

**Summary of Assessment of Strategic  
Options**

**East Riding of Yorkshire Council:  
Core Strategy Issues and Options**

**Sustainability Appraisal**

**April 2008**



# East Riding of Yorkshire Council:

## Core Strategy Issues and Options Development Plan Document

### Sustainability Appraisal

#### Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

JOB NUMBER: 5044788			DOC REF: 5044788 ERYC Core Strategy DPD SA - Summary of Strategic Options Assessment (Final) V3.1.doc			
			Revision Date: 07 April 2008			
3	Final	GK/LP	MH	MH	RB	7/4/08
2	Second draft for comment	GK/LP	MH	MH	RB	26/3/08
1	Draft for comment	GK/LP	MH	MH	RB	11/3/08
		Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date

Revision	Purpose Description	<b>ATKINS</b>
----------	------------------------	---------------



*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

## Contents

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>2. Plan Issues and Options</b>	<b>2-1</b>
<b>3. Summary of Assessment</b>	<b>3-1</b>
Introduction	3-1
Results of Assessment	3-1

### List of Tables

Table 2.1 - Strategic Policy Options	2-1
Table 3.1 - Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options	3-3

This document is copyright and should not be copied in whole or in part by any means other than with the approval of Atkins Limited. Any unauthorised user of the document shall be responsible for all liabilities arising out of such use.

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

This page has been left intentionally blank.

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This document presents a summary of the assessment of strategic options developed for the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) for East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) as set out in the Core Strategy DPD Issues and Options paper published by ERYC in April 2008, which this report accompanies. The assessment of strategic options has been conducted as part of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the DPD.
- 1.2 At this stage the SA is primarily concerned with identifying the key sustainability features of each proposed strategic option, and an important purpose of this initial assessment is to inform debate on the issues and assumptions involved, thereby assisting in the process of development and refinement of the strategic options.
- 1.3 It should be noted that a number of the strategic options are not mutually exclusive, and in some cases there are effects arising from the combination of one or more options. These aspects have been taken into account in the assessment.
- 1.4 This document has been prepared by Atkins Limited independently of ERYC.



*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

This page has been left intentionally blank.

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

## 2. PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS

- 2.1 The Core Strategy DPD Issues and Options paper sets out a range of key issues which the DPD aims to address, grouped under five main policy themes: Spatial Strategy; A Healthy and Balanced Housing Market; A Prosperous Economy; A High Quality Environment and A Strong and Health Community. For each issue, the Issues and Options paper includes a consultation question presented in an alpha-numerically numbered box. Each consultation question includes a set of one or more strategic options, numbered alphabetically.
- 2.2 A few of the options have been specified in the Issues and Options paper as ‘Do Nothing’ options. For the purpose of this SA assessment, a Do Nothing option is defined as the minimum required by regional and national guidance. The inclusion of a Do Nothing option allows the ‘business as usual’ or ‘without DPD implementation’ scenario to be assessed relative to the alternative strategic options presented. The alternative strategic options should aim to improve on the situation which would exist if there were no DPD; the inclusion of the Do Nothing option helps to test this.
- 2.3 For those issues where a Do Nothing option has not been explicitly defined in the Issues and Options paper, for the purpose of the SA assessment either: a) one of the presented options has been identified as the Do Nothing option; or b) a new option has been added to form the Do Nothing option.
- 2.4 The full set of options assessed as part of the SA is presented in Table 2.1. The options are grouped under the issue to which they relate, numbered as per the relevant consultation question in the Issue and Options paper.

**Table 2.1 - Strategic Policy Options**

Issue/ Option		Reason for not assessing the option, where necessary
<b>Spatial Strategy (SS)</b>		
<b>SS 1</b>	<b>Flood risk</b>	
A	Place high importance on allowing development in the high risk flood zone that would provide wider sustainability benefits.	
B	Do Nothing: Place low importance on allowing development in the high risk flood zone that would provide wider sustainability benefits.	
<b>SS 8</b>	<b>Rural areas</b>	
A	Identify those villages that perform an important role and where small-scale development may be	

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

Issue/ Option		Reason for not assessing the option, where necessary
	appropriate.	
B	Do Nothing: Do not identify those villages that perform an important service centre role.	
<b>SS 9</b>	<b>Distribution of Development</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Continue current trends - Proportion of development directed towards: Major Haltemprice settlements: 5% (low) Principal Towns: 35% (low) Local Service Centres: 45% (high) Rural Areas: 15% (medium)	
B	Focus on Haltemprice - Proportion of development directed towards: Major Haltemprice settlements: 15% (high) Principal Towns: 40% (medium) Local Service Centres: 35% (medium) Rural Areas: 10% (low)	
C	Strengthen the role of Haltemprice and the Principal Towns - Proportion of development directed towards: Major Haltemprice settlements: 10% (medium) Principal Towns: 50% (high) Local Service Centres: 30% (low) Rural Areas: 10% (low)	
D	Strengthen the role of Principal Towns - Proportion of development directed towards: Major Haltemprice settlements: 5% (low) Principal Towns: 55% (high) Local Service Centres: 30% (low) Rural Areas: 10% (low)	
<b>SS 10</b>	<b>Identifying 'areas of search'</b>	
<b>SS 10a</b>	<b>Major Haltemprice Settlements</b>	
A	North of Cottingham	
B	South of Cottingham	
C	North of Willerby	
D	West of Kirk Ella	
E	South of Anlaby	
F	North of Hessle	
G	West of Hessle	
<b>SS 10b</b>	<b>Beverley</b>	
A	North-west of Beverley	
B	South-west of Beverley	
C	South of Beverley	
D	North of Beverley	
<b>SS 10c</b>	<b>Bridlington</b>	

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

Issue/ Option		Reason for not assessing the option, where necessary
A	South of Bridlington	
B	West of Bridlington	
C	North of Easton Road (B1253)	
D	North-west of Bridlington	
E	North of Bridlington	
F	North- east of Bridlington	
<b>SS 10d</b>	<b>Driffield</b>	
A	Alamein Barracks	
B	South of Driffield	
C	South- east of Driffield	
D	North- east of Driffield	
E	Land East of Scarborough Road	
F	Land North of Little Driffield/ West of A614	
<b>SS 10e</b>	<b>Goole</b>	
A	West of Goole	
B	North of Goole (excludes playing fields)	
C	North- east of Goole/West of Hook (excludes public open space east of Ivy Park Road)	
D	South of Old Goole	
E	South-West of Goole	
<b>A Healthy and Balanced Housing Market (HBHM)</b>		
<b>HBHM 1</b>	<b>Mix of housing</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Provide for a mix on all new housing developments	
B	Only require a mix on sites that are over a certain size or number of dwellings (i.e. have site size thresholds)	
<b>HBHM 3</b>	<b>Percentage of affordable housing in new developments</b>	
A	Do Nothing: A blanket approach which is in line with the RSS recommendation of over 40%	
B	A tiered approach which would vary above and below the figure set by RSS, according to the needs of different areas	
<b>HBHM 4</b>	<b>Affordable housing thresholds</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Blanket Approach: Threshold set at 15 in all settlements and rural areas	
B	Threshold set at 15 in Haltemprice and Principal Towns, 5 in Lower Service Centres and rural areas	
C	Threshold set at 15 in Haltemprice and Principal Towns, 5 in Lower Service Centres and 3 in rural areas	
D	Threshold set at 10 in Haltemprice and Principal Towns, 5 in Lower Service Centres and 1 in rural	

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

Issue/ Option		Reason for not assessing the option, where necessary
	areas	
<b>HBHM 5</b>	<b>Affordable housing in rural areas</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Allow for affordable housing in all rural communities	
B	Develop an approach that directs affordable housing to the larger, more sustainable, rural settlements	
	An Alternative Approach	Insufficient detail to assess effectively
<b>HBHM 6</b>	<b>Efficient use of land</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Focus 30% of new housing development on Previously Developed Land	
B	Focus 40% of new housing development on Previously Developed Land	
	A different target	Insufficient detail to assess effectively
<b>HBHM 7</b>	<b>Housing density</b>	
A	Manage housing density using the approach outlined in Table 8 of the Core Strategy I and O paper	
B	Where justified, allow densities below the thresholds set out in Table 8 of the Core Strategy I and O paper	
C	Do Nothing: Approach recommended in PPS3	
<b>A Prosperous Economy (PE)</b>		
<b>PE 1</b>	<b>Employment development in smaller settlements and rural areas</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Allocate sites specifically for employment use	
B	Do not allocate sites and instead use a criteria based policy to assess planning applications	
	An alternative approach	Insufficient detail to assess effectively
<b>PE 2</b>	<b>Protecting existing employment areas</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Identify specific employment sites that should be protected from alternative forms of development	
B	Use a criteria based approach to assess planning applications	
	An alternative approach	Insufficient detail to assess effectively
<b>PE 3</b>	<b>Employment Clusters</b>	
A	Allocate sufficient land to facilitate the growth of key employment clusters	
B	Do Nothing	
<b>PE 4</b>	<b>Retention of rural buildings for employment use</b>	

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

Issue/ Option		Reason for not assessing the option, where necessary
A	High protection – all rural buildings should be retained for employment use	
B	Do Nothing: Medium protection – retain preference for employment use but allow residential conversions in appropriate circumstances	
<b>PE 5</b>	<b>Farm/rural diversification</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Maintain the current approach in determining planning applications relating to farm/rural diversification	
B	Provide greater flexibility for bringing forward schemes in rural areas where they meet the needs of the local economy	
<b>PE 7</b>	<b>Transport</b>	
A	Safeguard land for future development of the transportation network	
B	Do Nothing	
<b>PE 9</b>	<b>Grid- connected renewable energy targets</b>	
A	Treat the local targets as minimum targets, to be exceeded, with essentially an open door policy to all renewable energy development, provided it does not result in significant adverse environmental, economic or social impacts	
B	Treat the local 2021 target as a ceiling target. Once met, any additional development will need to demonstrate that no adverse cumulative effects arising from the additional development will be generated, before permission will be granted	
C	Do Nothing: Take a neutral approach to the targets, encouraging renewable development generally, and not taking any particular stance on managing the delivery of the generation targets	
<b>PE 10</b>	<b>Wind turbine location</b>	
A	An explicit presumption against development in highly sensitive areas	
B	An effects based approach	
C	Do Nothing	
<b>PE 11</b>	<b>Renewable energy targets of different types of renewable technologies</b>	
A	Actively promote the development of other forms of renewable energy	
B	Target policy and management of environmental effects to the currently dominant types of renewable energy development	
C	Do Nothing	

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

Issue/ Option		Reason for not assessing the option, where necessary
<b>A High Quality Environment (HQE)</b>		
<b>HQE 1</b>	<b>Sustainable buildings</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Allow developers to choose whether or not to achieve the sustainability standards set out in the Code/ BREEAM	
B	Require new development to achieve specified ratings against BREEAM/The Code	
<b>HQE 2</b>	<b>Minimum target for local renewable or low carbon energy for new development</b>	
A	10% figure is unrealistic and is not deliverable, and so the target should be lower	
B	Do Nothing: 10% figure is about right	
C	Target should be higher than 10%	
<b>HQE 3</b>	<b>Site thresholds for local renewable or low carbon energy targets for new development</b>	
A	Apply lower site size thresholds	
B	Do Nothing: Site size thresholds are about right	
C	Apply higher site size thresholds	
<b>HQE 4</b>	<b>Good Design</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Rely on national guidance to ensure high quality design in new development	
B	Develop locally specific design policy to ensure high quality design in new development	
<b>HQE 5</b>	<b>Built heritage</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Rely on national and regional policy/ guidance	
B	Establish a more specific local criteria based approach	
C	Identify aspects of our built heritage to protect with specific policies	
<b>HQE 6</b>	<b>Biodiversity</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Do the minimum required i.e. only to mitigate or compensate for any loss	
B	Place a high priority on ensuring that new development contributes more positively to the enhancement of biodiversity	
<b>HQE 7</b>	<b>Green Infrastructure</b>	
A	Do Nothing: Develop green infrastructure based on the recommendations of the RSS and the approach outlined in the I&O	
B	Find ways to extend and enhance further green	

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

<b>Issue/ Option</b>		<b>Reason for not assessing the option, where necessary</b>
	infrastructure provision in East Riding	
<b>HQE 8</b>	<b>Landscape</b>	
A	Define specific landscape/green space designations to support the protection of our highest quality landscapes and to prevent the merging of identified settlements	
B	Develop a criteria based policy that would offer sufficient protection to these identified areas (this could include consideration of the different reasons for protection)	
C	Do Nothing	
<b>HQE 9</b>	<b>Coastal erosion</b>	
A	Develop Roll Back policies to facilitate re-location of development threatened by coastal erosion	
B	Do Nothing: Accept that nature will take its course	
<b>A Strong and Healthy Community (SCH)</b>		
<b>SHC 1</b>	<b>Rural facilities</b>	
A	Protect rural facilities in all locations	
B	Do Nothing: Apply protection policies only in the settlements to be identified through the spatial strategy, and which serve a wider rural catchment	
<b>SHC 3</b>	<b>Surplus health, education and other community facilities</b>	
A	Retain the site (or part of it) of surplus community facilities for other forms of community use. If there is no demand for further community facilities the site could be used for other purposes	
B	Do Nothing: Let the market suggest how the site should be redeveloped	
<b>SHC 4</b>	<b>Surplus health, education and other community facilities</b>	
A	Support multi-purpose uses of buildings for service provision	
B	Do Nothing	
<b>SHC 6</b>	<b>Developer contributions</b>	
A	Require a lower developer contribution for developments on certain sites	
B	Do Nothing	



*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

This page has been left intentionally blank.

## **3. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT**

### **INTRODUCTION**

- 3.1 Potential sustainability effects for each of the options were assessed in terms of progress towards achieving the SA objectives, as developed during the scoping stage of the appraisal and documented in the SA Scoping Report, using a set of assessment tables, or matrices. The assessment used a broad-brush and qualitative approach, which is generally accepted as good practice by Government guidance on SA for the earlier strategic stages of the appraisal.
- 3.2 Table 3.1 presents a summary in graphical form of the results of the assessment of strategic options, while the sections below present a brief analysis of the results. The detailed tables setting out the assessment of strategic options will be included in the full SA Report.

### **RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT**

#### **General Observations**

- 3.3 Key general issues which emerged from the assessment are as follows:
- ◆ The majority of the options fail to address the issues raised under the following SA objectives (this is indicated either by a considerable number of ‘neutral/uncertain’ effects or ‘minor’ effects):
    - 2 - To reduce crime and the fear of crime;
    - 5 - To improve housing affordability;
    - 10 - To reduce waste arisings and the amount of waste sent to landfill;
    - 11 - To improve the quality of local fresh water resources; and
    - 16 - To protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings.
  - ◆ A significant proportion of the options performed poorly against the following SA objectives (this is indicated by considerably more significant negative effects being predicted against the SA objective than significant positive effects):
    - 9 - To encourage more efficient use of land; and
    - 15 - To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology.
  - ◆ Most of the options resulted in positive effects against the remaining SA objectives; however, some mixed results, consisting of significant adverse effects for some options and significant beneficial effects for other options, are noticeable against the following SA objectives:
    - 8 - To reduce the growth of road traffic;

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

- 12 - To reduce levels of atmospheric GHG by reducing emissions and increasing extent of carbon sinks; and
- 17 - To protect and enhance the countryside and landscape quality.

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

**Table 3.1 - Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options**

SA Objective	Issue SS 1		SS 8		SS 9				SS 10a						
	A	B	A	B	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1 To reduce health inequalities	2	-1	2	1	-1	1	2	2	1	1	-0.5	-0.5	1	1	-0.5
2 To reduce crime and the fear of crime	2	-1	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 To reduce social exclusion and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	2	-1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4 To improve accessibility and public transport links to key services and employment areas	2	-2	2	0	-2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2
5 To improve housing affordability	2	-1	-0.5	1	-0.5	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 To maintain overall levels of education and skills and retain local highly skilled labour	2	-1	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
7 To improve air quality	0	0	1	0	-2	-1	-1	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	-1
8 To reduce the growth of road traffic	0	0	1	0	-2	1	1	1	2	2	-1	-1	2	1	-1
9 To encourage more efficient use of land	3	-2	1	2	-0.5	2	3	3	-2	-1	-1	-2	-1	-1	-1
10 To reduce waste arisings and the amount of waste sent to landfill	0	0	0	0	-1	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 To improve the quality of local fresh water resources	1	-1	0	0	-2	-1	-1	-2	-3	-1	-2	-1	-2	0	0
12 To reduce levels of atmospheric GHG by reducing emissions and increasing extent of carbon sinks	0	0	1	1	-2	-1	-1	-1	2	2	1	1	2	1	-1
13 To minimise the impacts of climate change by developing in a way that reduces risk from flooding and coastal erosion	-1	3	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2
14 To reduce carbon based energy use by increasing energy efficiency and production of renewable energy	0	0	1	1	-2	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	-1
15 To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology	0	0	2	0	-1	1	2	2	-2	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	-2
16 To protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings	1	-1	1	1	-1	1	1	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17 To protect and enhance the countryside and landscape quality	3	-1	2	1	-0.5	1	3	3	-2	-1	-1	-1	-2	-2	-2
18 To maintain and strengthen the economy of East Riding	1	-2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
19 To increase diversity of employment	1	-2	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
20 To support the renaissance of rural areas	2	-1	2	-0.5	1	1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>-0.70</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>-0.63</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.03</b>

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

SA Objective	Issue SS 10b				SS 10c						SS 10d					
	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
1 To reduce health inequalities	2	2	1	1	1	1	-0.5	-1	-1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1
2 To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 To reduce social exclusion and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	2	1	1	2	1
4 To improve accessibility and public transport links to key services and employment areas	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	-1	-1	-2	2	-1	-1	1	-0.5
5 To improve housing affordability	0	0	0	0	-2	0	1	1	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 To maintain overall levels of education and skills and retain local highly skilled labour	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
7 To improve air quality	-1	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
8 To reduce the growth of road traffic	-2	-2	-1	-2	1	1	-1	-1	-2	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1
9 To encourage more efficient use of land	-2	-2	-1	-3	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-1	2	-1	-1	-2	-1	-2
10 To reduce waste arisings and the amount of waste sent to landfill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 To improve the quality of local fresh water resources	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	-2	-1	-1	1	0	-1
12 To reduce levels of atmospheric GHG by reducing emissions and increasing extent of carbon sinks	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-2	-2	-2	-2	-1	-2	-1	-2	-2	-1	-2
13 To minimise the impacts of climate change by developing in a way that reduces risk from flooding and coastal erosion	1	2	1	-2	2	2	2	2	2	2	-0.5	1	2	2	1	2
14 To reduce carbon based energy use by increasing energy efficiency and production of renewable energy	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-2	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	1	-1
15 To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-3	-2	-2	-2	-3	-2	-2	-1	-1	-2	-1
16 To protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings	0	-1	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	-1	0
17 To protect and enhance the countryside and landscape quality	-1	-1	0	0	-2	-3	-1	-2	-3	-3	-1	-2	-1	0	-2	-2
18 To maintain and strengthen the economy of East Riding	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	2
19 To increase diversity of employment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
20 To support the renaissance of rural areas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>-0.05</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>-0.25</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>-0.08</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>-0.40</b>	<b>-0.25</b>	<b>-0.28</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>-0.10</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>-0.13</b>

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

SA Objective	Issue SS 10e					HBHM 1		HBHM 3		HBHM 4				HBHM 5	
	A	B	C	D	E	A	B	A	B	A	B	C	D	A	B
1 To reduce health inequalities	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2
2 To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	1
3 To reduce social exclusion and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	1	2
4 To improve accessibility and public transport links to key services and employment areas	2	1	-1	-2	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	2
5 To improve housing affordability	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	3	3	3
6 To maintain overall levels of education and skills and retain local highly skilled labour	2	2	2	1	2	2	-1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1
7 To improve air quality	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1
8 To reduce the growth of road traffic	1	1	-1	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-0.5
9 To encourage more efficient use of land	-2	-3	-3	-3	-2	0	0	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 To reduce waste arisings and the amount of waste sent to landfill	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 To improve the quality of local fresh water resources	1	-2	-1	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 To reduce levels of atmospheric GHG by reducing emissions and increasing extent of carbon sinks	2	1	-1	-2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1
13 To minimise the impacts of climate change by developing in a way that reduces risk from flooding and coastal erosion	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 To reduce carbon based energy use by increasing energy efficiency and production of renewable energy	2	1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1
15 To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology	-1	-2	-1	-2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 To protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17 To protect and enhance the countryside and landscape quality	0	0	-1	-1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18 To maintain and strengthen the economy of East Riding	2	-2	-2	-2	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2
19 To increase diversity of employment	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2
20 To support the renaissance of rural areas	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	-2	1	1	2	2	3
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>-0.20</b>	<b>-0.60</b>	<b>-0.85</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>1.03</b>

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

SA Objective	Issue HBHM 6			HBHM 7			PE 1		PE 2		PE 3		PE 4		PE 5	
	A	B		A	B	C	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
	1 To reduce health inequalities	1	2		1	2	-1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1
2 To reduce crime and the fear of crime	1	2		1	-0.5	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
3 To reduce social exclusion and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	1	2		2	1	-1	0	1	-1	1	1	-1	1	1	-0.5	1
4 To improve accessibility and public transport links to key services and employment areas	1	2		2	1	-1	2	3	1	2	2	-2	1	0.75	2	-1
5 To improve housing affordability	1	-1		1	1	-1	0	0	-1	1	0	0	-1	1	1	1
6 To maintain overall levels of education and skills and retain local highly skilled labour	1	2		2	1	0	2	2	1	1	2	-1	2	1	1	2
7 To improve air quality	-1	1		2	1	-1	0	0	0	0	1	-1	-1	-0.75	1	-1
8 To reduce the growth of road traffic	-1	1		2	1	-1	1	2	0	0	1	-2	-1	-0.75	2	-2
9 To encourage more efficient use of land	2	3		3	2	-2	1	2	-1	2	2	-2	-1	2	1	-2
10 To reduce waste arisings and the amount of waste sent to landfill	1	2		1	-1	-2	0	0	0	0	1	-1	1	2	1	-1
11 To improve the quality of local fresh water resources	1	2		1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-0.75	0	-1
12 To reduce levels of atmospheric GHG by reducing emissions and increasing extent of carbon sinks	2	3		1	-1	-2	1	2	0	0	2	-1	-1	-0.75	1	-1
13 To minimise the impacts of climate change by developing in a way that reduces risk from flooding and coastal erosion	1	2		1	-1	-2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 To reduce carbon based energy use by increasing energy efficiency and production of renewable energy	2	3		1	-1	-2	1	2	0	0	2	-1	0	0	1	-1
15 To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology	2	3		2	1	-1	2	3	0	0	1	-1	-1	-0.75	0	0
16 To protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings	1	2		-0.5	-0.5	-1	1	2	0	0	1	-1	1	0.75	1	-1
17 To protect and enhance the countryside and landscape quality	2	3		-0.5	-0.5	-1	1	2	-1	1	1	-1	3	3	1	-1
18 To maintain and strengthen the economy of East Riding	1	1		1	1	-1	3	2	2	2	3	-2	2	2	1	2
19 To increase diversity of employment	0	0		1	1	-1	1	2	2	2	3	-1	2	1	1	2
20 To support the renaissance of rural areas	1	-1		1	2	-0.5	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	3	1	2
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.70</b>		<b>1.25</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>-1.18</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>1.35</b>	<b>-0.80</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

SA Objective	Issue PE 7		PE 10			PE 11			PE 12			HQE 1		HQE 2		
	A	B	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	A	B	C
1 To reduce health inequalities	1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
2 To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
3 To reduce social exclusion and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0
4 To improve accessibility and public transport links to key services and employment areas	3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0
5 To improve housing affordability	-0.5	1	0.75	0.75	0.75	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	-1	-1	-2	-2
6 To maintain overall levels of education and skills and retain local highly skilled labour	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2
7 To improve air quality	-1	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	2
8 To reduce the growth of road traffic	-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	3	0	0	0
9 To encourage more efficient use of land	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	-1	1	2	1	1	1	1
10 To reduce waste arisings and the amount of waste sent to landfill	0	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	2	0	0	0
11 To improve the quality of local fresh water resources	-2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
12 To reduce levels of atmospheric GHG by reducing emissions and increasing extent of carbon sinks	-2	-2	3	2	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	1	3	1	2	3
13 To minimise the impacts of climate change by developing in a way that reduces risk from flooding and coastal erosion	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0
14 To reduce carbon based energy use by increasing energy efficiency and production of renewable energy	-2	-2	3	2	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	1	3	1	2	3
15 To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology	-1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	2
16 To protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings	-1	1	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-2	2	-1	-1	-1	3	0	0	0
17 To protect and enhance the countryside and landscape quality	-1	1	-2	-1	-1	-1	-2	-2	1	-1	-1	1	3	-1	-1	-2
18 To maintain and strengthen the economy of East Riding	3	-2	2	1	1	2	2	-0.5	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	-0.5
19 To increase diversity of employment	2	-1	2	1	1	1	1	-0.5	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
20 To support the renaissance of rural areas	1	-1	2	1	1	1	1	-0.5	1	-0.5	-0.5	1	2	0	0	0
<b>Average</b>	<b>-0.23</b>	<b>-0.55</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>-0.08</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.48</b>



Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

SA Objective	Issue HQE 3			HQE 4		HQE 5			HQE 6		HQE 7		HQE 8		
	A	B	C	A	B	A	B	C	A	B	A	B	A	B	C
1 To reduce health inequalities	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	2	1	0
2 To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0
3 To reduce social exclusion and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0
4 To improve accessibility and public transport links to key services and employment areas	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	-1	-1	1
5 To improve housing affordability	-2	-2	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1
6 To maintain overall levels of education and skills and retain local highly skilled labour	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
7 To improve air quality	2	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
8 To reduce the growth of road traffic	0	0	0	2	3	-1	-1	-1	0	0	-0.5	-0.5	0	0	0
9 To encourage more efficient use of land	1	1	1	2	1	-1	-2	-2	1	2	2	3	2	1	-1
10 To reduce waste arisings and the amount of waste sent to landfill	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 To improve the quality of local fresh water resources	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	2	-1
12 To reduce levels of atmospheric GHG by reducing emissions and increasing extent of carbon sinks	3	2	1	1	3	-1	-0.5	-0.5	1	2	1	1	1	1	-1
13 To minimise the impacts of climate change by developing in a way that reduces risk from flooding and coastal erosion	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	2	1	-1
14 To reduce carbon based energy use by increasing energy efficiency and production of renewable energy	3	2	1	1	3	-2	-0.5	-0.5	0	0	2	2	-1	-1	1
15 To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology	2	1	1	1	3	-0.5	1	1	1	3	2	3	3	2	1
16 To protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings	0	0	0	-1	3	1	3	3	0	1	2	2	2	1	-1
17 To protect and enhance the countryside and landscape quality	-2	-1	-1	1	3	1	2	2	-0.5	3	2	3	3	2	-2
18 To maintain and strengthen the economy of East Riding	-0.5	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	-0.5	1	1	1	1	-1
19 To increase diversity of employment	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1
20 To support the renaissance of rural areas	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	-0.5	-0.5	2	2	2	3	-1
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>-0.03</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>1.53</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>-0.30</b>

Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options

SA Objective	Issue HQE 9		SCH 3		SCH 5		SCH 6		SCH 8	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
	1 To reduce health inequalities	2	-2	2	-1	2	-2	2	1	2
2 To reduce crime and the fear of crime	0	0	-0.5	-1	2	-1	2	1	0	0
3 To reduce social exclusion and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	0	0	1	-1	2	-2	2	1	1	-1
4 To improve accessibility and public transport links to key services and employment areas	0	0	2	-1	3	-2	3	2	1	-1
5 To improve housing affordability	1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	-1	-1	2	-1
6 To maintain overall levels of education and skills and retain local highly skilled labour	0	0	2	-2	3	-1	2	1	1	-1
7 To improve air quality	0	0	1	-1	1	-0.5	2	1	0	0
8 To reduce the growth of road traffic	0	0	1	-1	2	-0.5	3	2	1	-1
9 To encourage more efficient use of land	1	0	-1	1	2	3	2	2	3	-2
10 To reduce waste arisings and the amount of waste sent to landfill	0	0	-1	-0.5	1	-1	1	1	-1	1
11 To improve the quality of local fresh water resources	-1	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	1	-1
12 To reduce levels of atmospheric GHG by reducing emissions and increasing extent of carbon sinks	1	0	1	-1	1	0	2	2	0	0
13 To minimise the impacts of climate change by developing in a way that reduces risk from flooding and coastal erosion	3	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 To reduce carbon based energy use by increasing energy efficiency and production of renewable energy	1	-1	0	-2	1	-1	1	1	0	0
15 To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats, and to conserve geology	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-0.5
16 To protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings	0	0	0	0	1	-1	0	0	0	0
17 To protect and enhance the countryside and landscape quality	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	-1
18 To maintain and strengthen the economy of East Riding	2	0	-2	2	1	2	1	1	2	-2
19 To increase diversity of employment	0	0	1	-1	1	1	1	1	0	0
20 To support the renaissance of rural areas	1	-1	1	-1	2	1	1	1	1	-1
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>-0.40</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>-0.53</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>-0.20</b>	<b>1.20</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>-0.63</b>

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

## Scoring of Options Assessment

3	+++	Major positive - likely to result in substantial progress towards the objective
2	++	Medium positive - likely to result in some progress towards the objective
1	+	Minor positive - likely to result in very limited progress towards the objective
0	0	Neutral outcome
-0.5	+/-	Range of possible positive and negative outcomes
0	?	Uncertain outcome
-1	-	Minor negative - likely to be to the very limited detriment of achieving the objective
-2	--	Medium negative - likely to be to the limited detriment of achieving the objective
-3	---	Major negative - likely to be substantially detrimental to achieving the objective

For the purposes of analysing the results of the assessment, significant effects are those that result in major or medium negative or positive effects.

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

**Issue SS 1 - Flood risk**

- 3.4 Of the two options assessed under this heading, Option A performs considerably better than Option B overall. Option A, is expected to result in nine significant beneficial effects, and only one minor negative effects, with no significant negative effects. Option B, which is regarded as the Do Nothing option, results in four significant negative effects, nine minor negative effects and only one significant beneficial effect. Option B performs poorly against the majority of the SA objectives because it is expected to limit development in flood risk areas thus restricting the possibility of beneficial development. It is expected to only benefit SA objective 13 (*Minimise flooding and coastal erosion*).

**Issue SS 8 – Rural areas**

- 3.5 Both of the options assessed under this heading are expected to have overall positive effects against the SA objectives. However, Option A is expected to result in six significant beneficial effects, whilst Option B, which is the Do Nothing option, is expected to result in only three beneficial effects. The approach adopted by Option A is expected to ensure developments are located in sustainable locations and balance the needs of the community and the character of the natural landscape and settings with economic growth and development. This is reflected in the option's stronger performance against the following SA objectives: 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 15 (*Enhance biodiversity*), 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*), 18 (*Maintain the local economy*) and 20 (*Support rural areas*). There is some uncertainty over the effect of Option B on some of the SA objectives at this stage; the likely outcomes depend on the final scope of the criteria.

**Issue SS 9 – Distribution of development**

- 3.6 Of the four options assessed under this heading, Options B and C perform better than the others overall. Neither of these options is expected to result in significant adverse effects and both result in numerous significant positive effects. Most of the benefits associated with these options are a result of focusing development in larger settlements and restricting development in more rural areas and smaller settlements. This approach is expected to have particular benefits for SA objectives relating to crime, social exclusion, accessibility, education and skills, land efficiency, local economy and employment opportunities (SA objectives 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 18 and 19 respectively). In contrast, Option A, which promotes higher proportions of development in rural areas and Local Service Centres, performs particularly poorly against SA objectives 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 7 (*Maintain air quality*), 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 11 (*Improve water quality*), 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*) and 14 (*Reduce carbon based energy*).

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

**Issue SS 10 – Identifying ‘areas of search’**

**10a - Major Haltemprice Settlements**

3.7 All seven options assessed under this heading are expected to result in overall beneficial effects against the SA objectives, with Options B and E performing better than the others. It is worthy of note that all of the options are expected to perform equally well against SA objectives 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 6, (*Maintain education and skills*), 13 (*Minimise impacts of climate change*), 18 (*Maintain the local economy*) and 19 (*Increase employment diversity*) and result in negative effects against SA objectives 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*), 15 (*Enhance biodiversity*) and 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*), although to differing degrees. Option G performs least well with several minor adverse effects, two significant adverse effects, against SA objectives 15 (*Enhance biodiversity*) and 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*) and only three significant beneficial effects, against SA objectives 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 6 (*Maintain education and skills*) and 13 (*Maintain the local economy*) and 18 (*Maintain the local economy*). The following SA objectives are expected to be affected in a range of different ways and degrees as a result of the spatial element of the options: 7 (*Maintain air quality*), 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 11 (*Improve water quality*), 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*) and 14 (*Reduce carbon based energy*).

**10b – Beverley**

3.8 Option C performs better overall against the SA objectives than Options A, B and D, which result in overall negative or neutral scores against the SA objectives. Option C is expected to significantly benefit SA objectives 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 6 (*Maintain education and skills*) and 18 (*Maintain the local economy*). All of the options are considered to represent poor use of land in terms of efficiency (SA objective 9). All options are expected to increase road traffic (SA objective 8) and result in a deterioration of air quality (SA objective 7) as well as negatively affecting biodiversity (SA objective 15).

**10c – Bridlington**

3.9 Of the six options assessed under this heading, only Option A results in positive effects overall against the SA objectives. Options A and F result in four significant beneficial effects each, while Options B, C, D and E result in three. Option E results in the most significant negative effects (six), while Option C results in the least (three). The outcome of the assessment illustrates that there are not expected to be large differences in the options’ performance in terms of overall sustainability. All options are expected to have significant adverse effects against SA objectives 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*) and 15 (*Enhance biodiversity*) and most of them against 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*). All the options are expected to significantly benefit SA objectives 6 (*Maintain education and skills*) and 13 (*Minimise flooding and*

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

*coastal erosion*) and most of them should significantly benefit SA objective 18 (*Maintain the local economy*).

**10d – Driffield**

- 3.10 Of the six options assessed under this heading, Option A performs the worst, but the differences between the performance of each option are not great. Option B performs marginally better overall, with four significant positive effects against SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*) and 6 (*Maintain education and skills*). All of the options are expected to have adverse effects against SA objectives 7 (*Maintain air quality*), 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*), 15 (*Enhance biodiversity*) and most of them against SA objective 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*), but should have some benefits for SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 6 (*Maintain education and skills*), 18 (*Maintain the local economy*) and 19 (*Increase employment diversity*).

**10e – Goole**

- 3.11 Options A and E under this heading are expected to result in overall positive effects, while Options B, C and D result in overall negative effects. All the options are expected to result in some, although mostly minor, positive effects for SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 6 (*Maintain education and skills*) and 19 (*Increase employment diversity*). Significant adverse effects are predicted against SA objectives 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*) and 13 (*Minimise flooding and coastal erosion*), which is owing to the high quality of agricultural land in the area as well as the high flood risk. It is worth noting that Options B, C and D are expected to result in significant adverse effects for the local economy (SA objective 18), while Options A and E are expected to benefit this objective.

**Issue HBHM 1 - Mix of housing**

- 3.12 Under this heading, it is Option A, the Do Nothing option, that performs best, resulting in 10 significant beneficial effects and no significant adverse effects, giving a strong overall score against the SA objectives. These effects are recorded against all of the social (1-6) and economic SA objectives (18-20) and SA objective 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*) while no effects are predicted against the rest of the environmental SA objectives (7 -16). Option B is expected to have minor beneficial effects against the economic SA objectives and mostly beneficial effects against the social SA objectives.

**Issue HBHM 3 - Percentage of affordable housing in new developments**

- 3.13 Of the two options under this heading, Option B performs best with eight significant beneficial effects against most of the social SA objectives: 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 2 (*Reduce crime*), 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 5 (*Improve housing affordability*) and 6 (*Maintain education and skills*) and all of the economic SA objectives (18 – 20). Option A, which is considered to be the Do Nothing option, is

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

expected to result in two significant positive effects against SA objectives 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*) and 5 (*Improve housing affordability*). Neither option is expected to produce significant adverse effects and have no effects against the environmental SA objectives except for minor effects against SA objective 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*)

**Issue HBHM 4 - Affordable housing thresholds**

- 3.14 All four of the options under this heading are expected to result in overall positive effects for the SA objectives. Option D performs best with eight significant positive effects; the reason for this is because the option presents a range of threshold levels appropriate for the needs of different areas. In contrast, Option A, which promotes a common threshold for all areas, is expected to significantly negatively affect rural renaissance (SA objective 22) because it is not expected to result in enough affordable housing in rural areas. Setting thresholds for the provision of affordable housing is expected to benefit social and economic sustainability, which is reflected in all the options' positive performance against these SA objectives: 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 2 (*Reduce crime*), 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 5 (*Improve housing affordability*), 6 (*Maintain education and skills*), 18 (*Maintain the local economy*) and 19 (*Increase employment diversity*).

**Issue HBHM 5 - Affordable housing in rural areas**

- 3.15 Option B, which aims to direct affordable housing to larger, more sustainable rural settlements is expected to result in a number of positive effects against the SA objectives. Significant beneficial effects are predicted for those SA objectives relating to health, social exclusion, accessibility, housing affordability, local economy, job opportunities and rural renaissance (SA objectives 1, 3, 4, 5, 18, 19 and 20 respectively). Option A, which is considered to be the Do Nothing option, is expected to result in several positive effects but also a number of minor negative effects in relation to a possible increase in traffic volumes associated with affordable housing being located in harder to reach areas: SA objectives 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 7 (*Maintain air quality*) 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*) and 14 (*Reduce carbon based energy*).

**Issue HBHM 6 - Efficient use of land**

- 3.16 Both of the options under this heading are expected to result in overall beneficial effects for the SA objectives, although Option B performs better than Option A, which is the Do Nothing option. Option B results in a total of 14 significant beneficial effects and only two minor adverse effects, which demonstrates that the use of previously developed land for new developments has a range of sustainability benefits across the social, environmental and economic SA objectives.

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

**Issue HBHM 7 - Housing density**

- 3.17 Option A under this heading promotes the highest levels of housing density across the area, and for this reason is expected to bring a range of significant benefits to the following SA objectives: 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 6 (*Maintain education and skills*), 7 (*Maintain air quality*), 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*) and 15 (*Enhance biodiversity*). Allowing lower densities within certain developments, as promoted by Option B, is expected to result in overall positive sustainability effects but with a range of minor adverse effects. Option C, the Do Nothing option, results in two significant beneficial effects, against SA objectives 6 (*Maintain education and skills*) and 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*) and no adverse effects.

**Issue PE 1 - Employment development in smaller settlements and rural areas**

- 3.18 Both of the options under this heading are expected to produce overall sustainability benefits against the SA objectives. The implementation of a criteria based approach (Option B) is expected to be more effective in benefiting the SA objectives than allocating specific employment sites (Option A). Thirteen significant positive effects are expected to result from Option B, while Option A is expected to produce five significant positive effects. Some notable differences in the outcome of these approaches relate to issues of transportation and accessibility; the criteria based approach is expected to be more effective in ensuring that accessibility is considered when deciding on the appropriate land use.

**Issue PE 2 - Protecting existing employment areas**

- 3.19 Option B under this heading promotes the use of a criteria based approach to protecting existing employment areas, whereas Option A aims to safeguard existing allocated land for employment and restrict other types of land use on these sites. It is the more flexible approach under Option B which is expected to result in more benefits for the SA objectives, with notable significant beneficial effects for the economic SA objectives (18, 19 and 20). It is also expected to result in more efficient use of land (SA objective 9) and development on sites which are appropriately accessible for the type of land use seeking planning application (SA objective 4).

**Issue PE 3 - Employment clusters**

- 3.20 The two options under this heading result in markedly different effects against the SA objectives. Option A is expected to result in overall positive effects, while Option B, the Do Nothing option, is expected to result in overall negative effects. Significant beneficial effects are predicted as a result of Option A against SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 6 (*Maintain education and skills*), 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*), 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*), 14 (*Reduce carbon based energy*), 18 (*Maintain the local economy*), 19 (*Increase employment diversity*) and 20 (*Support rural areas*). Option B is expected to result in significant adverse effects against SA objectives 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*),
-



*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*) and 18 (*Maintain the local economy*). It is clear from the assessment that land allocations to support key employment clusters, as advocated by Option A, are expected to greatly benefit the economic SA objectives (18, 19 and 20).

**Issue PE 4 - Retention of rural buildings for employment use**

- 3.21 Both options under this heading are expected to result in overall positive results against the SA objectives. Option B, which is the Do Nothing option, performs marginally better than Option A, but both result in five significant beneficial effects and no significant adverse effects. Both are expected to significantly benefit SA objectives 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*), 18 (*Maintain the local economy*) and 20 (*Support rural areas*). In addition, Option A is expected to significantly benefit SA objectives 6 (*Maintain education and skills*) and 19 (*Increase employment diversity*), while Option B should significantly benefit SA objectives 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*) and 10 (*Reduce waste arisings*).

**Issue PE 5 - Farm/rural diversification**

- 3.22 Of the two options assessed under this heading, Option A, which is the Do Nothing option, performs markedly better than Option B overall. While Option A results in no negative effects, Option B results in a majority of negative effects. However, the detailed results reveal a more mixed picture: Option A results in only two significant beneficial effects (4 - *Improve accessibility to services* and 8 - *Reduce traffic growth*) and no significant adverse effects, while Option B results in four significant beneficial effects (6 - *Maintain education and skills*, 18 - *Maintain the local economy*, 19 - *Increase employment diversity* and 20 - *Support rural areas*) but also two significant adverse effects (8 - *Reduce traffic growth*, 9 - *Encourage efficient land use*).

**Issue PE 7 - Transport**

- 3.23 Both of these options are expected to result in overall negative effects for the SA objectives. Option A performs better with five significant adverse effects, against SA objectives 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*), 11 (*Improve water quality*), 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*) and 14 (*Reduce carbon based energy*) and three significant beneficial effects, against SA objectives 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 18 (*Maintain the local economy*) and 19 (*Increase employment diversity*). Option B, however, is expected to result in six significant adverse effects against SA objectives 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 7 (*Maintain air quality*), 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*), 14 (*Reduce carbon based energy*) and 18 (*Maintain the local economy*), and no significant positive effects.

**Issue PE 9 - Grid-connected renewable energy targets**

- 3.24 The three options assessed under this heading are expected to perform in a similar manner to each other in terms of sustainability. Option A is expected to result in the most significant beneficial effects (seven) but also the most significant adverse

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

effects (two). This option, which supports an open door policy towards all renewable energy development, is expected to significantly benefit SA objectives 6 (*Maintain education and skills*), 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*), 14 (*Reduce carbon based energy*), 15 (*Enhance biodiversity*), 18 (*Maintain the local economy*), 19 (*Increase employment diversity*) and 20 (*Support rural areas*). Options B and C are predicted to also benefit these SA objectives but not to such a significant extent. All three options are predicted to negatively affect SA objectives relating to road traffic, waste arisings, biodiversity, heritage assets and their settings and landscape quality (SA objectives 8, 10, 15, and 17 respectively); these effects are associated with the construction and land take of potential renewable energy developments.

**Issue PE 10 - Wind turbine locations**

- 3.25 Under this heading, Options A and B are expected to result in similar effects as each other with overall beneficial performance against the SA objectives. Option B does result in the most significant beneficial effects, which are predicted against the following SA objectives: 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*), 14 (*Reduce carbon based energy*) and 18 (*Maintain the local economy*). All three options are expected to have adverse effects, although mostly considered to be minor, against SA objectives 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 10 (*Reduce waste arisings*), 16 (*Enhance heritage assets*) and 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*), which are related to the potential increase in traffic and waste associated with construction, as well as potential negative effects on the landscape, which are somewhat inevitable with developments of this nature. Few direct effects are predicted for the social SA objectives as a result of these three options.

**Issue PE 11 - Renewable energy targets of different types of renewable technologies**

- 3.26 Option A under this heading performs notably better than the other two options. It results in five significant positive effects against SA objectives 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*), 14 (*Reduce carbon based energy*), 15 (*Enhance biodiversity*), 16 (*Enhance heritage assets*) and 18 (*Maintain the local economy*). The only negative effects associated with these three options are considered to be minor and no direct effects are expected for the social SA objectives.

**Issue HQE 1 - Sustainable buildings**

- 3.27 Of the two options assessed under this heading, Option B performs notably better than Option A with 16 significant positive effects predicted against a range of social, environmental and economic SA objectives. This may not be surprising as the option seeks a requirement that all new developments achieve specified sustainability standards. In comparison, Option A, which is the Do Nothing option, is expected to result in six significant beneficial effects for SA objectives 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 7 (*Maintain air quality*), 8 (*Reduce*

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

*traffic growth*), 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*) and 13 (*Minimise impacts of climate change*).

**Issue HQE 2 - Minimum target for local renewable or low carbon energy for new development**

- 3.28 The three options under this heading are expected to have no direct effects on the majority of the social SA objectives, with the exception of SA objectives 5 (*Improve housing affordability*) and 6 (*Maintain education and skills*). Option C, which suggests a target higher than 10%, performs best overall with five significant beneficial effects, (6 - *Maintain education and skills*, 7 - *Maintain air quality*, 12 - *Reduce GHG emissions*, 14 - *Reduce carbon based energy* and 15 - *Enhance biodiversity*), all of which are environmental SA objectives, but also two significant adverse effects against SA objectives 5 (*Improve housing affordability*) and 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*). Option A, which advocates a lower target for renewables, performs worst overall and is expected to result in no significant beneficial or adverse effects. Option B, which is the Do Nothing option, is expected to result in three significant beneficial effects (12 - *Reduce GHG emissions*, 14 - *Reduce carbon based energy* and 18 - *Reduce waste arisings*) and one significant adverse effect against SA objective 5 (*Improve housing affordability*).

**Issue HQE 3 - Site thresholds for local renewable or low carbon energy targets for new development**

- 3.29 The overall performance against the SA objectives across the three options under this issue mirrors that for Issue HQE 2. Option A performs best, resulting in five significant beneficial effects (6 - *Maintain education and skills*, 7 - *Maintain air quality*, 12 - *Reduce GHG emissions*, 14 - *Reduce carbon based energy* and 15 - *Enhance biodiversity*). Option B, which is the Do Nothing option, results in three significant beneficial effects (12 - *Reduce GHG emissions*, 14 - *Reduce carbon based energy* and 18 - *Reduce waste arisings*) and Option C, which performs worst overall, in none. Most of these significant effects are against the environmental SA objectives. Few of the social SA objectives are expected to be affected by the options, except SA objectives 5 (*Improve housing affordability*) and 6 (*Maintain education and skills*), which have negative and positive affects respectively as a result of all the options. All the options are predicted to adversely affect SA objective 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*), although only Option A affects it significantly.

**Issue HQE 4 - Good design**

- 3.30 Both Option A and B perform well against the SA objectives, with eight and 16 significant beneficial effects respectively. The performance of Option B is particularly strong, with major positive effects against SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*) and 7 (*Maintain air quality*), 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 10 – 18 (*Reduce waste arisings*, *Improve water quality*, *Reduce GHG emissions*, *Minimise impacts of climate change*,

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

*Reduce carbon based energy, Enhance biodiversity, Enhance heritage assets and Enhance landscape quality respectively) which demonstrates that high quality design in new developments is expected to strongly benefit most social and environmental SA objectives. Some beneficial effects are also expected against two of the economic SA objectives: 18 (Maintain the local economy) and 20 (Support rural areas).*

**Issue HQE 5 - Built heritage**

- 3.31 Options B and C under this heading perform in a similar manner and are expected to result in overall positive effects against the SA objectives. These options are expected to result in significant positive effects for SA objectives 16 (*Enhance heritage assets*), 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*), 18 (*Maintain the local economy*) and 20 (*Support rural areas*) and significant adverse effects for SA objective 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*). Option A, which is identified as the Do Nothing option, performs less well with overall negative effects predicted. This assessment illustrates that options which include specific policies relating to the built environment formulated at the local level are expected to be more beneficial for sustainability than higher level policies. All three of the options are expected to have some negative effects against SA objectives 5 (*Improve housing affordability*), 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*), 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*) and 14 (*Reduce carbon based energy*), although some of these are expected to be very minor.

**Issue HQE 6 - Biodiversity**

- 3.32 The two options under this heading are expected to result in overall positive effects for the SA objectives. Option B performs better than Option A with nine significant positive effects predicted against a range of social, environmental and economic SA objectives. It is worthy of note that it is only Option B which results in a significant beneficial effect against the SA objective that relates to biodiversity (SA objective 15). No significant adverse effects are predicted as a result of any of these options.

**Issue HQE 7 - Green infrastructure**

- 3.33 Both of the options under this heading perform well against the SA objectives: Option B is predicted to result in 11 significant beneficial effects and Option A in 10. No significant adverse effects are predicted as a result of these options. Option B performs better than Option A because it seeks to extend and enhance further green infrastructure provision within the area, which results in major positive effects for SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 4 (*Improve housing affordability*), 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*), 11 (*Improve water quality*), 13 (*Minimise flooding and coastal erosion*), 15 (*Enhance biodiversity*), 16 (*Enhance heritage assets*) and 17 (*Enhance landscape quality*).

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

**Issue HQE 8 - Landscape**

- 3.34 Options A and B are expected to result in overall beneficial effects for the SA objectives, while Option C is expected to result in negative effects overall. Option A performs best with eight significant beneficial effects and no significant adverse effects. It is worth noting that Options A and B are expected to benefit the SA objective relating to landscape quality (SA objective 17) while Option C, which is the Do Nothing option, is expected to result in significant adverse effects against this objective. A similar result is also predicted for SA objective 20 relating to rural renaissance, which is expected to be closely linked to the protection of the natural landscape.

**Issue HQE 9 - Coastal erosion**

- 3.35 The two options assessed under this heading are expected to perform in opposing manners. Option A is predicted to be beneficial for sustainability while Option B is expected to bring overall negative effects. Three significant beneficial effects are predicted as a result of Option A against SA objectives related to health, flood risk and coastal erosion, and the local economy (SA objectives 1, 13 and 18 respectively). Option B, however, is expected to significantly affect negatively SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*) and 13 (*Minimise flooding and coastal erosion*).

**Issue SHC 3 - Rural facilities**

- 3.36 Of the two options assessed under this heading, Option A is expected to produce overall positive effects although it results in only three significant positive effects, against SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 4 (*Improve housing affordability*) and 6 (*Maintain education and skills*). Option B produces a range of negative effects and only one significant positive effect each against SA objective 18 (*Maintain the local economy*); interestingly, Option A produces a significant adverse effect against this SA objective.

**Issue SHC 5 - Surplus health, education and other community facilities**

- 3.37 Option A is expected to result in overall beneficial effects for the SA objectives with eight significant beneficial effects against the social SA objectives: 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 2 (*Reduce crime*), 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*) and 6 (*Maintain education and skills*), but also for the SA objectives relating to the growth of road traffic and efficient use of land (SA objectives 8 and 9 respectively). Option B, which is considered to be the Do Nothing option, is expected to result in overall negative effects with two significant beneficial effects, against SA objectives 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*) and 18 (*Maintain the local economy*), and three significant adverse effects, against SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*) and 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*). This reflects the concern that whilst there may be some economic benefits to market led development, it is expected that it could fail to benefit the social SA objectives.

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

**Issue SHC 4 - Surplus health, education and other community facilities**

- 3.38 Options A and B are both expected to result in overall positive effects for the SA objectives. Option A performs better with nine significant positive effects against SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 2 (*Reduce crime*), 3 (*Reduce social exclusion*), 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 6 (*Maintain education and skills*), 7 (*Maintain air quality*), 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*) and 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*). Option B results in only four significant beneficial effects against SA objectives 4 (*Improve accessibility to services*), 8 (*Reduce traffic growth*), 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*), 12 (*Reduce GHG emissions*), but neither results in significant negative effects.

**Issue SHC 6 - Developer contributions**

- 3.39 Of the two options assessed under this heading, Option A performs significantly better than Option B, which is expected to result in overall negative effects for the SA objectives. Option A, which encourages the remediation of contaminated land sites by reducing developer contributions, is expected to result in significant beneficial effects against SA objectives 1 (*Reduce health inequalities*), 5 (*Improve housing affordability*), 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*) and 18 (*Maintain the local economy*) and no significant adverse effects. Option B, which is the Do Nothing option, is expected to result in two significant adverse effects for SA objectives 9 (*Encourage efficient land use*) and 18 (*Maintain the local economy*).

*Summary of Assessment of Strategic Options*

---

This page has been left intentionally blank.

Atkins is an international Design, Engineering & Management Consultancy. Our clients choose Atkins to plan, design and enable their major projects across a wide range of disciplines both in the UK and overseas.

We are the largest engineering consultancy in the UK and the largest multi-disciplinary consultancy in Europe. Our unrivalled reputation rests on the skills of the 15,000 specialists within the organisation.

Our clients are varied and include governments, local and regional authorities, funding agencies and commercial and industrial enterprises. We help our clients to realise their objectives by developing and delivering practical solutions, adding value to their businesses through the application of our experience, innovative thinking and state-of-the-art technology.

**Atkins Limited**

5th Floor, Milford House  
1 Milford Street  
Swindon  
Wiltshire SN1 1DW

**Contact:** Mark Hewlett  
**Telephone number:** +44 (0) 1793 516961  
**Fax number:** +44 (0) 1793 516916

**Email:** [mark.hewlett@atkinsglobal.com](mailto:mark.hewlett@atkinsglobal.com)  
**Web address:** [www.atkinsglobal.com/environment](http://www.atkinsglobal.com/environment)

**ATKINS**