate limitations affecting the variety of crops that can be grown. However, despite the land in question not performing at the highest end of the agricultural land classification, it must be noted that the use of the site has been for equine-related purposes for some time – so crop production has not been occurring at this location for some time.		
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	6. Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	No, the site is located almost entirely on greenfield land so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land.	Major negative -2	
<b>16. Natural Resources and Waste Management</b> To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including soils, safeguarding minerals and waste.	7. Will it sterilise mineral resources?	The site sits outside the Coal Mining Reporting Area monitored by the Coal Authority. No data exists suggesting either past mining activity or that reserves exist under or close by to the site. Potential development would not conflict with any site-based policies in the current Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Plan.	Neutral 0	