

Appendix D1

Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

Mitigation measures

1. Introduction

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Erewash Core Strategy Review and its amendment version has undertaken three key stages of options appraisal. The first considered options for a spatial hierarchy, i.e. potential broad locations for housing growth – which tested 8 options in total. This is known as **SA1**. To reflect the differing roles played between village settlements where more advanced infrastructure exists (Key settlements) and those villages in the Borough where infrastructure is limited (Other settlements), one of the 8 options (Option G) has been extrapolated out, with two options (G(i) and G(ii)) created. Importantly, the division of Option G does not see the removal of the primary option and its assessment, with this remaining unaltered. However, the creation and subsequent testing of Options G(i) and G(ii) offers a greater understanding of the differences in comparative sustainability between the two respective types of village settlement in Erewash. The second stage considered a range of policy options across four topic areas; Employment, Green and Blue Infrastructure, Town, Local and Village Centres and Transport. This is known as **SA2**. An additional employment option was subsequently tested in response to a request made by the Inspector examining the soundness of the Core Strategy Review. A second additional option was also tested as the site had been overlooked at a previous stage. Neither were found to represent sustainable options. The third stage considered a wide and extensive range of possible housing sites. This is known as **SA3**. Overall, appraisals of 61 different potential sites are included as part of this SA stage. This represents a culmination of 17 extant appraisals from the original SA3 and 44 new appraisals from the SA3 update.

The new appraisals were largely carried out in response to a call for housing sites undertaken by the Council in September 2024. This was also a reaction to the appointed Inspector expressing concerns over the existence of an insufficient land supply which met short and longer-term housing requirements. The main document of the Draft Publication SA contains more information about each of these three stages of SA, as well as their conclusions.

The purpose of this document is to follow on from completion of the three stages of options appraisal (SA1 – SA3), including the subsequent work as explained above, and:

- Confirm the options taken forward to form policies within the Core Strategy Review; and
- Highlight for each preferred option where there were adverse effects identified by SA assessment, confirm where mitigation is required and then make suggestions to help mitigate the flagged effects.

Additionally this document is required to:

- Identify how the perceived benefits of each preferred option can be maximised.

This document demonstrates where mitigation could be applied to preferred options in the Core Strategy Review to mitigate any identified adverse effects (as defined in **Section 3** of this document). It is considered that by implementing such mitigation, the perceived benefits of each preferred option would be maximised. In effect, this document (in Section 3) identifies where the perceived benefits of each preferred option can be maximised by proposing mitigation to apply, helping to satisfy the above requirement.

Where required, this document should also propose measures to monitor any significant effects of implementing the preferred options. However, it is considered that the application of mitigation measures as proposed within this document, in culmination, would result in there being no outstanding significant effects from implementing the Core Strategy Review. Therefore no specific monitoring associated with this is considered required or proposed within the document.

2. Preferred Options

Introduction:

The SA has tested a range of options across three stages of appraisal (**SA1-3**). The outcomes of each stage and a range of other evidence have informed the selection and development of preferred options which the Borough Council considers should form the content of the Core Strategy Review. The preferred options are summarised in the following tables, separated into their respective stages of appraisal.

Settlement Hierarchy (SA1):

Table 1: Preferred settlement hierarchy (ranked)

Settlement hierarchy rank	Settlement hierarchy descriptor
1	Growth within Long Eaton Urban Area (conurbation)
2	Growth within Ilkeston Urban Area (town)
3	Growth within the Rural Area settlements (villages)
4	New Settlement on brownfield land not in the Green Belt (former Stanton Ironworks)
5	Extension of conurbations into the Green Belt (Derby and Nottingham)
6	Extension of towns into the Green Belt (Ilkeston)
7	Extension of villages with a centre (Key Settlements) into the Green Belt

Policies (SA2):

Table 2: Preferred policy options

Policy theme	Option number	Option description
Employment	2	Allocation of strategic employment zones in Erewash, plus the allocation of new employment land at Stanton Regeneration Site (SRS).
Green and Blue Infrastructure	2	Allocate Strategic Green Infrastructure Zones (SGI Zones).
Town, Local and Village Centres	4	Existing retail hierarchy plus new local centre at Kirk Hallam within SGA25 (potential allocation south west of Kirk Hallam) and designation of village centres at existing areas of higher retail concentration in Breaston, Draycott, West Hallam and Little Eaton. New village centre at Stanton South.
Transport	1	Implementation of the Kirk Hallam relief road.
Transport	3	Safeguard and enhance Trent Valley Way and Great Northern Greenway (including Bennerley Viaduct).

Strategic Housing Sites (SA3):*Table 3: Preferred strategic housing sites*

Strategic housing site descriptor	Strategic housing site name
SGA21	South Stanton
SGA1	Acorn Way
SGA26	North of Spondon
SGA25	South West of Kirk Hallam
CSR-0011	West of Sandiacre
SGA3	Breadsall Hilltop
CSR-0044	South of West Hallam
CSR-0048	North of West Hallam
CSR-0003	East of Breaston
CSR-0040	South West of Draycott
CSR-0039	North of Borrowash
CSR-0035	West of Borrowash

3. Preferred Options - mitigation

This section considers against each of the options highlighted in Section 2 where the SA has identified **adverse effects** and a need for mitigation, and makes suggestions as to how such mitigation can be incorporated into the policies of the Core Strategy Review. Where mitigation is not considered required, even where adverse effects have been identified, this is justified.

For the purpose of this exercise, an 'adverse effect' is wherever an objective has received a major negative or equivalent rating through the testing process. Where this is the case, any minor and/or major negative criteria question ratings against that objective are highlighted in the below tables, against which mitigation can be sought. The basis for considering only objectives where major negatives have been awarded is to focus on mitigating *significant* effects.

Where no adverse effects are identified by the SA, in accordance with the parameters outlined above, the options are not referred to within this section. The options this applies to are listed below.

Table 4: Preferred options without any significant adverse effects

Stage of SA (SA1-3)	Option/ policy theme	Option description
SA1	1	Growth within Long Eaton Urban Area (conurbation)
SA1	2	Growth within Ilkeston Urban Area (town)
SA1	4	New Settlement on brownfield land not in the Green Belt (former Stanton Ironworks)
SA2	Green and blue infrastructure	Allocate Strategic Green Infrastructure Zones (SGI Zones)
SA2	Transport	Safeguard and enhance Trent Valley Way and Great Northern Greenway (including Bennerley Viaduct).
SA3	Strategic housing sites	South Stanton

Settlement hierarchy (SA1):

The preferred settlement hierarchy options listed below had adverse effects identified by SA1 and therefore require mitigation. However, suggestions for potential mitigation are not put forward against SA1 options here because more detailed options relating to the various settlement hierarchy categories are instead considered by SA2 and SA3. It is therefore considered that options for mitigation are best deliberated against these, rather than the broad options addressed by SA1. Ultimately, SA1 acted as a starting point for the consideration of broad locations for growth and it is considered unfeasible to adequately consider specific mitigation measures for these when additional, relevant and more timely opportunities to do this present themselves under the consideration of adverse effects against more focussed options stemming from SA2 and SA3.

Table 5: Growth within the Rural Area settlements

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions
Transport	Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment?
Transport	Will it reduce journeys undertaken by private car by encouraging alternative modes of transport?
Transport	Will it increase accessibility to services and facilities?

Table 6: Extension of conurbations (Nottingham and Derby) into the Green Belt

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions
Brownfield land	Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it allow for biodiversity net gains?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it conserve and enhance the geological environment?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it provide new open space of green space?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it improve the quality of existing open space?

Table 7: Extension of towns (Ilkeston) into the Green Belt

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions
Brownfield land	Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?
Flooding and water quality	Will it minimise or mitigate flood risk?
Flooding and water quality	Will it improve water quality?
Flooding and water quality	Will it conserve water?
Flooding and water quality	Will it cause a deterioration of Water Framework Directive status or potential of onsite watercourses?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it allow for biodiversity net gains?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it conserve and enhance the geological environment?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it provide new open space of green space?
Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure	Will it improve the quality of existing open space?
Natural resources and waste management	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?
Natural resources and waste management	Will it result in additional waste?
Natural resources and waste management	Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land?
Natural resources and waste management	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?

Table 8: Extension of villages with a centre (Key Settlements) into the Green Belt

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions
Health and Wellbeing	Will it improve access to local food growing opportunities?
Community Safety	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?
Community Safety	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?
Transport	Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment?
Transport	Will it reduce journeys undertaken by private car by encouraging alternative modes of transport?
Brownfield Land	Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?
Brownfield Land	Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity interests of land?
Energy and Climate Change	Will it result in additional energy use?
Pollution and Air Quality	Will it increase levels of air, noise and other types of pollution?
Flooding and Water Quality	Will it improve water quality?
Flooding and Water Quality	Will it conserve water?
Flooding and Water Quality	Will it cause a deterioration of Water Framework Directive status or potential of on-site watercourses?
Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green & Blue Infrastructure	Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?
Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green & Blue Infrastructure	Will it allow for biodiversity net gains?
Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green & Blue Infrastructure	Will it improve the quality of existing open space?
Landscape and Built Environment	Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between the landscape and the built environment?
Natural Resources & Waste Management	Will it result in additional waste?
Natural Resources & Waste Management	Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land?
Natural Resources & Waste Management	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?

Table 9: Extension of villages without a centre (Other Settlements) into the Green Belt

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions
Health and Wellbeing	Will it improve access to local food growing opportunities?
Community Safety	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?
Community Safety	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?
Transport	Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment?
Transport	Will it reduce journeys undertaken by private car by encouraging alternative modes of transport?
Brownfield Land	Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?
Brownfield Land	Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity interests of land?
Energy and Climate Change	Will it result in additional energy use?
Pollution and Air Quality	Will it increase levels of air, noise and other types of pollution?
Flooding and Water Quality	Will it improve water quality?
Flooding and Water Quality	Will it conserve water?
Flooding and Water Quality	Will it cause a deterioration of Water Framework Directive status or potential of on-site watercourses?
Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green & Blue Infrastructure	Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?
Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green & Blue Infrastructure	Will it allow for biodiversity net gains?
Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green & Blue Infrastructure	Will it improve the quality of existing open space?
Landscape and Built Environment	Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between the landscape and the built environment?
Natural Resources & Waste Management	Will it result in additional waste?
Natural Resources & Waste Management	Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land?
Natural Resources & Waste Management	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?

Topic-based policies (SA2):

Table 10: Employment (Option 2)

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	<i>Will it conserve water?</i>	<i>-2</i>	<i>The allocation of strategic employment sites would not in itself directly conserve water. The allocation (and subsequent development) of at least 40ha of new employment space will inevitably result in a net increase in the volume of water used as part of the various industrial processes.</i>	<i>Allocation of strategic employment locations offer businesses the security of making investment decisions in the modernisation of existing facilities due to the policy protection offered to wider areas of employment. Implementing this option therefore affords some level of mitigation whereby modernisation of facilities will be in line with national standards on water conservation.</i>	<i>Building regulations will have a role to play in mitigating effects on this criteria question through modernisation of existing facilities resulting from this preferred option.</i>
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	<i>Will it improve or help promote water efficiency?</i>	<i>-1</i>	<i>The allocation of strategic employment sites would not in itself directly help or promote water efficiency.</i>	<i>Allocation of strategic employment locations offer businesses the security of making investment decisions in the modernisation of existing facilities due to the policy protection offered to wider areas of employment. Implementing this option therefore affords some level of mitigation whereby modernisation of facilities will be in line with national standards on water efficiency.</i>	<i>Building regulations will have a role to play in mitigating effects on this criteria question through modernisation of existing facilities resulting from this preferred option.</i>

Table 11: Town, Local & Village Centres (Option 4)

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure</i>	Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?	-2	<i>Due to the built up nature of the presently designated town and local centres, there is minimal opportunity to help protect and improve biodiversity and protected species. The negative impact on biodiversity is also expected to occur more greatly from the presently unbuilt centres (South West Kirk Hallam Local Centre and South Stanton Village Centre).</i>	<i>In terms of the two higher risk centres which form part of strategic housing proposals, implementation of a range of measures, including those highlighted against SGA25 in this document, could afford some mitigation. This could include a requirement for biodiversity net gain to be delivered by sites, integration of sufficient tree planting and the maintaining of existing hedgerow and tree belt boundaries between development and the open countryside.</i>
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure</i>	Will it allow for biodiversity net gains?	-1	<i>This option includes centres which are already built out, with no net gain expected from these centres. The new centres, yet to be built (South West Kirk Hallam Local Centre and South Stanton Village Centre) provide opportunity for net gain, though it is not expected to be delivered through the centres development.</i>	<i>In terms of the two higher risk centres which form part of strategic housing proposals, implementation of a range of measures, including those highlighted against SGA25 in this document, could afford some mitigation. This could include a requirement for biodiversity net gain to be delivered by sites, integration of sufficient tree planting and the maintaining of existing hedgerow and tree belt boundaries between development and the open countryside.</i>
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure</i>	Will it provide new open space or green space?	-1	<i>The land uses within town and local centres is highly competitive, with higher density buildings expected. Green spaces/open spaces are not</i>	<i>Require that open and green space is delivered on strategic housing allocations, specifically the two which will also accommodate the village centres within this option. Whilst the village centres are unlikely to be able to accommodate this directly</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document
			<i>traditional uses within retail centres and so they would not be expected to provide new open space or green space.</i>	<i>given the competitive nature of land within retail centres, associated wider development does have the opportunity to do so if required which could help to mitigate the effects on this criteria question overall.</i>
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure</i>	Will it improve the quality of existing open space?	-1	<i>The designation of the retail hierarchy will not improve the quality of existing open space. Little, if any open space can be found within the present town, local and proposed neighbourhood centres.</i>	None
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-2	<i>The consumption of raw materials at established centres would be minimal but the addition of a centre at Kirk Hallam and South Stanton would increase the consumption of raw materials more notably in the short term as a result of associated construction activity.</i>	None
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques?	-1	<i>Little opportunity to promote use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques within existing centres. Development of new centres</i>	<i>The fact that the two new centres would form part of wider strategic housing developments provides an opportunity for some direct mitigation in response to this criteria question, which is not available to existing centres, particularly around</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document
			<i>provides some opportunity, but also relies in part on development on greenfield land and would result in notable increase in consumption of raw materials in the short term relating to construction activity.</i>	<i>sustainable design. This could include a requirement that strategic housing developments are based on a network of streets that prioritises sustainable travel, the installation of additional and new bus halts and provision of additional facilities to contribute to the sustainable design of neighbourhoods.</i>
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	<i>Will it result in additional waste?</i>	<i>-1</i>	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term as the new centres are developed. However once established, the new local centre is not expected to generate large amounts of waste.</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	<i>Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?</i>	<i>-1</i>	<i>This option includes town, local and neighbourhood centres being located mainly on brownfield sites, with the exception of the local centre at South West Kirk Hallam which will have a negative impact on greenfield land, as it will be lost through the centre's development.</i>	<i>In terms of the centre which will result in the loss of greenfield land within the wider strategic housing site SGA25, implementation of a range of measures highlighted against SGA25 in this document, could afford some mitigation. This could include a requirement for biodiversity net gain, integration of sufficient tree planting and the maintaining of existing hedgerow and tree belt boundaries between development and the open countryside and the establishment of significant amounts of new open and formal green space forming part of a green corridor between the</i>

<i>Objective requiring mitigation</i>	<i>Criteria questions</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Key issues identified</i>	<i>Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document</i>
				<i>adjacent Local Nature Reserve and western edge of the site.</i>

Table 12: Transport (Option 1)

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Community safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>Expansion of highway network will provide additional opportunity for highways-related crime. It will also enable the delivery of a strategic housing site thus indirect consequences include increase in incidences of crime associated with an expanded population locally.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Where mitigation against highways related crime is possible, this will be addressed through the highway design process. Indirect consequences relating to an expanded population are addressed, as appropriate, against the strategic housing site (SGA25) option.</i>
<i>Community safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Expansion of the built environment will result in increased opportunity for related safety and security issues to emerge which do not exist currently given the existing greenfield status of the land.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>The highways design process will address requirements relating to maximising highways safety, otherwise indirect consequences relating to an expanded population are addressed, as appropriate, against the strategic housing site (SGA25) option.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Brownfield land</i>	Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?	-2	<i>Land required to accommodate the relief road and associated strategic housing site is entirely greenfield and would not see the redevelopment of any brownfield land</i>	<i>Implementation of the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise use of available brownfield land first for example within Long Eaton and Ilkeston.</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Brownfield land</i>	Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity interests of land?	-1	<i>The natural condition of much of the land required to accommodate the relief road and associated strategic housing site means this option will likely result in some detriment to biodiversity interests</i>	<i>Require the delivery of an appropriate level of biodiversity net gain. Utilise opportunities for enhancing assets within the vicinity of or within proposed development extents. Require appropriate landscape/ green space treatment along the extent of the relief road which interacts with the open countryside.</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it minimise or mitigate flood risk?	-1	<i>Development of greenfield/ natural land will compromise the land in performing its normal drainage functions.</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR to compliment any strategic housing development relating to this option which incorporates existing water assets on site and ensures development does not encroach upon them.</i>	<i>Appropriate drainage will be a requirement for any development on site through existing regulations and national policy.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it improve water quality?	-1	<i>Development of the land associated with this option has potential to impact on local water quality including existing water courses/ assets.</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR which incorporates existing water assets (including the Sow Brook) on site and ensures development does not encroach upon them.</i>	<i>Appropriate drainage will be a requirement for any development on site through existing regulations and national policy.</i>
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it conserve water?	-1	<i>Increase in population resulting from strategic housing development associated with delivery of the relief road will inevitably lead to an increase in water consumption locally.</i>	<i>Avoid any relief road routes which would impede on existing water assets in the vicinity. Conserve existing water assets in the vicinity alongside any new development associated with delivery of the relief road.</i>	<i>An increase in water usage associated with new dwellings is unavoidable, though building regulations do have provision for minimising effect from new builds.</i>
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it cause a deterioration of Water Framework Directive status or potential of onsite watercourses?	-1	<i>Development of the land associated with this option has potential to impact on local water quality including existing water courses/ assets.</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR which incorporates existing water assets (including the Sow Brook) on site and ensures development does not encroach upon them.</i>	<i>Appropriate drainage will be a requirement for any development on site through existing regulations and national policy.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure</i>	Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?	-1	<i>Risk that protected species may be identified, priority species and local habitats nearby/ adjacent to the site are present and will be impacted on</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR to provide appropriate buffer between development associated with this option and biodiversity assets. Provide appropriate buffering along length of relief road. Require the delivery of an appropriate level of biodiversity net gain across wider site. Utilise opportunities for enhancing assets within the vicinity of or within proposed development extents.</i>	<i>Given the scale of the site, national requirements are such that an Environmental Impact Assessment will be required for the site, and this will identify where specific risks need mitigating.</i>
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure</i>	Will it conserve and enhance the geological environment?	-1	<i>Extraction of material associated with development of the relief road and associated housing poses risk to existing geological environment.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>The manner in which construction would relate with the geology sitting beneath the development site would require a developer to work within the confines of regulated guidelines ensuring safe construction methods. A construction method statement may be required as part of a future planning application.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure</i>	Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?	-1	<i>Implementation of relief road and wider associated development risks loss of existing trees and will fail to enhance any existing woodland cover.</i>	<i>Implement tree and hedgerow planting along westbound side of relief road to buffer between it and the wider countryside. Incorporate planting across the associated wider development.</i>	None
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure</i>	Will it provide new open space or green space?	-1	<i>Loss of large portion of open countryside which is accessed by Public Rights of Way in present form will take away existing open/ green space provision.</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR to provide appropriate buffer between development associated with this option and a significant amount of formal open/ green space much beyond that currently accessible to the public.</i>	None
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure</i>	Will it improve the quality of existing open space?	-1	<i>Loss of large portion of open countryside which is accessed by Public Rights of Way in present form will take away existing (non-formal) open space.</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR to provide appropriate buffer between development associated with this option and a significant amount of formal open/ green space much beyond that currently accessible to the public.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Landscape and built environment</i>	Does it respect or preserve identified landscape character?	-2	<i>Relief road would significantly alter local landscape character, particularly considered against existing characteristics. The wider associated development of the site would also alter character.</i>	<i>Integrate landscaping along westbound edge of relief road to soften its relationship with the wider countryside. Integrate quality landscaping with development through green and open spaces to minimise impact of development on wider landscape. Particular efforts should be directed to ensuring a quality relationship between Pioneer Meadows LNR and development in landscape terms.</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Landscape and built environment</i>	Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity?	-1	<i>Development of the relief road (and associated wider development) is likely to result in substantial alteration to visual amenity currently enjoyed by existing neighbouring residents in Ilkeston.</i>	<i>Integrate landscaping along westbound edge of relief road to soften its relationship with the wider countryside. Integrate quality landscaping with development through green and open spaces and appropriate planting to minimise impact of wider development on existing visual amenity. Develop a strategic green corridor between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR to maintain a sense of 'openness' as far as is possible.</i>	<i>None</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Landscape and built environment</i>	Will it maintain and / or enhance the local distinctiveness of the townscape or settlement character?	-1	<i>Potential for new development associated with delivery of the relief road to conflict with the adjacent uniform style at Kirk Hallam</i>	<i>Require that any development associated with the relief road respects the wider settlement context through appropriate design.</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Landscape and built environment</i>	Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between the landscape and the built environment?	-1	<i>A new relief road has the potential to sever relationship between built environment and wider landscape</i>	<i>Require appropriate landscape buffering between the relief road and wider countryside to soften its impact and better integrate it with the environment.</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-2	<i>The relief road will primarily facilitate private car based journeys, likely leading to an increase in associated consumption of raw materials locally.</i>	<i>Reduce longer term consumption through enhancing alternative existing and establish new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across associated development to minimise locally derived car usage. Provide for sustainable forms of safe travel along the length of the relief road.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-1	<i>Construction related waste will increase in the short term and household waste in the long term as a result of associated residential development</i>	None	<i>Short term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable. Household waste increases cannot be avoided. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need.</i>
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it reduce hazardous waste?	-1	<i>No opportunity to reduce hazardous waste. Construction activity may generate hazardous waste</i>	None	<i>Waste associated with construction activity is unavoidable. The management of any hazardous waste will be controlled and mitigated as appropriate by construction related regulations.</i>
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land?	-1	<i>Small section of land rated as 'moderate to good' in agricultural terms will be developed on as a result of the relief road and associated residential development.</i>	None	<i>The overall approach to growth set out by the preferred options ensures that agricultural land of this quality is mostly avoided. Not providing options for growth in the preferred way risks speculative development and wider impact on better quality agricultural land. Overall this represents a tiny proportion of overall land considered for development falls outside of the highest category ratings.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-2	<i>This option is wholly reliant on the use of greenfield land and will result in a notable loss particularly when taking into account associated residential development.</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR to provide appropriate buffer between development associated with this option and a significant amount of formal open/ green space much beyond that currently accessible to the public. More widely, implement the preferred approach to growth which seeks to exhaust the use of brownfield land first.</i>	None

Strategic Housing Sites (SA3):

Table 13: Preferred strategic housing site SGA1 - Acorn Way

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Community safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>The development of this site would result in the urbanising of space which would influence an increase in the likelihood of crime and the fear of crime. The construction of homes, presence of cars and provision of open spaces naturally leads to an expansion of crime-related activities which needs to be addressed through suitable mitigation.</i>	None	<i>Such an expansion of the population locally will result in an unavoidable adverse effect on this criteria question – however, existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and fear of crime with national policy and guidance further supporting this.</i>
<i>Community safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Similarly to the commentary above, new developments whilst offering widespread benefits also influence a possible expansion of crime and anti-social behaviour – particularly where development occurs on greenfield land with no, or very little, history of such activity.</i>	None	<i>An increase in potential safety and anti-social issues relating to the built environment is unavoidable in the context of significant built environment expansion. However, in security terms existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and national building regulations ensure minimum safety standards are met by new development.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Brownfield land</i>	Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?	-2	<i>The allocation of land for strategic housing development involves a sizeable area of greenfield land being identified.</i>	<i>The implementation of the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston. However, there is insufficient brownfield land to meet all of Erewash's housing needs.</i>	None
<i>Brownfield land</i>	Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity interests of land?	-1	<i>Identification of internal hedgerows and groups of trees at locations across the site which may be threatened by housing development of a strategic scale.</i>	<i>Introducing tree planting at appropriate parts of the site, whilst maintaining existing hedgerow and tree belt boundaries. Sustainable drainage infrastructure should also help development minimise impact on on-site biodiversity and deliver biodiversity net gain.</i>	None
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it minimise or mitigate flood risk?	-1	<i>The allocation's proximity to the Oaklands Brook, a tributary of the Lees Brook. Development may therefore affect the hydrology of the site and impact on the rate of surface water discharge into the Oaklands Brook.</i>	<i>A requirement for appropriate sustainable drainage infrastructure to be provided on-site to help control the safe discharge of water. A need to deliver biodiversity net gain should ensure land in vicinity of Oaklands Brook (a Local Wildlife Site) remains free from development.</i>	<i>Appropriate drainage across will be a requirement for any development as set out by existing regulations and national policy.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it improve water quality?	-1	<i>As above, the allocation's proximity to the Oakland Brook may increase the potential for rainwaters to transfer into the watercourse over-ground rather than through natural processes via permeation through subterranean means. The site's location within the catchment of Breadsall Railway Cutting SSSI might impact on the quality of water relied upon by the SSSI.</i>	<i>A requirement for appropriate sustainable drainage infrastructure to be provided on-site to help control the safe discharge of water. New tree planting and the provision of open/green space throughout the development should help maintain the site's current hydrology.</i>	<i>Water quality is regulated by the Environment Agency with Severn Trent Water maintaining responsibility for drainage.</i>
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it conserve water?	-2	<i>Water usage will significantly increase locally as a result of additional household demands from several hundred new domestic properties at this site.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Development will inevitably increase the water required by new households who need water supply for drainage and domestic appliances. However, existing climate change policy within the Erewash Core Strategy specifically calls for a limit in water usage by each newly-built home. Controls on water usage emanate from building regulations which planning policies must adhere to.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it cause a deterioration of Water Framework Directive status or potential of onsite watercourses?	-1	<i>Development of land adjacent to the Oakland Brook risks affecting the water quality of this watercourse. This is due to the alteration of natural drainage patterns caused by the urbanisation of greenfield land.</i>	<i>A requirement for appropriate sustainable drainage infrastructure to be provided on-site to help control the safe discharge of water. New tree planting and the provision of open/green space throughout the development should help maintain the site's current hydrology.</i>	<i>Appropriate drainage across will be a requirement for any development as set out by existing regulations and national policy.</i>
<i>Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue and Green Infrastructure</i>	Will it conserve and enhance the geological environment?	-1	<i>Construction of a major housing site has the ability to alter the geology of land due to aspects such as foundation creation and material extraction.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>The manner in which construction would relate with the geology sitting beneath the development site would require a developer to work within the confines of regulated guidelines ensuring safe construction methods. A construction method statement may be required as part of a future planning application.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Landscape and built environment</i>	Does it respect or preserve identified landscape character?	-2	<i>Development would urbanise a largely open area between Morley Road and Acorn Way, altering the characteristics of the landscape.</i>	<i>Necessary to provide better crossing points over Acorn Way to ensure rights of way straddling the allocation can legibly continue eastwards into the open countryside. Appropriate tree planting and the setting out of open/green space across the site should help to minimise development's impact upon the landscape.</i>	None
<i>Landscape and built environment</i>	Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity?	-1	<i>Similarly to landscape character, development would impact on visual amenity evident around the site. The urbanisation of land east of Morley Road could result in a negative impact.</i>	<i>Development should be influenced by policy which promotes the principles of good design throughout all aspects of a scheme. Aspects such as the provision of a layout favouring non-motorised movement, suitably-located open space with tree planting and other landscaping features to ensure a softened urban edge.</i>	<i>Existing policy in the Erewash Core Strategy regarding design will help to positively influence the appearance and layout of development at this location.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-1	<i>The development of any strategically-sized site will inevitably lead to the consumption of raw materials, particularly through the construction activities.</i>	<i>Reduce longer term consumption through enhancing alternative existing and establish new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across development to minimise locally derived car usage.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-2	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term and household waste will be generated over a much longer-term as a result of a significant residential development.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short-term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable, although developers should aim to minimise this as far as a reasonably practicable. The generation of additional householder waste is unavoidable. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need. It will be the responsibility of individual households to regulate the amount of waste they generate.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-2	<i>As discussed earlier under the 'efficient use of brownfield land', the loss of greenfield land at this location would happen in the event that this development occurred.</i>	<i>Implement the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston. However, given there is insufficient brownfield land to meet all of Erewash's assessed housing needs. It will be necessary to make provision for open/green space within strategic housing developments, with tree planting also expected to play a role in the 'greening' of sites.</i>	None

Table 14: Preferred strategic housing site SGA26 – North of Spondon

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Community safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>Development of the site is likely to lead to an increase in incidences of crime, compared to what is currently experienced at the site.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Such an expansion of the population locally will result in an unavoidable adverse effect on this criteria question – however existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and fear of crime and national policy and guidance further supports this.</i>
<i>Community safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Expansion of the built environment will result in increased opportunity for related safety and security issues to emerge which do not exist currently given the existing greenfield status of the land.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>An increase in potential safety and security issues relating to the built environment is unavoidable in the context of significant built environment expansion. However, in security terms existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and national building regulations ensure minimum safety standards are met by new development.</i>
<i>Brownfield land</i>	Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?	-2	<i>Site is entirely greenfield and would not see the redevelopment of any brownfield land.</i>	<i>Implementation of the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise use of available brownfield land first for example within Long Eaton and Ilkeston.</i>	<i>None</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Brownfield land</i>	Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity interests of land?	-1	<i>Hedgerows and trees enclosing the site support existing biodiversity on site and would be lost to development.</i>	<i>Maintain and enhance existing hedgerows and tree boundaries between the site and countryside. Deliver biodiversity net gain on the site itself and seek opportunities to enhance neighbouring Spondon Wood. Implement semi natural buffer zone between development and Spondon Wood to protect biodiversity of the wood and provide opportunity for additional biodiversity value to be integrated with the site.</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it improve water quality?	-1	<i>Development is unlikely to improve the quality of water within the water cycle.</i>	<i>Develop a buffer between development and Spondon Wood which would provide a new semi-natural environment and provide associated natural drainage.</i>	<i>Appropriate drainage will be a requirement for any development on site through existing regulations and national policy.</i>
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it conserve water?	-2	<i>Development will increase demand for water locally, therefore will not help to conserve water.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>An increase in water usage associated with new dwellings is unavoidable, though building regulations do have provision for minimising effect from new builds.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, blue and green infrastructure</i>	Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?	-1	<i>Development could negatively impact on surrounding biodiversity given proximity of existing assets such as Spondon Wood.</i>	<i>Maintain the existing hedgerows and tree belt boundaries between development and open countryside, and if possible, enhance them. Deliver proportionate biodiversity net gain on the site where possible. Where this may not be possible, provide biodiversity enhancement in neighbouring assets where possible. Implement a buffer between development and Spondon Wood which would provide semi natural green space to protect the woodland's biodiversity and provide opportunity for further enhancement within the site. Require that disturbance to the Dunshill Shelterbelt Local Wildlife Site during the creation of the new vehicular junction and access point into the site is minimised.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, blue and green infrastructure</i>	Will it conserve and enhance the geological environment?	-1	<i>Construction of a major housing site has the ability to alter the geology of land due to aspects such as foundation creation and material extraction.</i>	None	<i>The manner in which construction would relate with the geology sitting beneath the development site would require a developer to work within the confines of regulated guidelines ensuring safe construction methods. A construction method statement may be required as part of a future planning application.</i>
<i>Natural environment, biodiversity, blue and green infrastructure</i>	Will it encourage and protect or improve Blue and/or Green Infrastructure networks?	-1	<i>Site is distant from the Borough's strategic blue and green infrastructure network with little opportunity to enhance it.</i>	<i>Require enhancement of green infrastructure locally through creation of semi natural open space between Spondon Wood and development. Extend Dale Abbey Footpath 58 into the site to widen green infrastructure connectivity across the area and into the wider Erewash Green Infrastructure network.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Landscape and built environment</i>	Does it respect or preserve identified landscape character?	-2	<i>Urbanisation of the site would fail to respect or preserve the identified landscape character as described and assessed within the SA site assessment.</i>	<i>Maintain the existing hedgerows and tree belt boundaries between development and open countryside, and if possible, enhance them. Implement a buffer between development and Spondon Wood which would provide semi natural green space and help to maintain some level of landscape openness.</i>	None
<i>Landscape and built environment</i>	Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity?	-2	<i>Development would impact on views, infilling much of the land between the woods and properties on Huntley Avenue and Fallow Road.</i>	<i>Require a coherent and quality design for the neighbourhood that respects its settlement context. Maintain and enhance existing hedgerows and tree belts between the site and open countryside. Protect and enhance the woodland. Integrate sufficient green space and tree planting within the site to help the development blend into its countryside context. Require creation of a semi natural buffer between development and woodland to establish more significant openness and help protect setting of adjacent woodland.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-1	<i>Development would lead to an increase in consumption of raw materials as a result of construction activity.</i>	<i>Reduce longer term consumption through enhancing alternative existing and establish new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across development to minimise locally derived car usage, such as the extension of footpath 58 into the site.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-2	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term and household waste in the long-term as a result of the development of a notable number of new domestic properties.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable although developers should seek to minimise waste generation during construction as far as is possible. Household waste increases cannot be avoided. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land?	-1	<i>The site is situated on good to moderate farmland. Although the land is not at the highest end of the agricultural land classification, a housing development would remove a sizable amount of agricultural land from crop production.</i>	None	<i>The overall approach to growth set out by the preferred options ensures that agricultural land of this quality is mostly avoided. Not providing options for growth in the preferred way risks speculative development and wider impact on better quality agricultural land. The land in question is good to moderate, therefore not at the highest end of the BMV rating.</i>
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-2	<i>The site is located entirely on greenfield land so development would not prevent the loss of greenfield land.</i>	<i>Require a green buffer between the site and Spondon Wood. Maintaining and enhance existing hedgerows and tree belts between the site and countryside. Implement the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston.</i>	None

Table 15: Preferred strategic housing site SGA25 – South-West of Kirk Hallam

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in preferred options document	Comments
<i>Community safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>Delivery of housing at this scale will result in significant increase in population locally, and normal crime activity associated with this. No specific opportunities exist to offset this through reduction in existing rural crime.</i>	None	<i>Such an expansion of the population locally will result in an unavoidable adverse effect on this criteria question – however existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and fear of crime and national policy and guidance further supports this.</i>
<i>Community safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Expansion of the built environment will result in increased opportunity for related safety and security issues to emerge which do not exist currently given the existing greenfield status of the land.</i>	None	<i>An increase in potential safety and security issues relating to the built environment is unavoidable in the context of significant built environment expansion. However, in security terms existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and national building regulations ensure minimum safety standards are met by new development.</i>
<i>Brownfield land</i>	Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?	-2	<i>Site is entirely greenfield and would not see the redevelopment of any brownfield land.</i>	<i>Implementation of the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise use of available brownfield land first for example within Long Eaton and Ilkeston.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in preferred options document	Comments
<i>Brownfield land</i>	Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity interests of land?	-1	<i>Loss of a specific hedgerow and development of greenfield land with its associated ecosystem</i>	<i>Require that existing hedgerow and tree belts between the site and countryside are maintained. Require the delivery of an appropriate level of biodiversity net gain. Utilise opportunities for enhancing assets within the vicinity of or within proposed development extents – for example establish a strategic green corridor between the western extent of the site and Pioneer Meadows Local Nature Reserve.</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	Will it minimise or mitigate flood risk?	-1	<i>Existing water assets within site and wider existing drainage function likely to be compromised by development.</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor within the site between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR to compliment the strategic housing development which incorporates existing water assets (including the Sow Brook) on site and ensures development does not encroach upon them.</i>	<i>Appropriate drainage will be a requirement for any development on site through existing regulations and national policy.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in preferred options document	Comments
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	<i>Will it improve water quality?</i>	<i>-1</i>	<i>Site within influence of Attenborough Gravel Pits SSSI which is especially sensitive to water quality. Existing water assets within the site mean development of the land risks impacting negatively on local water quality.</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor within the site between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR to compliment any strategic housing development relating to this option which incorporates existing water assets (including the Sow Brook) on site and ensures development does not encroach upon them.</i>	<i>Appropriate drainage will be a requirement for any development on site through existing regulations and national policy.</i>
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	<i>Will it conserve water?</i>	<i>-2</i>	<i>Water usage will significantly increase locally as a result of increase in commercial and domestic properties at this site resulting from its strategic redevelopment.</i>	<i>Conserve existing water assets within the site alongside new development.</i>	<i>An increase in water usage associated with new dwellings is unavoidable, though building regulations do have provision for minimising effect from new builds.</i>
<i>Flooding and water quality</i>	<i>Will it cause a deterioration of Water Framework Directive</i>	<i>-1</i>	<i>Specific risk from development to the Sow Brook which flows through the site. General risk resulting from alteration of natural drainage through urbanisation of greenfield land.</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor within the site between the relief road and Pioneer Meadows LNR which incorporates existing water assets (including the Sow Brook) on site in order to protect their current condition.</i>	<i>Appropriate drainage will be a requirement for any development on site through existing regulations and national policy.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in preferred options document	Comments
<i>Landscape and built environment</i>	Does it respect or preserve identified landscape character?	-2	<i>Development of this scale would significantly alter the existing landscape character of the area.</i>	<i>Integrate landscaping along westbound edge of site (delineated by the associated relief road) to soften its relationship with the wider countryside. Integrate quality landscaping with development through green and open spaces to minimise impact of development on wider landscape. Particular efforts should be directed to ensuring a quality relationship between Pioneer Meadows LNR and development in landscape terms through establishment of a strategic green corridor through the site.</i>	None
<i>Landscape and built environment</i>	Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity?	-2	<i>Development of this scale likely to result in substantial alteration to visual amenity currently enjoyed by existing neighbouring residents.</i>	<i>Integrate landscaping along western extent of development to soften its relationship with the wider countryside. Integrate quality landscaping with development through green and open spaces and appropriate planting. Develop a strategic green corridor between the western extent of the site and Pioneer Meadows LNR to maintain a sense of 'openness' as far as is possible.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in preferred options document	Comments
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-1	<i>Construction of the site would result in increased consumption of raw materials over the construction period.</i>	<i>Reduce longer-term consumption through enhancing alternative existing and establish new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across development to minimise locally derived car usage.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in preferred options document	Comments
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-2	<i>Development of this scale would result in a significant expansion of households locally, with associated household waste.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short-term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable, although developers will find it commercially desirable to limit the scale and quantity of building waste. Household waste increases cannot be realistically avoided with little scope for mitigation due to the overlap with human behaviour. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need. Responsibility for reducing waste and maximising the recycling of eligible items is an individual matter and therefore falls outside the scope of the planning system.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in preferred options document	Comments
<i>Natural resources and waste management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-2	<i>This option is wholly reliant on the use of greenfield land and will result in a notable loss.</i>	<i>Develop a strategic green corridor between the western extent of the development and Pioneer Meadows LNR to provide appropriate buffer and a significant amount of formal open/ green space much beyond that currently accessible to the public. Delivery of the preferred approach to growth which focusses on exhausting alternative types of land (brownfield) first, minimising use of greenfield land, would go some way to mitigate this effect.</i>	None

Table 16: Preferred strategic housing site CSR-0011 – West of Sandiacre

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>The development of this site would result in the urbanising of space which would influence an increase in the likelihood of crime and the fear of crime. The construction of homes, presence of cars and provision of open spaces naturally leads to an expansion of crime-related activities which needs to be addressed through suitable mitigation.</i>	<i>The use of open space and landscaping can also make a positive impact in the design of new developments, with thoughtful layout and network/spacing of buildings able to contribute to the creation of areas that benefit from natural surveillance. This is encouraged by Policy 1.1(3) of the Submission CSR document which sets out expectations around all housing allocation sites.</i>	<i>Such an expansion of the population locally will result in an unavoidable adverse effect on this criteria question – however, existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy (Policy 10(1)(b) and 10(2)(g)) specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and fear of crime with national policy and guidance further supporting this.</i>
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Similarly to the commentary above, new developments whilst offering widespread benefits, also influence a possible expansion of crime and anti-social behaviour – particularly where development occurs on greenfield land with no, or very little, history of such activity.</i>	<i>The mitigation as described above will also address the sustainability criterion. In combination with design-based policies from the adopted Local Plan (Policy 10 of the 2014 Core Strategy), these policy provisions will positively impact upon the layout of development to as far as realistically possible, limit the scope for crime by creating a safe and secure built environment.</i>	<i>None</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Brownfield Land</i>	Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?	-2	<i>Site is entirely greenfield and would not result in any redevelopment of brownfield land.</i>	<i>Implementation of the preferred approach to growth as set out by the Council's spatial strategy looks to maximise use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston, and the inset villages throughout the Borough.</i>	<i>The shortage of deliverable development opportunities on brownfield land within non-Green Belt locations results in a need to consider where sustainable locations outside settlement boundaries exist in order to identify sufficient land to meet housing requirements.</i>
<i>Brownfield Land</i>	Will it minimise impact on the biodiversity interests of land?	-1	<i>The site adjoins a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Local Wildlife Site (Stony Clouds).</i>	<i>Incorporation of an appropriately-sized green buffer to ensure an appropriate stand-off is maintained between newly built development and the biodiversity assets which exist to the north-east/east of the site.</i>	<i>Housing development directly adjoins the LNR/LWS already along Larch Drive and Maple Avenue, demonstrating that residential areas can coexist alongside biodiversity assets. An appropriate green buffer would provide greater separation than what already exists in the instances cited above.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-1	<i>Construction of the site would result in increased consumption of raw materials over the construction period.</i>	<i>Reduce longer-term consumption post-construction phases through enhancing the existing and establishing new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across development to minimise locally derived car usage, maximising local Public Rights of Way (E12/1/1 and E12/8/1) to access Erewash Green Infrastructure Corridor to the east, offering opportunities for sustainable travel that offset consumption of raw materials.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-2	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term and household waste in the long-term as a result of the development of a notable number of new domestic properties.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short-term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable, although developers will find it commercially desirable to limit the scale and quantity of building waste. Household waste increases cannot be realistically avoided with little scope for mitigation due to the overlap with human behaviour. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need. Responsibility for reducing waste and maximising the recycling of eligible items is an individual, behavioural matter and therefore falls outside the scope of the planning system.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-2	<i>This option is wholly reliant on the use of greenfield land and will result in a notable loss.</i>	<i>Implement the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston. However, given there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the entirety of Erewash's assessed housing needs, it is necessary to assess the sustainability of other sources of land outside of towns and villages. It will be necessary to make provision for open/green space within strategic housing developments, with tree planting also expected to play a role in the 'greening' of sites.</i>	None

Table 17: Preferred strategic housing site SGA3 – Breadsall Hilltop

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Brownfield Land</i>	Will it make efficient use of brownfield land?	-2	<i>Site is entirely greenfield and would not result in any redevelopment of brownfield land.</i>	<i>Implementation of the preferred approach to growth as set out by the Council's spatial strategy looks to maximise use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston, and the inset villages throughout the Borough.</i>	<i>The shortage of deliverable development opportunities on brownfield land within non-Green Belt locations results in a need to consider where sustainable locations outside settlement boundaries exist in order to identify sufficient land to meet housing requirements.</i>
<i>Flooding and Water Quality</i>	Will it minimise or mitigate flood risk?	-1	<i>The site itself is located wholly within Flood Zone 1, but the Dam Brook which runs to the north of the site through Breadsall village might be impacted by the development of greenfield land which slopes down to the Brook, potentially altering the hydrology that exists within the area.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Whilst there wouldn't be an objection from the Environment Agency to development given the site's location within FZ1, the general principles of good development which are enshrined within Strategic Policy 1.1, and specifically 1.1(3) which requires sustainable drainage infrastructure, which in this case would see rainwater absorbed by new SuDS features and assets – preventing the run-off of rainwater into surrounding land.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Flooding and Water Quality</i>	Will it improve water quality?	-1	<i>Development is unlikely to improve the quality of water within the water cycle.</i>	<i>No specific mitigation is thought to be possible, but the input of technical information from statutory consultees such as Severn Trent Water can ensure that development can safely regulate water discharges – both surface-based and those from households.</i>	<i>Appropriate drainage will be a requirement for any development on site through existing regulations, national policy and appropriate conditions.</i>
<i>Flooding and Water Quality</i>	Will it conserve water?	-2	<i>Water usage will significantly increase locally as a result of the construction of domestic properties at this site, seeing demand for water rise.</i>	<i>Conserve any existing water assets within the site, alongside the new development. However, this will not directly assist in efforts to reduce the usage of water from new development which will occur post-construction.</i>	<i>An increase in water usage associated with new dwellings is unavoidable. However, building regulations do have provision for minimising the effect of water usage from new builds which see measures that enhance the efficiency of use.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green & Blue Infrastructure</i>	Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?	-2	<i>Adjoining Local Wildlife Site (disused railway cutting) immediately north may be impacted by adjacent development. Possibility of internal hedgerow network being damaged to allow for the site's development.</i>	<i>The retention of areas of vegetation within the site, but specifically within the north, can contribute to the continuation of biodiversity present on-site. Strategic Policy 1.1(2) requires hedgerow and tree belts to be retained wherever possible, recognising the contribution such features make to the landscape, in addition to supporting low-level biodiversity networks through the presence of habitat. Policy 1.1(3) also supports the implementation of aspects such as tree planting and SuDS as part of place-making, with both of these elements also able, in conjunction with the legal BNG duty, to enhance biodiversity at the site.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green & Blue Infrastructure</i>	Will it conserve and enhance the geological environment?	-1	<i>Development of an undulating area of land might require more extensive and intrusive ground/engineering workings to ensure the proper installation of footings for homes.</i>	None	<i>The manner in which construction would relate with the geology sitting beneath the development site would require a developer to work within the confines of regulated guidelines ensuring safe construction methods. A construction method statement may be required as part of a future planning application. An appropriate layout of development which respects the varying land levels would also make a positive contribution to conserving and enhancing the geological environment.</i>
<i>Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Green & Blue Infrastructure</i>	Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?	-1	<i>The threat from development to the removal of hedgerow trees which exist across the site.</i>	<i>Strategic Policy 1.1(2) requires hedgerow and tree belts to be retained wherever possible, recognising the contribution such features make to the landscape. A developer will need to demonstrate how the layout of a suggested scheme can work by making provision for retained hedgerow trees as part of the final development.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Landscape and Built Environment</i>	Does it respect or preserve identified landscape character?	-2	<i>Development of open fields between Breadsall Hilltop and Breadsall village would have a notable impact on the landscape character evidence throughout the identified land.</i>	<i>Any form of built development will impact on the current landscape which the site forms part of. Development would be expected to reduce impact on the landscape by working positively with the undulating land levels evident around the site to implement a layout which respects landscape features such as the dense banking of trees which lines the north of the site, helping to establish and create a positive interface.</i>	None
<i>Landscape and Built Environment</i>	Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity?	-1	<i>Visual amenity that the land contributes would be altered through its development.</i>	<i>Similarly to above, built development will inevitably alter the visual amenity currently in place across the site. New landscape features, such as appropriately sited open space and woodland, will be expected to be introduced as part of any future development – working to help provide a blended development between the A609 and the Great Northern Greenway, with sufficient buffer incorporated at the northern end of the site to reinforce the visual break between development and green infrastructure.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-1	<i>Construction of the site would result in increased consumption of raw materials over the construction period.</i>	<i>Reduce longer-term consumption post-construction phases through enhancing the existing and establishing new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across development to minimise locally derived car usage, maximising local Public Rights of Way to access Erewash Green Infrastructure Corridor to the north and facilities within Derby urban area immediately south, offering opportunities for sustainable modes of travel that offset the consumption of raw materials.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-2	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term and household waste in the long-term as a result of the development of a notable number of new domestic properties.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short-term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable, although developers will find it commercially desirable to limit the scale and quantity of building waste. Household waste increases cannot be realistically avoided with little scope for mitigation due to the overlap with human behaviour. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need. Responsibility for reducing waste and maximising the recycling of eligible items is an individual matter and therefore falls outside the scope of the planning system.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-2	<i>This option is wholly reliant on the use of greenfield land and will result in a notable loss.</i>	<i>Implement the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston. However, given there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the entirety of Erewash's assessed housing needs, it is necessary to assess the sustainability of other sources of land outside of towns and villages. It will be necessary to make provision for open/green space within strategic housing developments, with tree planting also expected to play a role in the 'greening' of sites.</i>	None

Table 18: Preferred strategic housing site CSR-0044 – South of West Hallam

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>The development of this site would result in the urbanising of space which would influence an increase in the likelihood of crime and the fear of crime. The construction of homes, presence of cars and provision of open spaces naturally leads to an expansion of crime-related activities which needs to be addressed through suitable mitigation.</i>	<i>The use of open space and landscaping can also make a positive impact in the design of new developments, with thoughtful layout and network/spacing of buildings able to contribute to the creation of areas that benefit from natural surveillance. This is encouraged by Policy 1.1(3) of the Submission CSR document which sets out expectations around all housing allocation sites.</i>	<i>Such an expansion of the population locally will result in an unavoidable adverse effect on this criteria question – however, existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy (Policy 10(1)(b) and 10(2)(g)) specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and fear of crime with national policy and guidance further supporting this.</i>
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Similarly to the commentary above, new developments whilst offering widespread benefits also influence a possible expansion of crime and anti-social behaviour – particularly where development occurs on greenfield land with no, or very little, history of such activity.</i>	<i>The mitigation as described above will also address the sustainability criterion. In combination with design-based policies from the adopted Local Plan (Policy 10 of the 2014 Core Strategy), these policy provisions will positively impact upon the layout of development to as far as realistically possible, limit the scope for crime by creating a safe and secure built environment.</i>	<i>None</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Landscape and Built Environment</i>	Does it have a positive impact on visual amenity?	-1	<i>Development would break current views and clear vistas from Beech Lane southwards into undulating countryside to the south of the village.</i>	<i>Development at the site should retain corridors throughout the new layout across the site where views are retained throughout development through the appropriate siting of homes, using open and green spaces to allow for vistas from Beech Lane in a southern direction out into open countryside.</i>	None
<i>Landscape and Built Environment</i>	Will it maintain and/or enhance the local distinctiveness of the townscape or settlement character?	-1	<i>Development would occur directly adjacent to the West Hallam Conservation Area, with new development potentially threatening the setting of the CA, impacting on its character.</i>	<i>Policy needs to reflect the more sensitive role played by land within the east of the site, by requiring development to respect the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area through appropriate layout (which may be lower in density than on other parts of the site, and higher levels of design to reflect the more traditional and historic styles of adjoining buildings within the CA.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-1	<i>Construction of the site would result in increased consumption of raw materials over the construction period.</i>	<i>Reduce longer-term consumption post-construction phases through enhancing the existing and establishing new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across development to minimise locally derived car usage, maximising local Public Rights of Way to access Erewash Green Infrastructure Corridor to the south (Great Northern Greenway) and localised facilities within West Hallam, offering opportunities for sustainable modes of travel that offset the consumption of raw materials.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-1	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term and household waste in the long-term as a result of the development of a notable number of new domestic properties.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short-term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable, although developers will find it commercially desirable to limit the scale and quantity of building waste. Household waste increases cannot be realistically avoided with little scope for mitigation due to the overlap with human behaviour. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need. Responsibility for reducing waste and maximising the recycling of eligible items is an individual, behavioural matter and therefore falls outside the scope of the planning system.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-1	<i>This option is wholly reliant on the use of greenfield land and will result in a notable loss.</i>	<i>Implement the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston. However, given there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the entirety of Erewash's assessed housing needs, it is necessary to assess the sustainability of other sources of land outside of towns and villages. It will be necessary to make provision for open/green space within strategic housing developments, with tree planting also expected to play a role in the 'greening' of sites.</i>	None

Table 19: Preferred strategic housing site CSR-0048 – North of West Hallam

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>The development of this site would result in the urbanising of space which would influence an increase in the likelihood of crime and the fear of crime. The construction of homes, presence of cars and provision of open spaces naturally leads to an expansion of crime-related activities which needs to be addressed through suitable mitigation.</i>	<i>The use of open space and landscaping can also make a positive impact in the design of new developments, with thoughtful layout and network/spacing of buildings able to contribute to the creation of areas that benefit from natural surveillance. This is encouraged by Policy 1.1(3) of the Submission CSR document which sets out expectations around all housing allocation sites.</i>	<i>Such an expansion of the population locally will result in an unavoidable adverse effect on this criteria question – however, existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy (Policy 10(1)(b) and 10(2)(g)) specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and fear of crime with national policy and guidance further supporting this.</i>
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Similarly to the commentary above, new developments whilst offering widespread benefits also influence a possible expansion of crime and anti-social behaviour – particularly where development occurs on greenfield land with no, or very little, history of such activity.</i>	<i>The mitigation as described above will also address the sustainability criterion. In combination with design-based policies from the adopted Local Plan (Policy 10 of the 2014 Core Strategy), these policy provisions will positively impact upon the layout of development to as far as realistically possible, limit the scope for crime by creating a safe and secure built environment.</i>	<i>None</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-1	<i>Construction of the site would result in increased consumption of raw materials over the construction period.</i>	<i>Reduce longer-term consumption post-construction phases through enhancing the existing and establishing new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across development to minimise locally derived car usage, maximising connections to access local green spaces, neighbourhood facilities in West Hallam village centre and public transport routes between Ilkeston and Derby, offering opportunities for sustainable modes of travel that offset the consumption of raw materials.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-1	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term and household waste in the long-term as a result of the development of a notable number of new domestic properties.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short-term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable, although developers will find it commercially desirable to limit the scale and quantity of building waste. Household waste increases cannot be realistically avoided with little scope for mitigation due to the overlap with human behaviour. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need. Responsibility for reducing waste and maximising the recycling of eligible items is an individual, behavioural matter and therefore falls outside the scope of the planning system.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-1	<i>This option is wholly reliant on the use of greenfield land and will result in a notable loss.</i>	<i>Implement the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston. However, given there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the entirety of Erewash's assessed housing needs, it is necessary to assess the sustainability of other sources of land outside of towns and villages. It will be necessary to make provision for open/green space within strategic housing developments, with tree planting also expected to play a role in the 'greening' of sites.</i>	None

Table 20: Preferred strategic housing site CSR-0003 – East of Breaston

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>The development of this site would result in the urbanising of space which would influence an increase in the likelihood of crime and the fear of crime. The construction of homes, presence of cars and provision of open spaces naturally leads to an expansion of crime-related activities which needs to be addressed through suitable mitigation.</i>	<i>The use of open space and landscaping can also make a positive impact in the design of new developments, with thoughtful layout and network/spacing of buildings able to contribute to the creation of areas that benefit from natural surveillance. This is encouraged by Policy 1.1(3) of the Submission CSR document which sets out expectations around all housing allocation sites.</i>	<i>Such an expansion of the population locally will result in an unavoidable adverse effect on this criteria question – however, existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy (Policy 10(1)(b) and 10(2)(g)) specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and fear of crime with national policy and guidance further supporting this.</i>
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Similarly to the commentary above, new developments whilst offering widespread benefits also influence a possible expansion of crime and anti-social behaviour – particularly where development occurs on greenfield land with no, or very little, history of such activity.</i>	<i>The mitigation as described above will also address the sustainability criterion. In combination with design-based policies from the adopted Local Plan (Policy 10 of the 2014 Core Strategy), these policy provisions will positively impact upon the layout of development to as far as realistically possible, limit the scope for crime by creating a safe and secure built environment.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-1	<i>Construction of the site would result in increased consumption of raw materials over the construction period.</i>	<i>Reduce longer-term consumption post-construction phases through enhancing the existing and establishing new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across development to minimise locally derived car usage, maximising connections to access local green spaces, neighbourhood facilities in Breaston village centre and public transport links to Nottingham and Derby, offering opportunities for sustainable modes of travel that offset the consumption of raw materials.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-1	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term and household waste in the long-term as a result of the development of a notable number of new domestic properties.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short-term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable, although developers will find it commercially desirable to limit the scale and quantity of building waste. Household waste increases cannot be realistically avoided with little scope for mitigation due to the overlap with human behaviour. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need. Responsibility for reducing waste and maximising the recycling of eligible items is an individual, behavioural matter and therefore falls outside the scope of the planning system.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land?	-1	<i>The site is set within an area of Grade 2 (Good) quality agricultural land, confirming its status as BMV land within the Borough.</i>	<i>Whilst the loss of BMV for non-agricultural purposes (in this case, for residential development) does not conform to national planning policy, land across the site has not been in agricultural use for some time – instead, fulfilling a number of equine-related purposes connected largely to the grazing of horses and their upkeep. The loss of land from active agricultural use lessens the level of effect that new homes upon the site would have, meaning mitigation measures would carry minimal effectiveness.</i>	<i>Further to the mitigation commentary, the loss of land at Heath Gardens represents only a small area of wider Grade 2 BMV land between Breaston and the M1 motorway. Notwithstanding the current equine-based use across the wider land, the remaining area could revert back to an agricultural use at some time during the future.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
Natural Resources and Waste Management	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-1	<i>This option is wholly reliant on the use of greenfield land and will result in a notable loss.</i>	<i>Implement the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston. However, given there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the entirety of Erewash's assessed housing needs, it is necessary to assess the sustainability of other sources of land outside of towns and villages. It will be necessary to make provision for open/green space within strategic housing developments, with tree planting also expected to play a role in the 'greening' of sites.</i>	None

Table 21: Preferred strategic housing site CSR-0040 – South West of Draycott

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>The development of this site would result in the urbanising of space which would influence an increase in the likelihood of crime and the fear of crime. The construction of homes, presence of cars and provision of open spaces naturally leads to an expansion of crime-related activities which needs to be addressed through suitable mitigation.</i>	<i>The use of open space and landscaping can also make a positive impact in the design of new developments, with thoughtful layout and network/spacing of buildings able to contribute to the creation of areas that benefit from natural surveillance. This is encouraged by Policy 1.1(3) of the Submission CSR document which sets out expectations around all housing allocation sites.</i>	<i>Such an expansion of the population locally will result in an unavoidable adverse effect on this criteria question – however, existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy (Policy 10(1)(b) and 10(2)(g)) specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and fear of crime with national policy and guidance further supporting this.</i>
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Similarly to the commentary above, new developments whilst offering widespread benefits also influence a possible expansion of crime and anti-social behaviour – particularly where development occurs on greenfield land with no, or very little, history of such activity.</i>	<i>The mitigation as described above will also address the sustainability criterion. In combination with design-based policies from the adopted Local Plan (Policy 10 of the 2014 Core Strategy), these policy provisions will positively impact upon the layout of development to as far as realistically possible, limit the scope for crime by creating a safe and secure built environment.</i>	<i>None</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-1	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term and household waste in the long-term as a result of the development of a notable number of new domestic properties.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short-term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable, although developers will find it commercially desirable to limit the scale and quantity of building waste. Household waste increases cannot be realistically avoided with little scope for mitigation due to the overlap with human behaviour. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need. Responsibility for reducing waste and maximising the recycling of eligible items is an individual, behavioural matter and therefore falls outside the scope of the planning system.</i>
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it protect the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land?	-1	<i>The site is set within an area of Grade 2 (Good) quality agricultural land, confirming its status as BMV land within the Borough.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>The overall approach to growth set out by the preferred options ensures that agricultural land of this quality is largely avoided. Not providing options for growth which conform to the preferred strategy risks speculative development in lesser sustainable areas which may result in wider impacts on better quality agricultural land.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-1	<i>This option is wholly reliant on the use of greenfield land and will result in a notable loss.</i>	<i>Implement the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston. However, given there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the entirety of Erewash's assessed housing needs, it is necessary to assess the sustainability of other sources of land outside of towns and villages. It will be necessary to make provision for open/green space within strategic housing developments, with tree planting also expected to play a role in the 'greening' of sites.</i>	None

Table 22: Preferred strategic housing site CSR-0039 – North of Borrowash

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>The development of this site would result in the urbanising of space which would influence an increase in the likelihood of crime and the fear of crime. The construction of homes, presence of cars and provision of open spaces naturally leads to an expansion of crime-related activities which needs to be addressed through suitable mitigation.</i>	<i>The use of open space and landscaping can also make a positive impact in the design of new developments, with thoughtful layout and network/spacing of buildings able to contribute to the creation of areas that benefit from natural surveillance. This is encouraged by Policy 1.1(3) of the Submission CSR document which sets out expectations around all housing allocation sites.</i>	<i>Such an expansion of the population locally will result in an unavoidable adverse effect on this criteria question – however, existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy (Policy 10(1)(b) and 10(2)(g)) specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and fear of crime with national policy and guidance further supporting this.</i>
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Similarly to the commentary above, new developments whilst offering widespread benefits also influence a possible expansion of crime and anti-social behaviour – particularly where development occurs on greenfield land with no, or very little, history of such activity.</i>	<i>The mitigation as described above will also address the sustainability criterion. In combination with design-based policies from the adopted Local Plan (Policy 10 of the 2014 Core Strategy), these policy provisions will positively impact upon the layout of development to as far as realistically possible, limit the scope for crime by creating a safe and secure built environment.</i>	<i>None</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-1	<i>Construction of the site would result in increased consumption of raw materials over the construction period.</i>	<i>Reduce longer-term consumption post-construction phases through enhancing the existing and establishing new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across development to minimise locally derived car usage, maximising connections to access local green spaces, neighbourhood facilities in Borrowash Local Centre and public transport links to Nottingham and Derby, offering opportunities for sustainable modes of travel that offset the consumption of raw materials.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-1	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term and household waste in the long-term as a result of the development of a notable number of new domestic properties.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short-term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable, although developers will find it commercially desirable to limit the scale and quantity of building waste. Household waste increases cannot be realistically avoided with little scope for mitigation due to the overlap with human behaviour. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need. Responsibility for reducing waste and maximising the recycling of eligible items is an individual, behavioural matter and therefore falls outside the scope of the planning system.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-1	<i>This option is wholly reliant on the use of greenfield land and will result in a notable loss.</i>	<i>Implement the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston. However, given there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the entirety of Erewash's assessed housing needs, it is necessary to assess the sustainability of other sources of land outside of towns and villages. It will be necessary to make provision for open/green space within strategic housing developments, with tree planting also expected to play a role in the 'greening' of sites.</i>	None

Table 23: Preferred strategic housing site CSR-0035 – West of Borrowash

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	-1	<i>The development of this site would result in the urbanising of space which would influence an increase in the likelihood of crime and the fear of crime. The construction of homes, presence of cars and provision of open spaces naturally leads to an expansion of crime-related activities which needs to be addressed through suitable mitigation.</i>	<i>The use of open space and landscaping can also make a positive impact in the design of new developments, with thoughtful layout and network/spacing of buildings able to contribute to the creation of areas that benefit from natural surveillance. This is encouraged by Policy 1.1(3) of the Submission CSR document which sets out expectations around all housing allocation sites.</i>	<i>Such an expansion of the population locally will result in an unavoidable adverse effect on this criteria question – however, existing design policy within the Erewash Core Strategy (Policy 10(1)(b) and 10(2)(g)) specifically calls for development which reduces the opportunities for crime and fear of crime with national policy and guidance further supporting this.</i>
<i>Community Safety</i>	Will it contribute to a safe and secure built environment?	-1	<i>Similarly to the commentary above, new developments whilst offering widespread benefits also influence a possible expansion of crime and anti-social behaviour – particularly where development occurs on greenfield land with no, or very little, history of such activity.</i>	<i>The mitigation as described above will also address the sustainability criterion. In combination with design-based policies from the adopted Local Plan (Policy 10 of the 2014 Core Strategy), these policy provisions will positively impact upon the layout of development to as far as realistically possible, limit the scope for crime by creating a safe and secure built environment.</i>	None

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?	-1	<i>Construction of the site would result in increased consumption of raw materials over the construction period.</i>	<i>Reduce longer-term consumption post-construction phases through enhancing the existing and establishing new sustainable transport options across the Borough. Require integration of appropriate levels of connectivity across development to minimise locally derived car usage, maximising connections to access local green spaces, neighbourhood facilities in Borrowash Local Centre and excellent public transport links to Nottingham and Derby, offering opportunities for sustainable modes of travel that offset the consumption of raw materials.</i>	<i>It will be the responsibility of a developer(s) to demonstrate that site construction will minimise the amount of raw materials necessary to develop housing. Improvements to construction practices, including more sustainable sourcing of key building materials, are now being followed by home builders to help improve the overall sustainability of developments. Building regulations will also influence the reduced usage of raw materials in line with national goals on climate change.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it result in additional waste?	-2	<i>Construction-related waste will increase in the short-term and household waste in the long-term as a result of the development of a notable number of new domestic properties.</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Short-term waste generation relating to construction activity is unavoidable, although developers will find it commercially desirable to limit the scale and quantity of building waste. Household waste increases cannot be realistically avoided with little scope for mitigation due to the overlap with human behaviour. This is not a site specific issue; it applies wherever new dwellings are to be accommodated to address the Borough's housing need. Responsibility for reducing waste and maximising the recycling of eligible items is an individual, behavioural matter and therefore falls outside the scope of the planning system.</i>

Objective requiring mitigation	Criteria questions	Score	Key issues identified	Suggested mitigation in submitted CSR document	Comments
<i>Natural Resources and Waste Management</i>	Will it prevent the loss of greenfield land to development?	-2	<i>This option is wholly reliant on the use of greenfield land and will result in a significant loss.</i>	<i>Implement the preferred approach to growth, which looks to maximise the use of available brownfield land first within the urban areas of Long Eaton and Ilkeston. However, given there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the entirety of Erewash's assessed housing needs, it is necessary to assess the sustainability of other sources of land outside of towns and villages. It will be necessary to make provision for open/green space within strategic housing developments, with tree planting also expected to play a role in the 'greening' of sites.</i>	<i>An indicative masterplan supplied by the site promoter indicates the provision of a substantial amount of green space set within a community scale park. Whilst this does not override the negative effects of the loss of greenfield land, the provision of a sizeable green space asset does offset somewhat the scale of loss.</i>