



## STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS CORE STRATEGY SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

This document is available in large copy prints, audio cassette, Braille or languages other than English. If you require the document in one of these formats please contact:

Forward Plans,  
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council,  
Moorlands House,  
Stockwell Street,  
Leek,  
ST13 6HQ.

Tel: 01538 395570



## CONTENTS

### PART I – Non Technical Summary

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy	4
3.	Core Strategy Spatial Objectives	4
4.	Sustainability Appraisal of the Initial Options	5
5.	Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Option & Broad Locations	6
6.	Sustainability Appraisal of the Submission Version & Broad Locations	7
7.	Sustainability Appraisal of the Addendum to the Submission Version & Broad Locations	7
8.	Sustainability Appraisal of the Revised Submission Version & Broad Locations	8
9.	Sustainability Appraisal of the Main Modifications	9
10.	Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Summary	9

### PART II – Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy

Section A	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	13
Section B	Options Stage	15
Section C	Preferred Option and Broad Locations	21
Section D	Submission Version	25
Section E	Addendum to Submission Version	32
Section F	Revised Submission Stage	38
Section G	Modifications Stage	44
Section H	List of Core Strategy Policies	50
Section I	Compatibility of the Plan (Spatial) Objectives against SA Objectives	51
Section J	Compatibility of Plan (Spatial) Objectives with each other	53

<b>Section K</b>	<b>Compatibility of Components of the Core Strategy with Each Other</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Section L</b>	<b>Assessment of the Components of the Core Strategy against SA Objectives</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Section M</b>	<b>Assessment of the Components of the Core Strategy – Cumulative Effects</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Section N</b>	<b>Summary of Assessment</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Section O</b>	<b>Sustainability Assessment of Broad Locations</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Section P</b>	<b>Problems Encountered/Issues Identified</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>Section Q</b>	<b>Equality Impact Assessment</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>Section R</b>	<b>Sign-Posting to Information Required by the SEA Directive</b>	<b>144</b>
<b>Section S</b>	<b>Quality Assurance Check</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>Section T</b>	<b>Implementation of the Core Strategy</b>	<b>148</b>

# STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS CORE STRATEGY SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

---

## PART I – Non Technical Summary

---

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 The District Council is required to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as an integral part of the production of the Core Strategy. SA's help to predict the environmental and socio-economic effects of policies and proposals of a plan and are used to inform decisions on plan preparation.
- 1.2 This Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report documents the role of the SA in developing, refining and choosing between options at each stage of the plans preparation. Key officers and outside bodies have been closely involved with preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal.

### 2. Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy

- 2.1 As part of the Development Plan Document pre-production stage, the District Council published a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Development Framework (LDF). This forms the key document in the first stage of the SA. The Report helps to set the context of the LDF, define its objectives, establish a baseline and decide on the scope and level of detail required of the Sustainability Appraisal, to ensure that sustainability concerns will be taken into account throughout production of the LDF. A copy of the Scoping Report can be viewed on the District Council's website.

### 3. Core Strategy Spatial Objectives

- 3.1 11 key objectives have been specifically identified for the Core Strategy. The objectives set out the desired outcomes the Council will aim to achieve through implementation of the document. These objectives were amended as a result of the Issues and Options consultation, Draft Preferred Options consultation and at the Revised Submission Stage to reflect the latest Government Legislation and guidelines.
  1. To make provision for the overall land-use requirements for the District, consistent with national and regional policy, local evidence, the role of Staffordshire Moorlands within North Staffordshire and the role of each settlement.

2. To create a District where development minimises its impact on the environment, helps to mitigate and adapt to the adverse effects of climate change and makes efficient use of resources.
3. To develop and diversify in a sustainable manner the District's economy and meet local employment needs in the towns and villages.
4. To provide new housing that is affordable, desirable, well-designed and meets the needs of residents of the Moorlands.
5. To ensure the long-term vitality and viability of the three market towns of Leek, Biddulph and Cheadle.
6. To maintain and promote sustainable regenerated rural areas and communities with access to employment opportunities, housing and services for all.
7. To support and enhance the tourism, cultural, recreation and leisure opportunities for the District's residents and visitors.
8. To promote local distinctiveness by means of good design and the conservation, protection and enhancement of historic, environmental and cultural assets throughout the District.
9. To protect and improve the character and distinctiveness of the countryside and its landscape, biodiversity and geological resources.
10. To deliver sustainable, inclusive, healthy and safe communities.
11. To reduce the need to travel or make it safer and easier to travel by more sustainable forms of transport.

## 4. Sustainability Appraisal of the Initial Options

- 4.1 Seven Spatial Options were generated in response to issues identified during the evidence gathering stage of the Core Strategy. These looked at approaches that the Council could take in working to meet the Core Strategy's Spatial Objectives.

**Option 1:** Continue with past approach

**Option 2:** Town based development

**Option 3:** Town and larger village based development

**Option 4:** Distributed development

**Option 5:** Leek based development

**Option 6:** New settlement

**Option 7:** Focused development

- 4.2 Key distinctions between the seven Spatial Options and the assessment was included in the Core Strategy Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report and the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report.

- 4.3 An assessment of these Spatial Options is provided in Part II – Section B of this report.

### Assessment of Options

- 4.4 Each Spatial Option was assessed against the Council's seventeen Sustainability Appraisal Objectives (see Part II – Section A of this report). The likely effects of the Options were assessed against the Sustainability Objectives and recorded as being significantly positive, positive, negative, significantly negative, having no significant effect, having an uncertain effect, or dependent on how implemented. An indication of predicted effects was also provided, where they are recorded as being significantly negative, negative, uncertain or dependent on how implemented. The likely significant effects of the Spatial Options on sustainability were also determined over time – in the short, medium and long-term, along with cumulative impacts of implementing the Spatial Option and possible mitigation measures, where appropriate. No weighting was attached to the scores.

### Outcome of the Initial Options SA

- 4.5 The Initial SA of the Options helped to identify which Options did not perform well and could be discounted before the Issues and Options public consultation. It also highlighted where changes could be made to ensure that negative impacts are minimised and positive impacts enhanced. Of the initial seven options three were discounted following the initial evaluation. Option 1 (Continue with present approach) was discounted as it would be unable to accommodate the level of required growth. Option 5 (Leek based development) was discounted given the required levels of growth for the District and the significant development of greenfield sites on the edge of the settlement which would be required. Option 6 (New Settlement) was discounted as the provision of a new settlement was the least sustainable option given the likely impact on the countryside and infrastructure implications. It would also have been contrary to regional planning advice at that time which focused on existing settlements.
- 4.6 The initial findings indicated that Spatial Option 3 (Town and larger village based development) performed best in sustainability terms with no negative impacts identified with this option. It also scored best in terms of positive sustainability impacts. This option is likely to maintain positive impacts over the short, medium and long term and have an enhanced positive social impact in the medium and long-term.
- 4.7 A summary of the impacts of the seven Spatial Options is provided in Part II – Section B.

## 5. Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Option and Broad Locations

- 5.1 In light of the comments received at the Issues and Options stage, evidence of development capacity and need, and the RSS - the preferred development approach was selected which focuses development on the three market towns of Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph and the larger villages but allows for limited housing development in other settlements to meet local needs.

- 5.2 A summary of the key components of the Preferred Option is shown in Part II – Section C. The likely effects of the Preferred Option was assessed against Sustainability Appraisal Objectives – recorded as being positive, negative, having no significant effect, dependent on implementation, or having an unknown impact. An indication of predicted effects is also provided, where they are recorded as being negative. Additionally, a sustainability assessment of the options for broad locations for each of the towns was undertaken.
- 5.3 The cumulative effects of the Preferred Option were assessed in greater detail, against SA Objectives and Indicators, paying particular attention to the impacts its implementation may have on the baseline situation, the likelihood of effects occurring, and the scale and nature of the impacts predicted over time, with possible mitigation measures, where appropriate.

## **6. Sustainability Appraisal of the Submission Version and Broad Locations**

- 6.1 In light of comments received at the Preferred Options stage and new evidence coming forward (including a landscape and settlement character assessment and a review of potential development capacity in the urban areas of all 3 towns) the Submission Version of the Plan was produced. A significant change at this stage was the inclusion of a separate policy for the Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor.
- 6.2 The likely effects of the Submission Version were assessed against Sustainability Appraisal Objectives – recorded as being positive, negative, having no significant effect, dependent on implementation, or having an unknown impact. An indication of predicted effects was also provided, where they were recorded as being negative. Additionally, a sustainability assessment of the options for broad locations for each of the towns was undertaken.
- 6.3 The cumulative effects of the Submission Version Core Strategy were assessed in greater detail, against SA Objectives and Indicators, paying particular attention to the impacts its implementation may have on the baseline situation, the likelihood of effects occurring, and the scale and nature of the impacts predicted over time, with possible mitigation measures, where appropriate. The findings of the assessment can be found in Part II – Section D of this report.

## **7. Sustainability Appraisal of the Addendum to the Submission Version & Broad Locations**

- 7.1 In May / June 2009, the Submission Core Strategy was published for comments. Objections were received to some of the broad areas identified for housing development and the issues raised in these representations, together with further evidence on the potential for some sites to deliver housing, led to the Council reconsidering whether the approach to broad locations for housing development in Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph contained within the Submission Version of the Core Strategy was the most appropriate.
- 7.2 Further investigations and assessments of alternative approaches to meeting the housing requirements in the three towns took place. As a result of these, the Council decided that significant changes to the broad locations for housing in all three towns were justified. It was considered that with these changes, the requirements and strategy of each town would

continue to be met in a sustainable way which would not undermine the overall soundness of the Core Strategy.

- 7.3 The main changes to the document proposed related to where future housing development would take place in Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph. Clearly, as alternative locations were being proposed in all three towns, these constituted significant focused changes to the plan. Therefore, the Council was required to publish them and give people the opportunity to make representations on these changes and how they would affect the soundness of the Submission Core Strategy. This included a sustainability appraisal of the options for broad locations in each of the towns. The findings of the assessment can be found in Part II – Section E of this report.

## **8. Sustainability Appraisal of the Revised Submission Version & Broad Locations**

- 8.1 In 2010, the Council decided to make further revisions to the proposals in the Core Strategy in light of new evidence on future housing requirements in the District, the results of previous consultation (at the Addendum Stage) and to address policy gaps likely to arise from the abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy. The key change was a proposal to reduce the Council's overall figure for new housing in the period 2006 – 2026 from 6000 to 5500 to reflect the latest evidence.
- 8.2 Consequently, further investigations and assessments of alternative approaches to meeting the housing requirements in the three towns had taken place. As a result of these, the Council decided that further significant changes to the broad locations for housing in Cheadle and Leek were justified. It was considered that with these changes, the requirements and strategy of each town would continue to be met in a sustainable way in which would not undermine the overall soundness of the Core Strategy.
- 8.3 The main changes to the document related to where future housing development would take place in Cheadle and Leek. These amendments constituted significant changes to the plan. Other revisions had been made to some of the policies, in particular a redistribution of some housing from Cheadle to the rural areas, the addition of a new policy on green infrastructure and significant re-drafting of policies on sustainability and renewable energy. A separate sustainability appraisal focused on how the revisions had affected the sustainability objectives in comparison with the previous version of the plan.
- 8.4 The Council published the revisions to the plan (with an accompanying SA) and sought representations between December 2011 and February 2012 on how they would affect the soundness of the Submission Core Strategy. As a result of representations received during this time, Sustainability Appraisals were undertaken for two areas put forward as alternative broad locations in North West Cheadle, however these were not considered to perform as well as other broad locations included in the document. The minor modifications to the revised submission core strategy approved by the Council in July 2012 were not considered to raise any issues which required further sustainability appraisal.
- 8.4 The likely effects of the Revised Submission Version Core Strategy were assessed against Sustainability Appraisal Objectives – recorded as being positive, negative, having no significant



effect, dependent on implementation, or having an unknown impact. An indication of predicted effects is also provided, where they are recorded as being negative. Additionally, a sustainability assessment of the options for broad locations for each of the towns was undertaken. The findings of the assessment can be found in Part II – Section F of this report.

- 8.5 The cumulative effects of the Revised Submission Version Core Strategy were assessed in greater detail, against SA Objectives and Indicators, paying particular attention to the impacts its implementation may have on the baseline situation, the likelihood of effects occurring, and the scale and nature of the impacts predicted over time, with possible mitigation measures, where appropriate.

## 9. Main Modifications

- 9.1 The Revised Submission Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in September 2012. The formal hearing part of the examination took place in early February 2013 and the Inspector issued his interim conclusions in early March 2013 which identified some key areas which he considered needed to be modified before the plan could be adopted. The Inspector invited the Council to consider what form these modifications should take and indicated that, if or where it is considered necessary, the Sustainability Appraisal should be reviewed.
- 9.2 The Council considered it appropriate to undertake a review of the sustainability appraisal at the modifications stage to understand the potential impacts of these changes on sustainability. The findings of the assessment can be found in Part II – Section G of this report. A Habitat Regulations Assessment update was also undertaken in order to assess any impact of the main modifications on European Sites.
- 9.3 A number of main modifications were subsequently agreed by Council on 4th June 2013 which were subject to a period of consultation during June/July 2013. The responses to this consultation were forwarded to the Inspector for his consideration.
- 9.4 On 2nd January 2014, the Planning Inspectorate issued the Inspector's final report. The report concludes that the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Local Plan provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the District over the next 15 years providing a number of main modifications are made to the Plan. All of the modifications were those proposed and agreed by the Council and the Inspector has recommended their inclusion after full consideration of the representations from other parties on these issues. The Inspector confirmed that the Sustainability Appraisal is adequate and that the public consultation requirements for the Core Strategy were fully and properly carried out. He also confirmed that the Core Strategy complied with all UK legislation and therefore complied with the relevant Articles in the Aarhus Convention.

## 10. Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Summary

- 10.1 Sections I to O in Part II of this report provide a final Sustainability Appraisal of the adopted Core Strategy.

- Section I – Compatibility of the Core Strategy Spatial Objectives against the SA Objectives
- Section J – Compatibility of the Core Strategy Spatial Objectives with each other.
- Section K – Compatibility of the Core Strategy policies with each other
- Section L – Assessment of the Core Strategy policies against SA objectives
- Section M – Assessment of the Core Strategy policies - cumulative effects
- Section N – Summary of the cumulative effects assessment
- Section O – SA Methodology and assessment of the Broad Locations

10.2 The following table provides a summary of the predicted cumulative effects of the Core Strategy. The full assessment can be found in Part II – Section M.

- + = Positive      ++ = Significantly Positive      -- = Significantly Negative
- = Negative
- 0 = Neutral (no significant positive or negative effects)
- ? = Impact Unknown
- I = Impact dependent on how implemented

Different components within an Option may generate varying impacts. This is indicated by '/'

SA Objectives	Short Term (less than 1 year)	Medium Term (1-5 years)	Long Term (5 years or more)	Summary of Appraisal
<b>Social</b>	- / +	+	++	Positive effect over time as growth is focussed in the towns and larger villages resulting in improved services/facilities and strengthening the retail offer in the towns. Provision of additional dwellings including affordable housing will provide more choice and meet the needs of local residents. Increase in employment land will provide locations for new and expanding businesses and greater opportunity to work locally. All of these positive effects direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel. Negative effect on the loss of views and landscape impact resulting from development – this may become less significant in the medium to long term.
<b>Environment</b>	-- / +	- / ++	- / ++	The cumulative effect on the environmental objectives are varied. This is mainly due to the effect of new development in terms of energy consumption, use of building materials, use of greenfield sites and impact on the character of the landscape and townscape. There are however some positive effects such as encouraging further development of tourism and culture and opportunities for renewable

				energy and energy efficient buildings.
<b>Economic</b>	++	++	++	The assessment shows the document has a significantly positive effect on the economic objectives. Provision of a range of sites across the District combined with the protection of suitable employment sites will safeguard the vitality and viability of the towns and larger settlements. The increase in the range of units will attract new employers and allow existing businesses to expand. There is an on-going need to ensure that the District's workforce skills match local employment opportunities.

Copies of the following documents can be found on the Council's website:

- Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy
- Core Strategy Consultation Statement
- Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for Staffordshire Moorlands
- Habitats Regulation Assessment

---

## PART II

---

<b>Section A</b>	<b>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Section B</b>	<b>Options Stage</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Section C</b>	<b>Preferred Option and Broad Locations</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Section D</b>	<b>Submission Version</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Section E</b>	<b>Addendum to Submission Version</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Section F</b>	<b>Revised Submission Stage</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Section G</b>	<b>Modifications Stage</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Section H</b>	<b>List of Core Strategy Policies</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Section I</b>	<b>Compatibility of the Plan (Spatial) Objectives against SA Objectives</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Section J</b>	<b>Compatibility of Plan (Spatial) Objectives with each other</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Section K</b>	<b>Compatibility of Components of the Core Strategy with Each Other</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Section L</b>	<b>Assessment of the Components of the Core Strategy against SA Objectives</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Section M</b>	<b>Assessment of the Components of the Core Strategy – Cumulative Effects</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Section N</b>	<b>Summary of Assessment</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Section O</b>	<b>Sustainability Assessment of Broad Locations</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Section P</b>	<b>Problems Encountered/Issues Identified</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>Section Q</b>	<b>Equality Impact Assessment</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>Section R</b>	<b>Sign-Posting to Information Required by the SEA Directive</b>	<b>144</b>
<b>Section S</b>	<b>Quality Assurance Check</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>Section T</b>	<b>Implementation of the Core Strategy</b>	<b>148</b>

## Section A – Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

- A.1 The Council has identified the following seventeen objectives for its SA. These are based on key sustainability issues, taking into account characteristics of the area and findings of its baseline data. Further detail can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. These seventeen sustainability objectives are unchanged for all sustainability appraisal of development plan documents.

SA OBJECTIVES		
SOCIAL	SA 1	<b>To improve the quality of where people work and live, and minimise risks and nuisances</b>
	SA 2	To eliminate social exclusion by promoting, maintaining and improving facilities, services and opportunities for all and access to them
	SA 3	<b>To minimise opportunities for crime and reduce the fear of crime</b>
	SA 4	To ensure adequate quality and provision of a range of house types to meet local needs in appropriate locations, and maintain and improve the local housing stock and provision of affordable/social housing
	SA 5	<b>To direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel</b>
	SA 6	To strengthen transport links between rural areas and towns, and improve conditions for walking, cycling and travel by public transport
ENVIRONMENT	SA 7	<b>To identify, conserve and enhance biodiversity sites and to maximise opportunities for achieving Biodiversity Action Plan targets</b>
	SA 8	To protect and enhance key habitats and species
	SA 9	<b>To reduce contamination, regenerate degraded environments and maintain soil resources and quality</b>
	SA 10	To promote efficient use of resources

	SA 11	<b>To reduce energy consumption and waste production, and facilitate renewable energy</b>
	SA 12	To reduce flood risk, protect and enhance water sources and environmental assets, and reduce contributions and vulnerability to climate change
	SA 13	<b>To protect and enhance the character of the landscape and townscape, historic assets, and maintain and strengthen local distinctiveness and sense of place</b>
	SA 14	To encourage further development of tourism and culture
<b>ECONOMIC</b>	SA 15	<b>To safeguard the vitality and viability of the District's towns and villages, and create and sustain a vibrant rural economy</b>
	SA 16	To strengthen, modernise and diversify the District economy, and promote sustainable economic growth
	SA 17	<b>To encourage and support a high and stable level of employment and variety of jobs to meet local employment needs</b>

## Section B – Options Stage

Seven spatial options were generated in response to issues identified during the evidence gathering stage of the Plan. These looked at approaches that the Council could take in working to meet the Core Strategy's draft spatial objectives. The seven options were as follows:

- **Option 1:** Continue with present approach
- **Option 2:** Town based development
- **Option 3:** Town and larger village based development
- **Option 4:** Distributed development
- **Option 5:** Leek based development
- **Option 6:** New settlement
- **Option 7:** Focused development

**Option 1** proposed development based on the current distribution of population. New development would be likely in Biddulph, Cheadle and Leek but also in all other settlements including some without development boundaries. There would be limited change to existing settlement boundaries and therefore the green belt and open countryside would be protected. This option would focus development within existing boundaries with priority given to brownfield sites.

**Option 2** proposed growth of Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph to accommodate the bulk of the District's housing and employment development needs. There would be limited development in the other villages for affordable housing only. This option would prioritise brownfield sites but allow for the peripheral expansion of the towns on main routes. The three town centres would grow as the main service providers for the District.

**Option 3** would focus development in and around the three towns and larger villages only. Growth of Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph and the larger villages would accommodate the bulk of the District's housing and employment development needs. There would be limited development in other settlements for affordable housing only. This option would prioritise brownfield sites but allow for peripheral expansion of towns and larger villages. Town centres and larger village centres would grow as the main service providers for the District.

**Option 4** proposed housing and employment development in all settlements sufficient to meet local needs. All parts of the District could experience change but on a limited scale. There would be limited development in town centres with greater focus on local and village centres. There would be enhanced transport links between settlements but it is also likely to result in increased use of the private car.

**Option 5** proposed to focus development in and around Leek. There would be growth of Leek to accommodate the bulk of the District's housing and employment development needs. There would be limited development in other towns and villages for affordable housing only. Priority would be given to brownfield sites but allowing for peripheral expansion on radial routes. Leek town centre would grow as the main service provider for the District.

**Option 6** proposed to focus development on a new settlement. The bulk of housing development would be accommodated within a new settlement. There would be limited development in other towns and villages for affordable housing only and to meet local employment needs. There would be limited

development in town and village centres, with greater focus on providing facilities and infrastructure to support the new settlement.

**Option 7** proposed focusing development on key development and regeneration opportunities. Growth would be to meet demand. The bulk of housing and employment development would target areas in need of regeneration, or where opportunities exist. There would be limited development in other areas for affordable housing only. The three town centres would grow as main service providers for the District.

## Summary of Impact of Options on Sustainability

The Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report and Appropriate Assessment Report was undertaken in September 2007. A summary of the sustainability assessment is included below.

### Option 1: Continue with present approach

Option 1 proposed least change to the District. This option did not score particularly well in terms of achieving the SA social objectives such as improving the quality of where people work and live. Accommodating the required levels of development within existing development boundaries, particularly rural areas, could be difficult to achieve resulting in higher densities and increased pressure for intensification in residential areas. This option would also make it difficult to meet the identified need for affordable housing.

This option had a relatively positive environmental impact as limited change to existing settlement boundaries would also secure the protection of the green belt and open countryside. This would have a positive impact on biodiversity sites, and protect and enhance key habitats and species. In the long term there was no existing policy guidance to deal with the need to reduce energy consumption.

Option 1 would only have a limited impact on achieving the SA's economic objectives of strengthening and modernising the District economy and encouraging a high and stable level of employment and variety of jobs to meet local employment needs. Priority would be given to brownfield sites but this option was unlikely to support the higher levels of growth sought by the Council.

Unlike Option 4, development in Option 1 would be unlikely to take place in settlements which have little or no facilities to support them, and therefore it has less negative sustainability issues associated with it than Option 4.

### Option 2: Town based development

Option 2 proposes focusing development in and around the three towns only in areas of high accessibility. This option overall scores well in terms of its positive sustainability impacts.

Option 2 scores well in achieving the SA's social objectives. The growth of Biddulph, Cheadle and Leek to accommodate the bulk of the District's housing and employment needs would provide the opportunity for maximising use of existing infrastructure, reducing the need to travel and strengthening transport links. In addition large scale developments may provide a range of house types and achieve high levels of affordable housing. There would be limited development in villages for affordable housing only.



Although brownfield sites are a priority for development under this option, it is likely to require significant development of greenfield sites and open countryside as the capacity for towns to absorb development may be limited. This may have a negative impact on biodiversity, and protection and enhancement of key habitats and species especially in the medium to long term, once brownfield sites have been developed. This would be likely to impact more so than Option 3 as development would be limited just to the three towns and therefore require more greenfield development.

This option also scores well in achieving the SA's economic objectives. Concentrating employment development in and around the 3 towns only will have a significantly positive impact by providing the opportunity to strengthen and diversify the District's economy, and support high levels of employment and a variety of jobs to meet local employment needs. In addition this option supports regeneration of the towns as a foci for the District.

### **Option 3: Town and larger village based development**

Option 3 proposes focusing development in and around the three towns and larger villages only. This option overall scores best in terms of its positive sustainability impacts.

This option does particularly well in achieving the SA's social objectives. The growth of Biddulph, Cheadle, Leek and key villages to accommodate the bulk of the District's housing and employment needs would have a significantly positive impact on their role as service providers, retention of local services and facilities, maximize the use of existing infrastructure and support the regeneration of large villages as well as towns. Option 3 would also have a positive impact on strengthening transport links between the rural areas and the towns, however, it would have a slightly less positive impact on directing development to more sustainable locations and reducing the need to travel than Option 2. Again as in Option 2, large scale developments may provide a range of house types and achieve high levels of affordable housing. There would be limited development in other villages for affordable housing only.

Brownfield sites are a priority for development under Option 3. Although this option is likely to require some development of greenfield sites and open countryside as the capacity for towns and key villages to absorb development may be limited, it is likely to be less than in Option 2. As a consequence it will not have a negative impact on biodiversity and, protection and enhancement of key habitats and species. Again this option would have a significantly positive impact on the character of the landscape and townscape and strengthen local distinctiveness.

This option also scores well in achieving the SA's economic objectives. Concentrating employment development in and around the 3 towns and key villages will have a significantly positive impact in terms of safeguarding their vitality and viability, supporting their role as main service providers and strengthening and diversifying the District's economy.

### **Option 4: Distributed development**

Option 4 proposes development that is dispersed across the entire District according to local needs. Option 4 has many similarities with Option 1.

This option does not score particularly well in terms of achieving the SA social objectives. It would support the retention of local services and facilities, however some settlements have little or no facilities to support additional development. This option is likely to provide only limited opportunity for

affordable housing because of smaller scale development, but would address local need issues. This option is one of the least sustainable and has a significantly negative impact in terms of directing development to more sustainable locations and reducing the need to travel.

This option promotes accommodating development on brownfield sites and within settlement boundaries but it may require the development of greenfield sites in some locations. As a consequence it is likely to have a positive impact on biodiversity, and protection and enhancement of key habitats and species compared to other options. The dispersal of development across the District would have a negative impact on opportunities to reduce energy consumption and facilitate renewable energy, especially in the long-term. However, this option would have a significantly positive impact on the character of the landscape and townscape, and strengthen local distinctiveness.

Distributing development across the District according to local needs will have a significantly positive impact in terms of safeguarding the vitality and viability of settlements. However, limited development in the towns may not sufficiently facilitate their growth and regeneration, and may not fully accord with national and regional planning guidance to focus on sustainable locations.

### **Option 5: Leek based development**

Option 5 proposes focusing development in and around Leek. This option performs well in terms of being highly sustainable, reducing the need to travel and strengthening links between rural areas and the town.

This option scores relatively well in achieving the SA's social objectives. The growth of Leek to accommodate the bulk of the District's housing and employment needs would provide the opportunity for maximizing use of existing infrastructure, and supporting its role as a focus for the District. However, this will also place pressure on existing infrastructure and services in the town, and increase pressure on intensification of residential areas. Large scale developments may provide a range of house types and achieve high levels of affordable housing. There would be limited development in villages for affordable housing only.

Although brownfield sites are a priority for development under this option, it is likely to require significant development of greenfield sites and major changes to the green belt boundary as the capacity for Leek to absorb development may be limited. This may have a negative impact on biodiversity and protection and enhancement of key habitats and species, especially in the medium to long term once the brownfield sites have been developed. This Option would however have a significantly positive impact on regenerating a number of brownfield sites in the town.

Option 5 does not score as highly as some of the other options in terms of achieving the SA's economic objectives. The vitality and viability and economic growth of the other towns and settlements could suffer because they are likely to lose out on investment opportunities and services/facilities.

### **Option 6: New settlement**

Option 6 proposes focusing development within a new settlement. This option performs particularly poorly in terms of achieving the SA's objectives.

This option would result in the bulk of housing development being accommodated within the new settlement. It would require considerable investment for facilities and services, and extensive development would be required to support necessary services, facilities and infrastructure needed. As a result other towns and settlements may lose out in terms of other investment opportunities, services/ facilities and affordable housing. A new settlement would have a significantly negative impact on reducing the need to travel and strengthening links between rural areas and the towns. It would also have a significantly negative impact on improving the quality of where people live and work.

This option also performs poorly overall in terms of achieving the SA environmental objectives. This option does provide an opportunity to provide a sustainable 'green' settlement with high levels of affordable housing (eco-town), which would have a significantly positive impact. It would also reduce the pressure for expansion and development of other settlements. However, this option would have a significantly negative impact on the open countryside and would therefore not support the government's aim of developing brownfield sites/land before greenfield sites/land. It would have a negative impact on biodiversity, protection and enhancement of key habitats, and a significantly negative impact on the efficient use of resources.

Option 6 does not score particularly well in terms of achieving the SA's economic objectives, such as strengthening the District's economy and supporting a high level of employment. It would also have a negative impact on safeguarding the vitality and viability of the Districts towns and villages.

### **Option 7: Focused development**

Option 7 proposes targeting development on key development and regeneration opportunities and those areas most in need or most capable of attracting development. This option supports areas in need of regeneration or development, and therefore performs well against a number of sustainability objectives.

Option 7 has a positive impact in terms of achieving the SA's social objectives. The bulk of housing and employment development would be located in areas in need of regeneration or where opportunities exist. This would provide the opportunity for large scale developments which may achieve high levels of affordable housing and support existing facilities and services. However, opportunities which come forward for development may not be the most sustainable locations therefore leading to increased use of private car. Other areas may also lose out in terms of other investment opportunities and services/facilities.

This option has a significantly positive impact on reducing contaminated sites and regenerating degraded environments due to the focus on brownfield sites. It also has a positive impact on promoting efficient use of resources, and opportunities to reduce energy consumption. There are a lack of opportunities to identify, conserve and enhance biodiversity sites and protect and enhance key habitats on previously developed sites, especially in the medium to long term.

Option 7 was considered to have the most positive impact in terms of addressing the SA's economic objectives as it would address specific issues and enable opportunities to be realised. This would support the vitality and viability of settlements and also strengthen the District's economy and employment base.

**Overall Finding:**

Option 3 (Town and large village based development) and Option 2 (Town based development) are considered to have the most positive impact on the SA objectives, as both promote development in more sustainable locations enabling transport links between the rural areas and towns to be strengthened. Both options would be likely to improve the quality of the local housing stock and provision of affordable housing/ social housing. Option 3 has a slightly more positive impact on the SA social objectives than Option 2 because it includes the larger villages as well as the towns. Option 2 is more likely to have negative impacts on biodiversity and protection/ enhancement of key habitats and species, as it is likely to require more greenfield development than Option 3. Both are identified as having a significantly positive impact on the economic sustainability objectives.

Option 6 (New settlement) is likely to have the most negative impact on the SA objectives especially on the open countryside. This would have a significant negative impact in terms of reducing the need to travel and strengthening transport links. This option does not support the Government's aim of developing brownfield sites before greenfield sites and regenerating degraded environments. The provision of new facilities and services in the new settlement would be likely to be at the expense of supporting existing facilities and services in other parts of the District. This option does have some positive impacts in that it could reduce the pressure for expansion and development of other settlements. It would create an opportunity to provide a sustainable 'green' settlement with consequent reduced energy consumption and waste production, and facilitate renewable energy but would limit opportunities in this respect for the rest of the District. The negative impacts appear to be far greater than the positive impacts identified.

Options 1 (Continue with present approach) and 4 (Distributed development) are quite similar in that they both propose limited growth of the towns as opposed to the rest of the District. As a result these options may not fully accord with national and regional planning guidance to focus development in sustainable locations. Both are unlikely to have major positive impacts regarding the social objectives. Overall, Option 1 is considered to have a more positive impact, as development is more likely to occur in more sustainable locations.

Options 5 (Leek based development) and 7 (Focused development) have similar impacts when assessed against the SA objectives. Option 7 is likely to have a slightly more positive impact on economic objectives and Option 5 is likely to have a slightly more positive impact in leading development to more sustainable locations and reducing the need to travel. Overall Option 7 performs better against the sustainability objectives due to it promoting development of all three towns rather than just Leek which is likely to result in less greenfield development than Option 5.

The findings of the initial SA were used to inform considerations of the options. Following initial evaluation, three options were discounted these were Option 1 (Continue with present approach), Option 5 (Leek based development) and Option 6 (New settlement). Option 1 was discounted as it was considered unrealistic, as it is unlikely to be able to accommodate all of the required growth. Option 5 was discounted as it was also likely to be unrealistic given the required levels of growth for the District, and the significant development of Greenfield sites on the edge of the settlement which would be required. Option 6 was discounted as it involved the provision of a new settlement which was the least sustainable option given the likely impact on the countryside and infrastructure implications and would have been contrary to regional planning advice for the District which focuses on existing settlements.

## Section C – Preferred Option and Broad Locations

The preferred option was selected after public consultation over the Issues and Options. A summary of the responses can be found in the Core Strategy Consultation Statement. The proposed preferred development approach focuses development on the three market towns of Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph and the larger villages but allows for limited development in the other settlements to meet local needs. No specific comments were received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal at this stage.

The Initial SA at Issues and Options stage found the Town and Larger Village based development option to deliver the most positive impacts on the SA objectives, closely followed by the town based development option. The proposed preferred development approach could be described as combining the positive impacts of the Town and Large Village based development option along with enabling smaller villages to develop in a sustainable way to meet their own local needs including meeting local housing requirements. The larger settlements that have been chosen as part of the Preferred Option Approach are those that already have some facilities, so the approach would enable them to develop further and therefore become more sustainable.

A managed rate of housing development is proposed rising to 320 dwellings per annum by 2016 and falling to 288 by 2026. An increased housing development rate is proposed for Cheadle to reflect growth aspirations and a reduced development rate in Biddulph and rural areas to reflect strategic constraints (proximity to MUAs to reflect RSS). Previously developed land will be prioritised over greenfield development with higher targets for development on brownfield land to 2016 of 65%, with this then reduced to 55% from 2017 to the end of the plan period.

The proposed spatial strategy policies establish a settlement hierarchy, and identifying the level and type of development appropriate for each settlement category. Major regeneration opportunities are identified including Cornhill, Churnet Works, Leek and Cheadle Town Centres and Biddulph East and in the countryside at Bolton Copperworks, Froghall and the Anzio Camp as well as a need for strategic transport improvements on A520 to A53 access road link, Leek; A521, Cheadle; and Alton Towers – Denstone link.

Green Belt will be maintained, but its detailed boundaries will be reviewed to ensure that its purpose in separating the urban areas and maintaining their identity is consistent with need to promote sustainable patterns of development around settlements.

The core policies seek to be proactive and aspirational. There are fewer policies but they are more comprehensive, more locally distinctive and with emphasis on value judgment. The Preferred Option seeks to focus development on the three market towns of Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph and the larger villages but allows for limited development in other settlements to meet local needs.

### Assessment of Broad Locations

The Sustainability Appraisal of Preferred Options undertaken in September 2008 included a sustainability assessment of the broad locations. The 17 SA Objectives were not considered to provide enough detailed information to fully assess the impact of development in the broad locations and more importantly allow differentiation between them. Section N provides the methodology used to assess these areas. The conclusions from this assessment at this stage are included below.

## Summary of Impact of the Preferred Option on Sustainability

- + = Positive      + + = Significantly Positive      - - = Significantly Negative  
 - = Negative  
 0 = Neutral (no significant positive or negative effects)  
 ? = Impact Unknown  
 I = Impact dependent on how implemented

Different components within an Option may generate varying impacts. This is indicated by '/'

SA Objectives	Short Term (less than 1 year)	Medium Term (1-5 years)	Long Term (5 years or more)	Summary of Appraisal
<b>Social</b>	- / +	+	++	Positive effect over time as growth is focussed in the towns and larger villages resulting in improved services/facilities and strengthening the retail offer in the towns Provision of additional dwellings including affordable housing will provide more choice and meet the needs of local residents. Increase in employment land will provide locations for new and expanding businesses and greater opportunity to work locally. All of these positive effects direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel. Negative effect on the loss of views resulting from development – this may become less significant in the medium to long term.
<b>Environment</b>	-- / +	- / ++	- / ++	The cumulative effect on the environmental objectives are varied. This is mainly due to the effect of new development in terms of energy consumption, use of building materials, use of greenfield sites and impact on the character of the landscape and townscape. There are however some positive effects such as encouraging further development of tourism and culture and opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings.

<b>Economic</b>	++	++	++	The assessment shows that the preferred option has a significantly positive effect on the economic objectives. Provision of a range of sites across the District combined with the protection of suitable employment sites will safeguard the vitality and viability of the towns and larger settlements. The increase in the range of units will attract new employers and allow existing businesses to expand. There is an on-going need to ensure that the District's workforce skills match local employment opportunities.
-----------------	----	----	----	---

## Conclusions

The Preferred Option will contribute permanent positive social, economic and environmental impacts on sustainability by creating distinctive, sustainable and self-sufficient settlements, meeting local needs and a strong, prosperous economy.

Negative impacts will largely result from the development of new residential and employment sites due to the use of greenfield sites, loss of views/impact on the landscape and energy consumption of new buildings. These will be offset to a certain extent by social and economic gains such as greater choice of housing and employment opportunities such as the Regional Investment Site. Similarly the location of underused major developed sites in the countryside can be offset by providing opportunities for suitable uses.

It must be ensured that new developments meet the requirements set out in Policy SD1 – Achieving Sustainable Development and DC1 – Design Considerations in order to ensure that all new developments incorporate sustainable construction techniques and maximise energy efficiency in particular through greater attention to building layout and design. Strict attention to detail is required to ensure that potentially negative effects are prevented/ minimised and positive effects enhanced.

In terms of broad locations for housing development, in Biddulph the most sustainable broad locations are Area 8 (Urban Area), Area 2 (Uplands Mill), Area 5 (Newpool Meadows), Area 7 (Biddulph East) and Area 4 (West Biddulph).

In Leek the most sustainable broad locations are Area 8 (Urban Area), Area 1 (Churnet Works) and Area 3 (North of Leek). Area 4 (East of Leek) also performs well but a large proportion is located within the Ladydale SBI and although some development could be accommodated on the area lying outside the SBI, justification for development within the SBI would need to clearly outweigh the need to safeguard the intrinsic nature conservation value of the site.

In Cheadle the most sustainable broad locations are Area 8 (urban area), Area 4 (south west of Cheadle), Area 5 (south of Cheadle) and Area 1 (north Cheadle). It is considered that overall Area 2 would offer the best choice of location out of the remaining areas as it would have a lower impact on the landscape and could be linked with development in Area 1.

Some impacts such as key habitats and species depend on the specific location of the site and will be addressed at the Site Allocations DPD.



## Section D – Submission Version

A number of amendments were made to the document as a result of the Preferred Options consultation and the availability of further evidence. A significant change was that the Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor was considered as separate spatial policy. Changes were also made to the wording of a number of the policies. No specific comments were made regarding the Sustainability Appraisal at this stage. All representations received and the Council's response to them are included in the Core Strategy Consultation Statement.

Since the draft preferred options was produced further work was undertaken on all broad areas including a landscape and settlement character assessment and a review of potential development capacity in the urban areas of the three towns.

There have been significant changes to the broad areas proposed for Leek. Since the draft preferred options document additional capacity was identified in the urban area taking the figure to around 600 dwellings. In light of more recent evidence provided in the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment and detailed comments from the Countryside Section regarding the SBI designation, it is considered that Area 4 (East of Leek) would be unsuitable for large-scale development and therefore should not be taken forward as a broad location for development. It is however considered that there are some smaller parcels of land on the fringes of the urban area not designated as a SBI or used for recreational purposes, which may be suitable to be included in the Urban Area capacity amounting to around 50 dwellings.

No allowance was made for dwellings on the Churnet Works site in the calculations of housing provision due to the Environment Agency's concerns over the suitability of the area for residential use, although residential remains in the list of potential uses until the outcome of a detailed Flood Risk Assessment is known.

The total estimated capacity on sites which could accommodate 10 or more dwellings within the Urban Area was 600 dwellings, but this may vary as a result of more detailed assessment of sites as part of the Site Allocations DPD. Additionally, evidence from the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) suggested that a further 100 dwellings could come forward on smaller windfall sites which can accommodate less than 10 dwellings. The need to release land adjacent to the Urban Area would be assessed against the release and likely release of land within the Urban Area. The proposed broad locations for land outside the Urban Area were to the North of Leek and to the North East / Eastern fringes of Leek. These would be in the form of new community neighbourhoods of up to 250 dwellings. In view of the need for further assessment and consultation to be undertaken on these areas, it was considered that the identification of specific sites would be best done through the Site Allocations DPD. With the past completions and current commitments these allocations would provide in total 1955 dwellings for Leek, which exceeds the town's requirements but would provide flexibility for slippage on constrained sites. The area to the North of Leek was referred to as Area 3 at preferred options stage. The area on the Eastern Fringes of Leek was referred to as Area 5 at preferred options stage. Area 6 was smaller in extent to that included in the draft preferred options document and partially overlapped with Area 5. There were also differences in the extent of Area 5.

There were changes to the broad areas in Biddulph with Area 2 (Uplands Mill) and (Area 5) Newpool Meadows included in the Urban Area. Changes were also made to the Cheadle broad areas with Areas 4 and 5 being combined into one broad area called the South West Cheadle Urban Extension.

In addition a small number of sites formerly included in Area 1 (North Cheadle) were included in the Urban Area.

A summary of the key changes made to the Core Strategy to create the Submission Version are listed below.

- Vision - amended in respect of green infrastructure and heritage protection.
- Aims and Spatial Objectives - amended to better reflect the vision in respect of employment diversity, rural needs, and countryside protection.
- Policy SS1 - reference added to tourism which is recognised as a key element in the diversification of the District's economy, and clearer reference to tackling climate change and reducing carbon emissions.
- Policy SS2 – amended to include that the 6,000 dwellings should be viewed as a target and not a minimum. The supporting text makes it clear that this is not a ceiling. The phasing of residential development has been adjusted to lower development rates up to 2016 and increased development rates post 2016.
- Policy SS4 - amended to reflect the latest housing commitments and completions figures. The policy has been amended to be clearer in terms of identifying the extent of the area within which the restriction would operate. The wording has been amended to state 'the Green Belt and settlements inset within the Green Belt.'
- The employment land figure has been updated to 2026 to reflect the latest findings of the Employment Land Study with policies SS5 and SS6 having been amended to reflect the latest figures. The retail figure for Leek (Policy SS5) has been amended to 12,000m<sup>2</sup> (of which 50% is for bulky goods retailing).
- Policy SS5a (Leek Area Strategy) – changes made to include stronger reference to protecting and improving open space, sport and recreational facilities; clarifying consideration of the 'need' to provide a new multi-storey car park; reference to creating pedestrian and cycle links in the town and in particular between the town centre and Brough Park; and reference to expecting high quality design for Cornhill and Churnet Works sites. It is considered that Cornhill and Churnet Works both remain suitable for redevelopment but in light of concerns from the Environment Agency regarding flood risk at the Churnet Works site, further investigation is needed to determine whether residential development is acceptable. No allowance is therefore made for dwellings on the Churnet Works site in the calculations of housing provision although residential should remain in the list of potential uses until the outcome of a detailed Flood Risk Assessment is known. (Details of the changes made to the broad locations can be found in Section L.)
- Policy SS5b (Biddulph Area Strategy) - changes have been made to the policy including clarifying that 'improvements to all Schlinder properties' applies only to those unimproved properties; stronger reference to protecting and improving open space, sport and recreational facilities; and reference to the need for extra care facilities which the PCT has highlighted as a priority for Biddulph. (Details of the changes made to the broad locations can be found in Section L.)
- Policy SS5c (Cheadle Area Strategy) - amended to recognise that the need for and viability of the provision of a bypass and the first phase comprising of a southern link road should be confirmed by means of a Transportation Study. (Details of the changes made to the broad locations can be found in Section L.)
- There have been amendments to the classification of some villages with Oakamoor reclassified as a smaller village, Wetley Rocks reclassified as a larger village and Swinscoe to be classified as a smaller village. Caverswall and Cookshill reclassified as smaller villages. Minor changes

- are suggested including clarification of where development would be appropriate and reinforcing that affordable housing is appropriate in the smaller villages and other rural areas.
- A separate policy for the Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor has been created in order to provide a stronger and clearer strategic context for any subsequent Masterplan and SPD. It also gives the initiative a higher profile within the Core Strategy.
  - The policy relating to Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site has been revised and renumbered to SS8. The policy and supporting text have been amended to recognise that in light of more recent guidance and changing economic and transport needs since the original development brief was adopted in 1997, the brief should be reviewed. This will also give an opportunity to address the scope for accommodating other supporting uses as well as re-assessing highways and transport requirements.
  - SD1 – reference added for need to conform to any subsequent local evidence which may be produced in respect of on-site renewable energy targets or sustainable construction requirements (a joint study is to be undertaken across Staffordshire to identify local standards). Requirement added for all new developments to incorporate use of sustainable urban drainage schemes.
  - E1 – deletion of reference to criteria for large-scale office developments as this is already set out in the RSS and recognition that preference will be given to town centre locations for all office developments unless ancillary to another use or specifically identified in the Site Allocations DPD.
  - E2 - no changes have been made to the policy since draft preferred options.
  - E3 – provides greater support for permanent new tourism accommodation in the Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor to complement existing attractions and cultural facilities in town centres and villages.
  - Policy H1 - reference added to need to provide a mix of housing in terms of size, type and tenure which will be informed by factors such as available supply and market demand as well as the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
  - Policy H2 - affordable housing target has been reduced for sites of 15 dwellings or more in towns from 50% to 40% in light of concerns and recent evidence regarding the feasibility of delivering high levels of affordable housing. Also an additional requirement is suggested for all sites that the actual level of provision be determined through negotiation taking into account development viability and other contributions.
  - Policy H3 - deletion of requirement for sites to be well located on the highway network and further clarification of need to avoid harm to sites or features of natural, historic or archaeological value.
  - Policy TCR1 - amended in order that the criteria for changes of use of A1 retail to non-A1 uses in primary shopping frontages is consistent with policy in the adopted Biddulph Town Centre Area Action Plan.
  - Policy TCR2 - reference to facilitating sites for bulky goods retailing deleted and replaced by reference to sites being identified by the Council for 'significant' retail provision. Also, reference added to major retail proposals (other than those identified by the Council) not being allowed outside town centres unless it can be demonstrated that it is acceptable under national and regional planning guidance.
  - Policy DC1 – reference added to need to incorporate green infrastructure and the principles of active design into schemes.
  - Policy DC2 – reference added to areas of historic landscape character and the settings of designated assets being safeguarded and enhanced.

- Policy DC3 - reference added to requirement to recognise and conserve the special quality of the landscape in the Peak District National Park and ensuring that development does not adversely affect the wider setting of the National Park.
- Policy C1 - minor correction made to refer to utility (rather than service) infrastructure, and clarification that community facilities includes cultural facilities such as theatres.
- Policy C2 - amended to require contributions from new residential development to be towards sports and recreation facilities as well as open space and also to require that new sport, recreation and open space facilities should be designed so that they are fit for purpose. It also sets stronger criteria for the protection and replacement of existing open space, recreational land and buildings.
- Policy R1 - reference added to the need for development in the rural areas to also sustain the historic environment and to clarify that the re-use of rural buildings for commercial enterprise includes tourism uses. Reference to tourism uses being supported where it will contribute positively to the rural economy and is near to an existing settlement and would not undermine other tourism enterprises has been deleted, as it is considered too inflexible and also raises non planning issues of competition.
- Policy R2 – amended to clarify that new housing outside towns and villages will only be permitted where it is for affordable housing or meets an essential local need that cannot be met elsewhere. Reference to replacement dwellings amended to require that it should not have a significantly greater detrimental impact on the existing character of the rural area than the original dwelling, in order to give greater control over such developments.
- Policy NE1 - reference added to the biological resources of 'neighbouring areas' as well as those of the District being protected and enhanced. Significant changes made to remainder of the policy to reflect advice from Natural England and other bodies regarding making better reference to the hierarchy of sites; setting out more fully how such areas are to be protected and enhanced taking account of the affects of climate change; recognising the value of the natural environment for sport and recreation; and ensuring the provision and protection of green infrastructure.
- Policy T1 - reference added to any parking standards which may be produced locally.
- Policy T2 – reference added to seeking greater rail use to help minimise the environmental impact of freight road transport.

## Summary of Impact of Submission Version on Sustainability

- + = Positive      ++ = Significantly Positive      -- = Significantly Negative  
 - = Negative  
 0 = Neutral (no significant positive or negative effects)  
 ? = Impact Unknown  
 I = Impact dependent on how implemented

Different components within an Option may generate varying impacts. This is indicated by '/'

SA Objectives	Short Term (less than 1 year)	Medium Term (1-5 years)	Long Term (5 years or more)	Summary of Appraisal
<b>Social</b>	- / +	+	++	Positive effect over time as growth is focussed in the towns and larger villages resulting in improved services/facilities and strengthening the retail offer in the towns. Provision of additional dwellings including affordable housing will provide more choice and meet the needs of local residents. Increase in employment land will provide locations for new and expanding businesses and greater opportunity to work locally. All of these positive effects direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel. Negative effect on the loss of views and landscape impact resulting from development – this may become less significant in the medium to long term.
<b>Environment</b>	-- / +	- / ++	- / ++	The cumulative effect on the environmental objectives are varied. This is mainly due to the effect of new development in terms of energy consumption, use of building materials, use of greenfield sites and impact on the character of the landscape and townscape. There are however some positive effects such as encouraging further development of tourism and culture and opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings.
<b>Economic</b>	++	++	++	The assessment shows that the submission version has a significantly positive effect on the economic objectives. Provision of a range of sites across the District combined with the protection of suitable employment sites will safeguard the vitality and viability of the towns and larger settlements. The increase in the range of units will attract new employers and allow existing businesses to expand. There is an on-

				going need to ensure that the District's workforce skills match local employment opportunities.
--	--	--	--	---

## Conclusions

The Sustainability Appraisal of the Submission Version was undertaken in May 2009. It considered that the Submission Version of the Core Strategy will contribute permanent positive social, economic and environmental impacts on sustainability by creating distinctive, sustainable and self-sufficient settlements, meeting local needs and a strong, prosperous economy. The new Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor policy indicated many positive impacts including supporting strategic footpath / cycle routes, conserving and enhancing biodiversity sites and nature conservation sites, strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place, creating a vibrant rural economy and employment opportunities.

Negative impacts would largely result from the development of new residential and employment sites due to the use of greenfield sites, impact on soil resources, loss of views/impact on the landscape and energy consumption of new buildings. These would be offset to a certain extent by social and economic gains such as greater choice of housing and employment opportunities such as the Regional Investment Site. Similarly the location of underused major developed sites in the countryside could be offset by providing opportunities for suitable uses.

It must be ensured that new developments meet the requirements set out in Policy SD1 – Achieving Sustainable Development and DC1 – Design Considerations in order to ensure that all new developments incorporate sustainable construction techniques and maximise energy efficiency in particular through greater attention to building layout and design. Strict attention to detail is required to ensure that potentially negative effects are prevented/ minimised and positive effects enhanced.

In terms of specific broad areas for housing development, in Leek the most sustainable broad locations were the urban area and the north of Leek. Due to the changes in the extent of the urban area, this was rescored against the sustainability criteria. It scored less well than at Preferred Options Stage due to the addition of sites that are in close proximity to Ladydale SBI and due to the addition of sites which are not all within a 1km radius of the town centre or local facilities. Also some were agricultural land and some are not located on a C or unclassified road. The area to the north east of Leek (Area 6 at Preferred Options Stage) and the area to the eastern fringes of Leek (Area 5) scored significantly less well than the other broad areas due to them being in the open countryside, outside the existing development boundary and relatively remote from the town centre. However, these areas were longer term sites to provide flexibility to meet the town's requirements which cannot otherwise be met in the urban area and north of Leek. The extent of Areas 5 & 6 was amended from that at Preferred Options stage and the SA scoring was reassessed to reflect it. As a result, Area 5 scored lower on location due to it all lying outside the town development boundary and Area 6 scored lower due to the smaller area identified not having access onto a classified A road or being on a bus route.

In Biddulph, the most sustainable broad locations for housing were the urban area and the extension to the urban area west of the bypass. Land in the greenbelt at Newpool was significantly less sustainable due to it being open countryside, in the greenbelt and the vast majority being classified as Grade 3 agricultural land. The sustainability score for the urban area is slightly lower than at preferred options stage as this area incorporated Uplands Mill and the current commitment at

Newpool Meadows lowering the score for access to the town centre and facilities and not being located on a classified road.

In Cheadle, the most sustainable broad locations were the urban area, the south west urban extension and the extension to the urban area north of Cheadle. The extension to the north of Cheadle performs less well although the policy (SS5c) states that this area may not be required but it is considered appropriate to retain this for longer term development on the grounds that it would provide flexibility to help deliver the District's housing needs and support local infrastructure requirements for Cheadle. The sustainability scoring was changed from the Preferred Options scoring in 2 broad areas. The scope of the urban area was amended to include Area 1 (North Cheadle) thereby lowering the sustainability score in terms of access to the town centre and facilities and being on a classified road. Former broad Areas 4 & 5 were amalgamated into one broad area (South West Cheadle Urban Extension) which resulted in a lower overall score because Area 5 is located in the green belt.

Some impacts such as key habitats and species depend on the specific location of the site and will be addressed in the Site Allocations DPD.

In terms of the proposed 'major developed areas in the countryside', both areas (Anzio Camp, Blackshaw Moor and Bolton Copperworks, Froghall) scored relatively well due to the major regeneration opportunities that redevelopment would provide. However, the SA highlighted sustainability issues associated with both sites including poor access to facilities and services and the close proximity to designated Sites of Biological Importance. Froghall scored less well than Anzio Camp due to Flood Zone 3 running through part of the area. In addition there could be a potential negative impact on the heritage of the area as it lies adjacent to the Caldon Canal Conservation Area, although any redevelopment would have to be sensitive to the heritage, landscape and biodiversity of the area.

## Section E – Addendum to Submission Version

In May / June 2009 the District Council published the Core Strategy Submission Version together with an accompanying SA and invited representations on the legal compliance and soundness of the proposals. Over 400 representations were received, many of which questioned the soundness of some of the areas identified as broad locations for housing. At this stage there were a number of representations which referred to the Sustainability Appraisal. These were all related to the assessment of broad locations in Biddulph and Cheadle. All representations received and the Council's response to them are included in the Core Strategy Consultation Statement.

In terms of Biddulph, the sustainability of the broad areas showed that Area 6 is less than a kilometre from the town centre and has good public transport links. In Cheadle a number of respondents considered that other broad locations had not been appropriately considered and that the Sustainability Appraisal scoring was weighted in favour of Areas 4 & 5. In response, each of the areas was subjected to a comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal which considered location and type of land, accessibility, environmental impact, flood risk and infrastructure/regeneration benefits and scores were attributed to each element. The SA enabled the broad locations to be ranked in order of preference and preferred broad locations to meet Cheadle's requirements were identified. Consultation on the preferred broad locations and also the other broad locations was then undertaken. Suggestions were also invited for broad locations which had not been included. The assessment and ranking of all the broad areas was subsequently reviewed in the light of further evidence and responses from the Preferred Options consultation in order to identify the final choice of broad locations and their priorities.

The issues raised in these representations, together with further evidence on the potential for some sites to deliver housing, led to the Council reconsidering whether the approach to broad locations for housing development in Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph contained within the Submission Version of the Core Strategy was the most appropriate.

Further investigations and assessments of alternative approaches to meeting the housing requirements in the three towns took place. As a result of these, the Council decided that significant changes to the broad locations for housing in all three towns were justified. It was considered that with these changes, the requirements and strategy of each town would continue to be met in a sustainable way which would not undermine the overall soundness of the Core Strategy.

The main changes to the document proposed related to where future housing development would take place in Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph. Clearly, as alternative locations were being proposed in all three towns, these constituted significant focused changes to the plan. Therefore, the Council was required to publish them and give people the opportunity to make representations on these changes and how they would affect the soundness of the Submission Core Strategy.

No changes were being considered to the overall strategy or other proposals and policies for the District which were still considered to be sound. In addition, some minor changes to the Submission Version of the Core Strategy were also being proposed. These constituted points of clarification, factual and grammatical corrections, updating of figures and changes necessary to ensure the document was clear and up to date when adopted. Whilst the minor changes being proposed were not significant, representations were also being invited on these. The minor changes did not have an impact on the Sustainability Appraisal and therefore were not assessed.



## Summary of Changes to Addendum

A summary of how the proposed main changes to future housing development in Leek, Cheadle and Biddulph would affect the Core Strategy is detailed below:

### Spatial Strategy 5a (Leek Area Strategy)

- The deletion of Areas 5 (Eastern Fringe) and 6 (North East of Leek) as broad locations;
- An increase in the capacity in the urban area to 747 dwellings (to include 100 dwellings on the Churnet Works site and 20 dwellings at Belle Vue Factory);
- The bulk of the remaining requirement of 214 dwellings to be accommodated within the broad location of Area 3 (North of Leek) as identified in the Core Strategy Submission Version, but with a reduced capacity of 150 dwellings;
- An allowance of 100 dwellings to be met on 'small urban extension' sites to meet any shortfall, if required. These sites would not be identified in the Core Strategy, but would come forward through the Site Allocations DPD.

#### Anticipated Housing Provision

<b>TOTAL REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>1800</b>
Completions since 2006	244
Current Commitments	591
New allocations – Within the urban area (Area 8)	747
New allocations – North of Leek (Area 3)	150
Windfall allowance	100
<b>TOTAL POTENTIAL PROVISION</b>	<b>1932</b>
Slippage allowance	-96
<b>Over/ under provision</b>	<b>+36</b>

### Spatial Strategy 5b (Biddulph Area Strategy)

- The deletion of area 6 (Newpool) as a broad location;
- An increase in the capacity in the urban area to 582 dwellings (to include an additional 22 dwellings on the mill sites);
- The bulk of the remaining requirement of 472 dwellings to be accommodated within the broad location of area 4 (West Biddulph) as identified in the Core Strategy Submission Version with a capacity of 330 dwellings;
- An allowance of 150 dwellings to be met on 'small urban extension' sites to meet any shortfall, if required. These sites would not be identified in the Core Strategy, but would come forward through the Site Allocations DPD.

#### Anticipated Housing Provision

<b>TOTAL REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>1200</b>
Completions since 2006	98
Current Commitments	53
New allocations – Within the urban area (Area 8)	582
New allocations – West of Bypass (Area 4)	330
Small Urban Extensions	150
Windfall allowance	100
<b>TOTAL POTENTIAL PROVISION</b>	<b>1313</b>

Slippage allowance	-105
<b>Over/ under provision</b>	<b>+8</b>

### Spatial Strategy 5c (Cheadle Area Strategy)

- The deletion of Areas 4 and 5 (South West of Cheadle) as a broad location for housing and the deletion of the associated link road;
- Retaining areas 1 and 2 (North and North East Cheadle) as broad locations for housing as identified in the Core Strategy Submission Version with an estimated capacity of 430 dwellings;
- Identifying a new area 4a (Brookhouses) as a broad location for housing with an estimated capacity of between 50 and 200 dwellings dependent on deliverability;
- Identifying new areas 6 and 7 (East Cheadle) as broad locations for housing with a combined estimated capacity of between 300 and 450 dwellings (dependent on capacity in area 4a) on appropriate sustainable sites across these areas;
- Additional infrastructure benefits from all appropriate new housing development to support the provision of a recreational area for younger people to serve Cheadle West and a new primary school to serve East / North Cheadle.

### Anticipated Housing Provision

<b>TOTAL REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>1500</b>
Completions since 2006	55
Current Commitments	94
New allocations – Within the urban area (Area 8)	452
New allocations – Brookhouses, Cheadle (Area 4a)	50 - 200
New allocations – North and North East of Cheadle (Areas 1 and 2)	430
New allocations – East of Cheadle (Area 6 and 7)	300 - 450
Windfall allowance	100
<b>TOTAL POTENTIAL PROVISION</b>	<b>1631</b>
Slippage allowance	-135
<b>Over/ under provision</b>	<b>-4</b>

## Summary of Impact of Addendum to Submission Version on Sustainability

- + = Positive      ++ = Significantly Positive      -- = Significantly Negative  
 - = Negative  
 0 = Neutral (no significant positive or negative effects)  
 ? = Impact Unknown  
 I = Impact dependent on how implemented

Different components within an Option may generate varying impacts. This is indicated by '/'

SA Objectives	Short Term (less than 1 year)	Medium Term (1-5 years)	Long Term (5 years or more)	Summary of Appraisal
<b>Social</b>	- / +	+	++	Positive effect over time as growth is focussed in the towns and larger villages resulting in improved services/facilities and strengthening the retail offer in the towns. Provision of additional dwellings including affordable housing will provide more choice and meet the needs of local residents. Increase in employment land will provide locations for new and expanding businesses and greater opportunity to work locally. All of these positive effects direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel. Negative effect on the loss of views and landscape impact resulting from development – this may become less significant in the medium to long term.
<b>Environment</b>	-- / +	- / ++	- / ++	The cumulative effect on the environmental objectives are varied. This is mainly due to the effect of new development in terms of energy consumption, use of building materials, use of greenfield sites and impact on the character of the landscape and townscape. There are however some positive effects such as encouraging further development of tourism and culture and opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings.
<b>Economic</b>	++	++	++	The assessment shows the document has a significantly positive effect on the economic objectives. Provision of a range of sites across the District combined with the protection of suitable employment sites will safeguard the vitality and viability of the towns and larger settlements. The increase in the range of units will attract new employers and allow existing businesses to expand. There is an on-going need

				to ensure that the District's workforce skills match local employment opportunities.
--	--	--	--	--

## Conclusions

The detailed Sustainability Appraisal of the Addendum to the Submission Core Strategy was published in December 2009. Changes made to the Addendum to the Submission Version of the Core Strategy have not altered the overall impact on sustainability. The Submission Version of the Core Strategy (incorporating the Addendum) will contribute permanent positive social, economic and environmental impacts on sustainability by creating distinctive, sustainable and self-sufficient settlements, meeting local needs and a strong, prosperous economy.

Negative impacts would largely result from the development of new residential and employment sites due to the use of greenfield sites, impact on soil resources, loss of views/impact on the landscape and energy consumption of new buildings. These will be offset to a certain extent by social and economic gains such as greater choice of housing and employment opportunities such as the Regional Investment Site. Similarly the location of underused major developed sites in the countryside can be offset by providing opportunities for suitable uses.

It must be ensured that new developments meet the requirements set out in Policy SD1 – Achieving Sustainable Development and DC1 – Design Considerations in order to ensure that all new developments incorporate sustainable construction techniques and maximise energy efficiency in particular through greater attention to building layout and design. Strict attention to detail is required to ensure that potentially negative effects are prevented/ minimised and positive effects enhanced.

In terms of specific broad areas for housing development, in Leek development of Area 3 has the potential to have a negative impact on a biodiversity site as recent survey work has identified part of the area as being of high nature conservation value which should be protected from development and has been designated an SBI. Despite this, overall the changes would result in a higher sustainability score for Leek than in the Submission Core Strategy mainly due to the deletion of Areas 5 and 6 as broad locations and their replacement with 'small urban extensions' some of which are in closer proximity to services and facilities, brownfield land and non-agricultural land.

There were some changes to the scoring of broad areas in Leek since the Submission Version was assessed. The score for Area 3 has increased slightly as there is now direct access onto a frequent bus service with the addition of Bode Business Park. The assessment has been amended to reflect the recent SBI designation of the tipped area and agricultural field within this broad area. Area 6a has seen an increased score from Area 6 at Submission Stage. This is because the smaller area does not include any agricultural land and is not in close proximity to an SBI. Evidence stating a reduced flood risk at Churnet Works has resulted in the scoring for this area increasing.

In Biddulph, overall the changes proposed to the broad locations would result in an equal or potentially higher level of sustainability than in the Submission Core Strategy. Small urban extensions scored the same as Area 6 (which was deleted). However, there is the potential for some of the small urban extensions to be located on more sustainable sites than Area 6 resulting in a higher sustainability score.

There has been a change to the scoring in Area 4 since the Submission Stage due to a change in the bus timetable resulting in no bus route in close proximity to the area and the sustainability scoring reducing slightly.

In Cheadle, overall the changes would result in a marginally lower level of sustainability than in the Submission Core Strategy but they represent the most sustainable of the alternative options considered. Deleted Areas 4 and 5 have a relatively high sustainability score which is higher than Area 4a (included at this stage). Area 6 & 7 also scores lower than deleted Areas 4 & 5 but significantly higher than the other areas considered (i.e. Areas 10 and 11). Additional infrastructure benefits can also be realised from all appropriate new housing development to support the provision of a recreational area for younger people to serve Cheadle West and a new primary school to serve East / North Cheadle.

Some impacts such as key habitats and species depend on the specific location of the site and will be addressed in the Site Allocations DPD.

## Section F – Revised Submission Stage

Following consultation on the Submission Version of the Core Strategy, which raised issues relating to the broad locations for housing and led to a reconsideration of these broad locations by the Council, further consultation on an Addendum to the Core Strategy (with an accompanying revised SA) was held in December 2009 / January 2010. This proposed amendments to the broad areas in each of the towns. Over 400 responses were received to this consultation, most of which were objecting to the proposals put forward for Cheadle, particularly the inclusion of the area to the east of Cheadle (Area 6/7). All representations received and the Council's response to them are included in the Core Strategy Consultation Statement. At this stage there were a number of representations which referred to the Sustainability Appraisal. These were all related to the assessment of broad locations in Cheadle.

In response to comments regarding the Sustainability Appraisal at this stage, all potential sites had been appraised in terms of their location, land type, accessibility, environmental impact, flood risk and infrastructure /regeneration benefits. Area 1 was considered to perform well as it is located within the development boundary, has good accessibility and would not have a detrimental impact on nature conservation sites or on the landscape. Area 2 scored less well because it is located outside the settlement boundary in open countryside and currently has no direct access. However, it would have limited impact on areas of nature conservation value and is not in an area identified as being of significant landscape value in the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment. Both areas scored higher than other areas evaluated at Leek Road and near to JCB. Area 4a scored relatively highly because of its location within the current development boundary, its proximity to schools, its limited impact on the environment and the scope to provide open space facilities. With regard to the floodplain, only a very small part of the area would fall within any area at risk of flooding which could be excluded from the development site. Areas 6 and 7 performed relatively highly compared to other areas evaluated off Leek Road and near to JCB but less well than Areas 4 and 5. They are both well related to the existing urban area, are served by public transport, near to existing recreation facilities and, combined with areas 1 and 2 have the capacity to deliver a new primary school. Furthermore the scales of development is such that there would be an opportunity for significant improvements to be made to public transport, cycle and pedestrian links to improve connectivity to the town centre and employment areas.

In 2010, the Council decided to make further revisions to the proposals in the Core Strategy in light of new evidence on future housing requirements in the District, the results of previous consultation and to address policy gaps likely to arise from the abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy. The key change is a proposal to reduce the Council's overall figure for new housing in the period 2006 – 2026 from 6000 to 5500 to reflect the latest evidence.

Consequently, further investigations and assessments of alternative approaches to meeting the housing requirements in the three towns were considered. As a result of these, the Council decided that further significant changes to the broad locations for housing in Cheadle and Leek were justified. It was considered that with these changes, the requirements and strategy of each town would continue to be met in a sustainable way in which would not undermine the overall soundness of the Core Strategy.

The main changes proposed to the Revised Submission document related to where future housing development would take place in Cheadle and Leek. These amendments constituted significant changes to the plan. Other revisions were made to some of the policies, in particular a redistribution

of some housing from Cheadle to the rural areas, the addition of a new policy on green infrastructure and significant re-drafting of policies on sustainability and renewable energy. The Council is required to publish these changes (with an accompanying SA) and give people the opportunity to make representations on how they will affect the soundness of the Submission Core Strategy. The following Sustainability Appraisal summarises the sustainability assessment of these revisions to the Core Strategy.

Most of the revisions to the policies were of a minor nature e.g. points of clarification, factual and grammatical corrections, updating of figures and changes necessary to ensure the document was clear and up to date when adopted. Whilst the minor changes proposed were not significant, representations were also invited on them. The minor changes did not have an impact on the Sustainability Appraisal and only policies where wording changes are considered to be significant were reassessed.

The main changes proposed to the Core Strategy from the previous submission document which was published in May 2009 were:

- References to RSS amended to reflect latest government proposals in Localism Bill to abolish all RSSs.
- All statistics, dates and document references updated to reflect latest available information.
- All references to public bodies and authorities updated to reflect subsequent re-organisational changes.
- Aims and Objectives and Spatial Strategy amended to delete reference to consistency with RSS and incorporate broader reference to consistency with national and regional policy and local evidence with specific reference to housing development levels being based on the Council's assessment of housing requirements.
- **Spatial Strategy Policy SS2** amended to reduce District housing requirement from 6,000 to 5,500 dwellings over period 2006 – 2026 and to change phasing of development with reduced development rates up to 2021. Additional obligation introduced for Council to review housing requirements and phased development rates every 5 years to ensure that future provision will continue to adequately meet identified local needs and reflect development potential.
- **Spatial Strategy Policy SS3** amended to reduce proportion of housing requirement to be met in Cheadle from 25% to 22% and increase proportion to be met in the Rural Areas from 25% to 28%.
- **Spatial Strategy Policy SS5** amended to incorporate reduced housing requirements and affordable housing targets for Leek, Biddulph and Cheadle
- **Leek Area Strategy Policy SS5a** amended to reduce scale of housing provision overall from 1800 to 1650 dwellings and delete proposed broad locations for housing allocations at Areas 3 (Extension to North of Leek) and Areas 5/6 (Extension to North East/Eastern Fringes of Leek). New housing allocations to be now only within the urban area (for approx. 642 dwellings) and on small urban extension sites (for approx. 150 dwellings)
- **Biddulph Area Strategy Policy SS5b** amended to reduce scale of provision overall from 1200 to 1100 dwellings. New housing allocations to be within the urban area (for approx. 312 dwellings), on small urban extension sites (for approx. 100 dwellings), and on Area 4 to West of Bypass (reduced from 330 to 280 dwellings).
- **Cheadle Area Strategy Policy SS5c** amended to reduce scale of provision overall from 1500 to 1210 dwellings and delete proposed broad location for housing allocations at Areas 4 and 5 (South West Cheadle Urban Extension). New housing allocations to be now

only within the urban area (for approx. 441 dwellings), on small urban extension sites (for approx. 200 dwellings), and on Areas 1 and 2 to North and North East of Cheadle (for approx. 400 dwellings).

- **Leek and Biddulph Area Strategies Policies SS5a and SS5b** amended to strengthen reference to supporting their regeneration and accessibility to employment areas (currently covered by RSS policy UR2)
- **Leek, Biddulph and Cheadle Area Strategies SS5a, SS5b and SS5c** amended to include additional reference to urban areas in list of broad locations for employment development
- **Rural Area Strategy Policy SS6** amended to increase scale of provision overall from 1500 to 1540 dwellings and increase provision of affordable housing from 300 to 400 dwellings.
- **Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor Policy SS7** addition of the words 'and heritage' in the last bullet point.
- **Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site policy SS8** amended to include objectives for development on this site (currently covered by RSS policy PA7)
- **Sustainable Development Policy SD1** amended in the form of 3 policies to set out local requirements for energy savings, renewable energy, carbon emission reductions and sustainable design and construction requirements (currently covered by RSS policies SD1, QE9 and QE10)
- **Economy & Employment Policy E1** amended to permit large scale office developments only where there is a clear need and it will have no adverse impacts on office development schemes in other centres (currently covered by RSS policy PA13b)
- **Economy & Employment Policy E3** amended to provide greater clarity and guidance on new tourism developments
- **Gypsy & Travellers Policy H3** amendment to allow for the allocation of a site 'or sites' for gypsies and travellers to provide increased flexibility.
- **Design & Conservation Policy DC1** reference made to new policy C3 on green infrastructure and new reference to biodiversity and geological heritage with a cross reference to Policy NE1.
- **Design & Conservation Policy DC3** reference to new policy C3 on green infrastructure.
- **Sustainable Communities Policy C1** amended to include reference to infrastructure requirements associated with new developments being met through any subsequently adopted Community Infrastructure Levy as well as through planning obligations.
- **New Sustainable Communities Policy C3** on Green Infrastructure Strategy setting out intention to develop integrated network of multi-functional green infrastructure through Site Allocations DPD and Green Infrastructure Strategy currently covered by RSS policies QE4, QE6 and QE7).
- **Rural Housing Policy R2** amended to allow also for conversions to residential where it can be demonstrated that a commercial use would not be suitable.
- **Natural Environment Policy NE1** new reference to landscape scale conservation management and cross reference to new Policy C3.



## Summary of Impact of Revised Submission Version on Sustainability

- + = Positive      ++ = Significantly Positive      -- = Significantly Negative  
 - = Negative  
 0 = Neutral (no significant positive or negative effects)  
 ? = Impact Unknown  
 I = Impact dependent on how implemented

Different components within an Option may generate varying impacts. This is indicated by '/'

SA Objectives	Short Term (less than 1 year)	Medium Term (1-5 years)	Long Term (5 years or more)	Summary of Appraisal
<b>Social</b>	- / +	+	++	Positive effect over time as growth is focussed in the towns and larger villages resulting in improved services/facilities and strengthening the retail offer in the towns. Provision of additional dwellings including affordable housing will provide more choice and meet the needs of local residents. Increase in employment land will provide locations for new and expanding businesses and greater opportunity to work locally. All of these positive effects direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel. Negative effect on the loss of views and landscape impact resulting from development – this may become less significant in the medium to long term.
<b>Environment</b>	-- / +	- / ++	- / ++	The cumulative effect on the environmental objectives are varied. This is mainly due to the effect of new development in terms of energy consumption, use of building materials, use of greenfield sites and impact on the character of the landscape and townscape. There are however some positive effects such as encouraging further development of tourism and culture and opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings.
<b>Economic</b>	++	++	++	The assessment shows the document has a significantly positive effect on the economic objectives. Provision of a range of sites across the District combined with the protection of suitable employment sites will safeguard the vitality and viability of the towns and larger settlements. The increase in the range of units will attract new employers and allow existing businesses

				to expand. There is an on-going need to ensure that the District's workforce skills match local employment opportunities.
--	--	--	--	---

## Conclusions

Revisions made to the Submission Version of the Core Strategy were considered in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Revised Submission Version undertaken in December 2011 and did not alter the overall impact on sustainability. The Revised Submission Version of the Core Strategy was considered to contribute permanent positive social, economic and environmental impacts on sustainability by creating distinctive, sustainable and self-sufficient settlements, meeting local needs and a strong, prosperous economy.

Negative impacts would largely result from the development of new residential and employment sites due to the use of greenfield sites, impact on soil resources, loss of views/impact on the landscape and energy consumption of new buildings. These will be offset to a certain extent by social and economic gains such as greater choice of housing and employment opportunities such as the Regional Investment Site. Similarly the location of underused major developed sites in the countryside can be offset by providing opportunities for suitable uses.

It must be ensured that new developments meet the requirements set out in Policy SD1 – Sustainable Use of Resources and DC1 – Design Considerations in order to ensure that all new developments incorporate sustainable construction techniques and maximise energy efficiency in particular through greater attention to building layout and design. Strict attention to detail is required to ensure that potentially negative effects are prevented/ minimised and positive effects enhanced.

In terms of specific broad areas for housing development, overall, the broad areas proposed for development in the Revised Submission Core Strategy would result in a higher sustainability score for Leek than in the Submission Core Strategy. This was mainly due to the deletion of Areas 5 and 6 as broad locations and their replacement with 'small urban extensions' some of which are in closer proximity to services and facilities, brownfield land and non-agricultural land. In Biddulph, overall the changes proposed to the broad locations would result in an equal or potentially higher level of sustainability than in the Submission Core Strategy. Small urban extensions scored the same as Area 6 (which has been deleted). However, there is the potential for some of the small urban extensions to be located on more sustainable sites than Area 6 resulting in a higher sustainability score. In Cheadle, the changes to the broad areas for housing development result in a lower level of sustainability than in the Submission Core Strategy as the 'small urban extensions' and Area 2 (which may not have been required for development in the Submission Version of the plan but is required in the Revised Submission Version) both have lower scores than some of the alternative broad areas which have been discounted. However, it should be emphasised that proposals in the Revised Submission Core Strategy significantly reduced the number of houses planned for Cheadle and this will result in less green field development around the town overall. Some impacts such as key habitats and species depend on the specific location of the site and will be addressed in the Site Allocations DPD.

In terms of the proposed 'major developed areas in the countryside', both areas (Anzio Camp, Blackshaw Moor and Bolton Copperworks, Froghall) score relatively well due to the major regeneration opportunities that redevelopment would provide. However, the SA highlights sustainability issues

associated with both sites including poor access to facilities and services and the close proximity to designated Sites of Biological Importance. Froghall scores less well than Anzio Camp due to Flood Zone 3 running through part of the area. In addition there is the potential to have a negative impact on the heritage of the area as it lies adjacent to the Caldon Canal Conservation Area, although any redevelopment would have to be sensitive to the heritage, landscape and biodiversity of the area.

## Section G – Modifications Stage

The Revised Submission Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in September 2012. The formal hearing part of the examination took place from 5th to 8th February 2013. The Inspector issued his interim conclusions on 5th March 2013 which identified some key areas which he considered needed to be modified before the plan could be adopted. The Inspector invited the Council to consider what form these modifications should take. The Council agreed a schedule of modifications to be published for consultation. This consultation was undertaken between 24<sup>th</sup> June and 5<sup>th</sup> August 2013.

The Inspector indicated that, if or where it is considered necessary, the Sustainability Appraisal should be reviewed. The Council considered it appropriate to undertake a review at this stage to understand the potential impacts of these changes on sustainability.

### Summary of Main Modifications

---

#### **Policy SS1a: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development (New Policy)**

This new policy reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Planning applications that accord with policies in the Core Strategy will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no relevant policies, or policies are out of date the Council will also approve applications unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

---

#### **Policy SS2: Future Provision of Development**

The changes to this policy include:

- An increase in housing provision from 5500 to 6000 additional dwellings to be completed in the Staffordshire Moorlands during the period 2006 to 2026.
- Reference to the affordable housing target as part of the overall housing provision has been removed.
- A commitment to an early review of the Core Strategy which will be rolled into a single Local Plan combined with the Site Allocations DPD.
- Changes to the development rates post 2016.

---

#### **Policy SS4: Managing the Release of Housing Land**

New paragraph added to confirm that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) will identify specific deliverable sites sufficient for 5 years supply of housing and an additional buffer of 5% or 20% where appropriate.

---

#### **Policy SS5: Towns**

The increase in the housing requirement in Policy SS2: Future Provision of Development is reflected in the figures for the three towns.

---

#### **Policy SS5a: Leek Area Strategy**

Amendment to reflect changes to Policy SS7: Churnet Valley Area Strategy.

---

#### **Policy SS5b: Biddulph Area Strategy**

An amendment has been made to this policy to clarify that the small urban extensions in the green belt will be identified as part of a review of the green belt boundary through the Site Allocations DPD and the review of the Core Strategy.

---

#### **Policy SS5c: Cheadle Area Strategy**

The extension to the urban area to the north east of Cheadle (Area 2) has been deleted. The policy states that the Council will assess the need for other broad locations through the review of the Core Strategy. References to the need for a bypass and other infrastructure improvements have been moved to the supporting text.

---

**Policy SS6: Rural Areas**

The increase in the housing requirement in Policy SS2: Future Provision of Development is reflected in the figures for the rural area.

---

**Policy SS6a: Larger Villages Area Strategy**

Minor change to the text to refer to 'built-up' rather than 'urban' to provide a clearer description.

---

**Policy SS6b: Smaller Villages Area Strategy**

An amendment has been made to this policy so that new housing in smaller villages no longer have to meet an 'essential local need' as required in the countryside, but need to meet a 'local need'.

---

**Policy SS6c: Other Rural Areas Area Strategy**

Amendments to this policy include:

- clarification to include the types of housing development that would be acceptable in the countryside and green belt.
- deletion of the reference to Blythe Business Park as expansion and redevelopment of existing businesses are covered by general guidance under Policy E1: New Employment Development.
- amendment to text in part 5 relating to the Churnet Valley which reflects changes to Policy SS7: Churnet Valley Area Strategy.
- amendment to clarify the process for undertaking a review of the green belt boundaries.

---

**Policy SS7: Churnet Valley Area Strategy**

Amendments include:

- changes to clarify the aims of the strategic policy for the Churnet Valley;
- guidance on the principles of development which the Council would support; and
- stronger emphasis on the considerations regarding impact on the natural environment etc.

---

**Policy SD1: Sustainable Use of Resources**

This policy has been amended so that:

- previously developed land targets have been deleted;
- it has clarified circumstances for development on previously developed land and greenfield sites;
- only major-scale planning applications will need to provide a Sustainability/Energy Statement (originally most applications needed this);
- it is no longer required that the 'Building for Life' tool standards are applied to new developments, although the benefits will be incorporated into the supporting text.
- the target of 25% of minerals used from recycled / reused content in new-build schemes has been deleted and replaced with the need for developers to investigate the potential;
- the reference to site waste management plans has been removed as these are covered by separate legislation;

- there is no longer a requirement that all new development achieves the highest viably possible water conservation standards; however the Council's support for elevated water conservation standards remains. Also reference to how all new development should consider Sustainable Drainage Systems has been removed.

---

### **Policy SD2: Renewable and Low-Carbon Energy**

In order to improve clarity the previous Policy SD2 has been sub-divided into two separate policies: the first Policy 'Renewable and Low-Carbon Energy' is the new SD2 Policy – this carries forward the Policy about stand-alone renewables from Part (1) of the original Policy which is unchanged apart from the removal of the requirement for considering brownfield sites first. The second Policy (new "SD3") 'Carbon-Saving Measures in New Development' is set out below.

---

### **Policy SD3: Carbon-Saving Measures in Development (New Policy)**

This Policy consolidates Parts (2-5) of original Policy SD2; but the original requirements from these Parts have been substantially reworded to remove certain requirements/expectations upon developers and more clearly give an indication of those measures that the Council will support.

---

### **Policy E1: New Employment Development**

Amendment to include general guidance for the redevelopment, intensification or improvement of existing employment sites.

---

### **Policy E3: Tourism and Cultural Development**

Policy amended to provide greater clarity on those forms of tourism and cultural development which are appropriate and to reflect modifications to policy SS7 (Churnet Valley).

---

### **Policy H2: Affordable and Local Needs Housing**

This policy has been amended to reflect a reduced scale of 33% affordable housing obligations to 2016 to be consistent with the current evidence of viability. This was previously 40% in the towns and 50% in the larger villages. This target will be reviewed from 2016. Removed requirement for all housing in rest of rural areas to be either affordable to be either affordable or meet a local need which cannot be met elsewhere.

---

### **Policy H3: Gypsy and Traveller Sites**

The requirement for applicants to first prove a 'need' when determining planning applications for gypsy and traveller sites has been deleted.

---

### **Policy R2: Rural Housing**

Removal of the requirement for conversions to be affordable or meet an identified local need.

Although modifications to these policies are proposed the impacts of the changes are not considered to be significant enough to change the scoring from the Revised submission stage.

- + = Positive      ++ = Significantly Positive      -- = Significantly Negative  
 - = Negative  
 0 = Neutral (no significant positive or negative effects)  
 ? = Impact Unknown  
 I = Impact dependent on how implemented

Different components within an Option may generate varying impacts. This is indicated by '/'

SA Objectives	Short Term (less than 1 year)	Medium Term (1-5 years)	Long Term (5 years or more)	Summary of Appraisal
<b>Social</b>	- / +	+	++	Positive effect over time as growth is focused in the towns and larger villages resulting in improved services/facilities and strengthening the retail offer in the towns. Provision of additional dwellings including affordable housing will provide more choice and meet the needs of local residents - although the amount of affordable housing achieved is likely to be less due to reduced target. Increase in employment land will provide locations for new and expanding businesses and greater opportunity to work locally. All of these positive effects generally direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel. Car use in the District remains high and improvements to the public transport network should be sought wherever possible.
<b>Environment</b>	-- / +	- / ++	- / ++	The cumulative effect on the environmental objectives are varied. This is mainly due to the effect of new development in terms of energy consumption, use of building materials, use of greenfield sites and impact on the character of the landscape and townscape. There are however some positive effects such as encouraging further development of tourism and culture and opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings. The increased level of housing could have a greater impact on the green belt and landscape, particularly

				surrounding Biddulph and the larger villages. This may become less significant in the medium to long term.
<b>Economic</b>	++	++	++	The assessment shows the document has a significantly positive effect on the economic objectives. Provision of a range of sites across the District combined with the protection of suitable employment sites will safeguard the vitality and viability of the towns and larger settlements. The increase in the range of units will attract new employers and allow existing businesses to expand. There is an on-going need to ensure that the District's workforce skills match local employment opportunities.

The summary of the positive impacts on sustainability identified in the appraisal arising from the modifications relate to:

- the new policy on the presumption in favour of sustainable development in terms of securing development that improves the social, environmental and economic conditions of the area;
- the overall increase in the supply of new housing which will provide a choice and range of housing and support existing services and facilities;
- increased protection of the biodiversity and landscape character of the Churnet Valley and measures to improve connectivity and accessibility;
- general guidance for existing employment sites to protect the amenity, character or appearance of the area.

The summary of the negative impacts identified in the appraisal arising from the modifications relate to:

- the reduction of the affordable housing target – although this may be offset by the increase in overall housing provision and will, in any event, be reviewed for the period after 2016.
- a potential increase in the impact on green belt and the surrounding countryside particularly in Biddulph and the larger villages as a consequence of increase housing numbers. It will therefore be particularly important to maximise opportunities within existing settlement boundaries and draw on evidence contained within the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment.
- more housing in the rural area could increase the need to travel. It will be particularly important to support and retain facilities and services for local residents and ensure that there are alternative means of transport to the private car.
- The removal of a number of the original requirements regarding improving the sustainability of new development under Policies SD1 & SD2 has arguably 'watered down' their positive impacts; however the Council's position of support for such measures remain.

The main modifications propose the deletion of Area 2 in Cheadle for residential development. The proposed amendment to Policy SS5c states that the Council will assess the need for other broad locations through the review of the Core Strategy. Therefore no new or previously considered broad



locations are included in the modifications and an assessment of broad locations has not been included in this update. It is intended, in autumn 2013, to update the sustainability appraisal scoping report and the methodology for appraising potential development sites prior to producing a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) Options Report. The review of the Core Strategy will incorporate the Site Allocations DPD to form a single Local Plan.

The modifications are not considered to change the overall cumulative impacts of the plan over time.

## Section H – List of Core Strategy Policies

- SS1:** Development Principles
- SS1a:** Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- SS2:** Future Provision of Development
- SS3:** Distribution of Development
- SS4:** Managing the Release of Housing Land
- SS5:** Towns
- SS5a:** Leek Area Strategy
- SS5b:** Biddulph Area Strategy
- SS5c:** Cheadle Area Strategy
- SS6:** Rural Areas
- SS6a:** Larger Villages Area Strategy
- SS6b:** Smaller Villages Area Strategy
- SS6c:** Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
- SS7:** Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor
- SS8:** Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site
- SD1:** Sustainable Use of Resources
- SD2:** Renewable & Low Carbon Energy
- SD3:** Carbon-saving measures in Development
- SD4:** Pollution & Flood Risk
- E1:** New Employment Development
- E2:** Existing Employment Sites
- E3:** Tourism and Cultural Development
- H1:** New Housing Development
- H2:** Affordable and Local Needs Housing
- H3:** Gypsy and Traveller Sites
- TCR1:** Development in the Town Centres
- TCR2:** Retailing Outside Town Centres
- DC1:** Design Considerations
- DC2:** The Historic Environment
- DC3:** Landscape and Settlement Setting
- C1:** Creating Sustainable Communities
- C2:** Sport, Recreation and Open Space
- C3:** Green Infrastructure
- R1:** Rural Diversification
- R2:** Rural Housing
- NE1:** Biodiversity and Geological Resources
- T1:** Development and Sustainable Transport
- T2:** Other Sustainable Transport Measures

### Section I – Compatibility of Plan (Spatial) Objectives with SA Objectives

SA OBJECTIVE		CORE STRATEGY SPATIAL OBJECTIVES										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
SOCIAL	1	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	0
	2	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
	4	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
	5	0/+	+	+/-	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+
	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
ENVIRONMENTAL	7	0/-	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0
	8	0/-	0	0/-	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0
	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0
	10	+/-	+	+/-	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0
	11	0/-	+	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
	12	0/-	+	0/-	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+
	13	0/-	0	0/-	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0
	14	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0/+	0	0
ECONOMIC	15	+	0	+	0	+	+	0/+	+	0	+	0
	16	+	0	+	0	+	0	0/+	0	0	+	0
	17	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0

### **Conclusion:**

Assessment of compatibility between the Spatial Objectives and SA Objectives reveals the following conflicts:

Spatial Objective 1 may conflict with SA Objectives 10, 11, 12 and 13. Enabling further development will inevitably generate more energy use, increase land uptake and increase surface run-off, which may increase vulnerability to climate change. It could also impact on the character of the landscape/townscape and local distinctiveness and also biodiversity sites and key habitats and species. The Core Strategy Policies respond to this by:

- giving preference to development on previously developed land in allocating land for development and determining planning applications (Core Policy SD1 and Area Strategies)
- avoiding where possible development on sites where that are known to have key habitats or species and where it will appropriate mitigation measures are applied (Core Policy NE1)
- minimising development in areas that are vulnerable to flooding. Establishing flood control measures (Core Policy SD4)
- encouraging on-site renewable energy generation to offset energy usage. Sets out a range of measures to achieve national and regional targets in relation to use of resources and measures to address climate change. Supports small and large scale renewable energy schemes (Core Policies SD2 & SD3)
- establishing high standards of design (DC1, DC2 and DC3)

Spatial Objective 3 may conflict with SA Objectives 5, 7, 8,10,11,12 and 13. Ensuring that there is a range of employment sites and opportunities available in the District requires development on land that has not previously been developed and in terms of the Regional Investment Site in a location which is less sustainable. There may also be implications for development on new sites where there are existing species or habitats. The Core Policies respond to this by:

- encouraging development on previously developed land where possible (Core Policy SD1)
- ensuring development will not adversely impact on key habitats or species and where it will appropriate mitigation measures are applied (Core Policy NE1)
- encouraging on-site renewable energy generation to offset increased energy usage. Sets out a range of measures to achieve national and regional targets in relation to use of resources and measures to address climate change. Supports small and large scale renewable energy schemes (Core Policies SD1 & SD2)

## Section J - Compatibility of Plan (Spatial) Objectives with Each Other

Spatial Objective 1											
Spatial Objective 2	0										
Spatial Objective 3	+	0									
Spatial Objective 4	+	0	0								
Spatial Objective 5	+	0	+	0							
Spatial Objective 6	+	0	+	+	+						
Spatial Objective 7	0	0	0	0	+	+					
Spatial Objective 8	0	0	0	0	0	0	+				
Spatial Objective 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+			
Spatial Objective 10	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0		
Spatial Objective 11	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	
	Spatial Objective 1	Spatial Objective 2	Spatial Objective 3	Spatial Objective 4	Spatial Objective 5	Spatial Objective 6	Spatial Objective 7	Spatial Objective 8	Spatial Objective 9	Spatial Objective 10	Spatial Objective 11





### Section L – Assessment of Components of the Core Strategy against SA Objectives

- + = Positive      ++ = Significantly Positive      -- = Significantly Negative      - = Negative
- 0 = Neutral (no significant positive or negative effects)
- ? = Impact Unknown
- I = Impact dependent on how implemented

SA Objective		Component/Policy								
		SS1 Develop ment Principle s	SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Developmen t	SS2 Future Provision	SS3 Distribution of Development	SS4 Managing the Release of Housing Land	SS5 Towns	SS5a Leek Area Strategy	SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy	SS5c Cheadle Area Strategy
SOCIAL	1. To improve the quality of where people work and live, and minimise risks and nuisances	+	+	++ increasing the number of dwellings in the District therefore more choice	+	0	++	++	++	++
	2. To eliminate social exclusions by promoting, maintaining and improving	++	+	++ increase in employment land, more	++	0	++	++	++	++ Potential support for primary school and recreation area remains



SA Objective	Component/Policy								
	SS1 Develop ment Principle s	SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Developmen t	SS2 Future Provision	SS3 Distribution of Development	SS4 Managing the Release of Housing Land	SS5 Towns	SS5a Leek Area Strategy	SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy	SS5c Cheadle Area Strategy
facilities and services and opportunities for and access to them	deliver services, meeting local need. Addresses housing need including rural need. Meeting the needs of specific groups e.g. older people		choice, greater opportunity to work locally						
3. To minimise opportunities for crime and reduce fear of crime	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b> environmental enhancement, promotion of the evening/ night-	<b>+</b> regenerating and improving the streetscape,	<b>+</b> regenerating and improving the streetscape

SA Objective	Component/Policy								
	SS1 Develop ment Principle s	SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Developmen t	SS2 Future Provision	SS3 Distribution of Development	SS4 Managing the Release of Housing Land	SS5 Towns	SS5a Leek Area Strategy	SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy	SS5c Cheadle Area Strategy
							time economy	improving image and identity of Biddulph	
4. To ensure adequate quality and provision of a range of house types to meet local needs in appropriate locations, and maintain and improve the local housing stock and provision of affordable/ social housing	++	+	++ Reduced target for affordable housing will be offset by increased overall housing provision.	++	++	++ Reduced target for affordable housing will be offset by increased overall housing provision.	++ Reduced target for affordable housing will be offset by increased overall housing provision.	++ Reduced target for affordable housing will be offset by increased overall housing provision.	++ Reduced target for affordable housing will be offset by increased overall housing provision.

SA Objective	Component/Policy								
	SS1 Develop ment Principle s	SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Developmen t	SS2 Future Provision	SS3 Distribution of Development	SS4 Managing the Release of Housing Land	SS5 Towns	SS5a Leek Area Strategy	SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy	SS5c Cheadle Area Strategy
5. To direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++
6. To strengthen transport links between rural areas and towns, and improve conditions for walking, cycling and travel by public transport	0	+	+	0	+	0	++	++	++

SA Objective		Component/Policy								
		SS1 Develop ment Principle s	SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Developmen t	SS2 Future Provision	SS3 Distribution of Development	SS4 Managing the Release of Housing Land	SS5 Towns	SS5a Leek Area Strategy	SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy	SS5c Cheadle Area Strategy
ENVIRONMENT	7. Identify. Conserve and enhance biodiversity sites and to maximise opportunities for achieving Biodiversity Action Plan targets	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	8. To protect and enhance key habitats and species	0	0	0	0	0	0	? Presence of key habitats and species unknown for small urban extension sites	+ Habitat survey findings do not indicate Area 4 as being unsuitable for development other than protecting habitats along the disused railway line, watercourse and the bypass ? Presence of key habitats	+ Habitat survey findings do not indicate Area 1 & 2 as being unsuitable for development other than protecting the watercourse, swamp and a small area of unimproved grassland ? Presence of key habitats and species

SA Objective	Component/Policy								
	SS1 Development Principles	SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	SS2 Future Provision	SS3 Distribution of Development	SS4 Managing the Release of Housing Land	SS5 Towns	SS5a Leek Area Strategy	SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy	SS5c Cheadle Area Strategy
								and species unknown for small urban extension sites	unknown for small urban extension sites
9. To reduce contamination, regenerate degraded environments and maintain soil resources and quality	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>++</b> gives more policy direction than SS1 - loss of soil resources	<b>++</b> use of more previously developed sites - loss of soil due to use of greenfield land	<b>+</b> use of previously developed sites - loss of soil due to use of greenfield land	<b>+</b> use of previously developed sites - loss of soil due to use of greenfield land
10. To promote efficient use of resources	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b> </b> set out in Policy SD1	<b> </b> set out in Policy SD1	<b> </b> set out in Policy SD1	<b> </b> set out in Policy SD1
11. To reduce energy consumption	<b>+</b> requirement for development to contribute	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	- Energy consumption of new development <b>+</b> opportunities	- Energy consumption of new development (including the allocation of	- Energy consumption of new development (including the allocation of	- Energy consumption of new development (including the allocation of

SA Objective	Component/Policy								
	SS1 Develop ment Principle s	SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Developmen t	SS2 Future Provision	SS3 Distribution of Development	SS4 Managing the Release of Housing Land	SS5 Towns	SS5a Leek Area Strategy	SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy	SS5c Cheadle Area Strategy
	effectively to tackling climate change and reduced carbon emissions					for renewable energy & energy efficient buildings	small urban extensions rather than a single broad area which could result in increased energy usage) + opportunities for renewable energy & energy efficient buildings	small urban extensions rather than a single broad area which could result in increased energy usage) + opportunities for renewable energy & energy efficient buildings	small urban extensions rather than a single broad area which could result in increased energy usage) + opportunities for renewable energy & energy efficient buildings
12. To reduce flood risk, protect and enhance water sources and environmental assets, and reduce contributions and	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	- flood risk, small areas affected along watercourses in all of the broad locations + opportunities

SA Objective	Component/Policy								
	SS1 Develop ment Principle s	SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Developmen t	SS2 Future Provision	SS3 Distribution of Development	SS4 Managing the Release of Housing Land	SS5 Towns	SS5a Leek Area Strategy	SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy	SS5c Cheadle Area Strategy
vulnerability to climate change									for inclusion within amenity space
13. To protect and enhance the character of the landscape and townscape, historic assets, and maintain and strengthen local distinctiveness and sense of place	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	- new development will impact on the landscape <b>+</b> opportunities for enhancing the character of the towns	- new development will impact on the landscape <b>+</b> opportunities for enhancing the character of Leek	- new development will impact on the landscape <b>+</b> opportunities for enhancing the character of Biddulph	- new development will impact on the landscape <b>+</b> opportunities for enhancing the character of Cheadle
14. To encourage further development of tourism and culture	<b>++</b> specific referenc e to cultural and tourism facilities	<b>+</b>	<b>++</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>++</b>	<b>++</b>	<b>++</b>

SA Objective		Component/Policy								
		SS1 Develop ment Principle s	SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Developmen t	SS2 Future Provision	SS3 Distribution of Development	SS4 Managing the Release of Housing Land	SS5 Towns	SS5a Leek Area Strategy	SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy	SS5c Cheadle Area Strategy
ECONOMIC	15. To safeguard the vitality and viability of the District's towns and villages, and create and sustain a vibrant rural economy	++	+	++	++	0	++	++	++	++
	16. To strengthen, modernise and diversify the District economy, and sustainable economic growth	+	+	++ identifies employment need and amount of provision	++	0	++	++	++	++
	17. To encourage and support a high and stable level of employment and variety of jobs to meet local employment	+	+	++	++	0	++	++	++	++



SA Objective		Component/Policy							
		SS1 Development Principles	SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	SS2 Future Provision	SS3 Distribution of Development	SS4 Managing the Release of Housing Land	SS5 Towns	SS5a Leek Area Strategy	SS5b Biddulph Area Strategy
	needs								

SA Objective		Component/Policy					
		SS6 Rural Areas	SS6a Larger Villages Area Strategy	SS6b Smaller Villages Area Strategy	SS6c Other Rural Areas Area Strategy	SS7 Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor	SS8 Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site
SOCIAL	1. To improve the quality of where people work and live, and minimise risks and nuisances	++	++	+ issue of scale, it is positive for the local economy in terms of supporting facilities and local needs housing	0	0	0
	2. To eliminate social exclusion by promoting, maintaining and improving facilities, services and opportunities	+	++	0 due to scale	0	0 Measures to improve connectivity and accessibility to & within Churnet Valley	0

SA Objective		Component/Policy					
		SS6 Rural Areas	SS6a Larger Villages Area Strategy	SS6b Smaller Villages Area Strategy	SS6c Other Rural Areas Area Strategy	SS7 Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor	SS8 Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site
	for all and access to them						
	3. To minimise opportunities for crime and reduce the fear of crime	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4. To ensure adequate quality and provision of a range of house types to meet local needs in appropriate locations, and maintain and improve the +local housing stock and provision of affordable/ social housing	++ Less affordable housing will be achieved than previously, however, increased general housing provision.	++ Less affordable housing will be achieved than previously, however, increased general housing provision.	++ meets local need in terms of their size, type and tenure	+ meets exceptional local need	0	0

SA Objective		Component/Policy					
		SS6 Rural Areas	SS6a Larger Villages Area Strategy	SS6b Smaller Villages Area Strategy	SS6c Other Rural Areas Area Strategy	SS7 Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor	SS8 Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site
5. To direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel	<p><b>0</b> Proportion of development in the rural areas likely to increase the need to travel  <b>+</b> Most of the development in the rural areas to be directed to the more sustainable larger villages</p>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	- due to location of major developed sites	<b>+</b> development required to demonstrate strong sustainable development principles	<b>I</b> depends on site use, not necessarily sustainable.
6. To strengthen transport links between rural areas and towns, and improve conditions for walking, cycling and travel by public transport	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b> support for links to strategic footpath/ cycle routes. Support for alternative means of access.	<b>0</b>
7. To identify, conserve and enhance biodiversity sites and to maximise opportunities for achieving Biodiversity Action Plan targets	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b> support for measures to protect designated nature conservation sites and river valley as wildlife corridors	<b>0</b>
8. To protect and	<b>0</b>	<b>?</b> Presence of key	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b> Support for	<b>?</b> Presence of key

SA Objective		Component/Policy					
		SS6 Rural Areas	SS6a Larger Villages Area Strategy	SS6b Smaller Villages Area Strategy	SS6c Other Rural Areas Area Strategy	SS7 Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor	SS8 Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site
	enhance key habitats and species		habitats and species unknown			actions to protect and enhance the biodiversity of the valley, including the maintenance, buffering and connection of designated sites & actions to mitigate climate change.	habitats and species unknown
	9. To reduce contamination, regenerate degraded environments and maintain soil resources and quality	- loss of soil resources due to use of green field sites	+ use of previously developed sites - loss of soil due to use of greenfield sites	0	+ + regenerate underused major developed sites and re-use of rural buildings	+ potential for re-use of existing buildings / previously developed sites	- loss of soil due to use of greenfield site
	10.To promote efficient use of resources	! set out in Policy SD1 + re-use of rural buildings	! depends on details contained in Policy SD1	0	+ re-use of rural buildings	! set out in Policy SD1	! set out in policy SD1
	11. To reduce energy consumption and	- Energy consumption of new development + opportunities for	- Energy consumption of new development	0 due to scale of development	+ opportunities for renewable energy & energy efficient	- Energy consumption of new development	- Energy consumption of new development

SA Objective		Component/Policy					
		SS6 Rural Areas	SS6a Larger Villages Area Strategy	SS6b Smaller Villages Area Strategy	SS6c Other Rural Areas Area Strategy	SS7 Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor	SS8 Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site
	waste production. And facilitate renewable energy	renewable energy & energy efficient buildings	+ opportunities for renewable energy & energy efficient buildings		buildings on brownfield sites	+ opportunities for renewable energy & energy efficient buildings	+ opportunities for renewable energy & energy efficient buildings
	12. To reduce flood risk, protect and enhance water sources and environmental assets, and reduce contributions and vulnerability to climate change	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>!</b> depends on advice from Environment Agency	<b>0</b>
	13. To protect and enhance the character of the landscape and townscape, historic assets, and maintain and strengthen local distinctiveness and sense of place	- new development will impact on the landscape + opportunities for enhancing the character of settlements	- new development will impact on the landscape + opportunities for enhancing the character of settlements	+	++ limits scale of development, protects character of landscape	++ promotes development that is sensitive to the heritage, landscape and biodiversity	- greenfield site, impact on the landscape

SA Objective		Component/Policy					
		SS6 Rural Areas	SS6a Larger Villages Area Strategy	SS6b Smaller Villages Area Strategy	SS6c Other Rural Areas Area Strategy	SS7 Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor	SS8 Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site
	14. To encourage further development of tourism and culture	++	++	0	++ enhanced tourist facilities and rural diversification	++ promotes tourism development in the Churnet Valley area	0
	15. To safeguard the vitality and viability of the District's towns and villages, and create and sustain a vibrant rural economy	++	++	+	+	+	++
	16. To strengthen, modernise and diversify the District economy, and promote sustainable economic growth	++	++	0 due to scale	+	+	++

SA Objective		Component/Policy					
		SS6 Rural Areas	SS6a Larger Villages Area Strategy	SS6b Smaller Villages Area Strategy	SS6c Other Rural Areas Area Strategy	SS7 Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor	SS8 Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site
17. To encourage and support a high and stable level of employment and variety of jobs to meet local employment needs		++	++	0 due to scale	+	+	++

SA Objective		Component/ Policy						
		SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources	SD2 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	SD3 Carbon-saving measures in Development	SD4 Pollution & Flood Risk	E1 New Employment Development	E2 Existing Employment Sites	E3 Tourism and Cultural Facilities

SA Objective		Component/ Policy							
		SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources	SD2 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	SD3 Carbon-saving measures in Development	SD4 Pollution & Flood Risk	E1 New Employment Development	E2 Existing Employment Sites	E3 Tourism and Cultural Facilities	H1 New Housing Development
SOCIAL	1. To improve the quality of where people work and live, and minimise risks and nuisances	+ Reduced positive impact to reflect modified requirements of the Policy.	++ Social benefits associated with implementation of such schemes e.g. reduced heating bills and reduction of fuel poverty in rural areas	+ social benefits associated with implementation of such schemes e.g. reduced heating bills and reduction of fuel poverty in rural areas	++ Controlling pollution and flood risk improves quality and minimises risk and nuisances	++	+	+	++
	2. To eliminate social exclusion by promoting, maintaining and improving facilities, services and opportunities for all and access to them	+	0	0	0	++	+	+	++
	3. To minimise opportunities for crime and reduce the fear of	0	0	0	0	depends on design	depends on design	0	depends on design



SA Objective	Component/ Policy							
	SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources	SD2 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	SD3 Carbon-saving measures in Development	SD4 Pollution & Flood Risk	E1 New Employment Development	E2 Existing Employment Sites	E3 Tourism and Cultural Facilities	H1 New Housing Development
crime								
4. To ensure adequate quality and provision of a range of house types to meet local needs in appropriate locations, and maintain and improve the +local housing stock and provision of affordable/ social housing	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b> opportunities to improve housing stock with energy saving – supportive of retrofitting	<b>+</b> 'in appropriate locations' prevents housing adjacent to pollution sensitive developments and mitigates flood risk	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>++</b>
5. To direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel	<b>++</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b> Directs development away from pollution	<b>++</b>	<b>++</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>++</b>
6. To strengthen transport links between rural areas and towns, and	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>0</b>

SA Objective		Component/ Policy							
		SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources	SD2 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	SD3 Carbon-saving measures in Development	SD4 Pollution & Flood Risk	E1 New Employment Development	E2 Existing Employment Sites	E3 Tourism and Cultural Facilities	H1 New Housing Development
	improve conditions for walking, cycling and travel by public transport								
ENVIRONMENT	7. To identify, conserve and enhance biodiversity sites and to maximise opportunities for achieving Biodiversity Action Plan targets	<b>I</b> Subject to specific requirements in Policy NE1 being met	<b>O</b> Has to comply with Policy NE1 in terms of impact on designated sites of European, national and local biodiversity and geological importance	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b> Avoiding or mitigating the effects of pollution will have a positive effect on biodiversity	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	8. To protect and enhance key habitats and species	<b>I</b> Subject to specific requirements in Policy NE1 being met	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b> Avoiding or mitigating the effects of pollution will have a positive effect on	<b>?</b> Presence of key habitats and species unknown	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>?</b> Presence of key habitats and species unknown

SA Objective	Component/ Policy							
	SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources	SD2 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	SD3 Carbon-saving measures in Development	SD4 Pollution & Flood Risk	E1 New Employment Development	E2 Existing Employment Sites	E3 Tourism and Cultural Facilities	H1 New Housing Development
				key habitats and species				
9. To reduce contamination, regenerate degraded environments and maintain soil resources and quality	++ still considered to have a significant positive impact despite modifications relaxing standards	0	0	+ Avoids effects of pollution so 'reduces contamination'	+ use of previously developed sites - loss of soil due to use of greenfield sites	++ re-use of existing sites wherever practicable	0	0
10. To promote efficient use of resources	++	++ Emphasis on renewable/low carbon energy which utilises less raw materials and has lower carbon emissions during operation than	++ Emphasis on renewable or low carbon energy / energy efficiency	0	! set out in Policy SD1	++	0	! depends on details contained in Policy SD1

SA Objective	Component/ Policy							
	SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources	SD2 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	SD3 Carbon-saving measures in Development	SD4 Pollution & Flood Risk	E1 New Employment Development	E2 Existing Employment Sites	E3 Tourism and Cultural Facilities	H1 New Housing Development
		traditional energy sources.						
11. To reduce energy consumption and waste production. And facilitate renewable energy	+ Modified Policy considered to have reduced positive impact.	++ Emphasis on renewable/low carbon energy which utilises less raw materials and has lower carbon emissions during operation than traditional energy sources.	+ Supports micro-renewables, and lower-carbon forms of energy to serve development, ie lower resource/waste impacts	0	- energy consumption of new development + opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings	0	0	- energy consumption of new development + opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings
12. To reduce flood risk, protect and enhance water sources and environmental assets, and reduce contributions and	+ Modified Policy considered to have reduced positive impact.	++ Lower-carbon forms of energy reduce vulnerability to/better	++ Reduces vulnerability to climate change	++ Policy reduces flood risk, protects water sources	0	0	0	0

SA Objective	Component/ Policy							
	SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources	SD2 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	SD3 Carbon-saving measures in Development	SD4 Pollution & Flood Risk	E1 New Employment Development	E2 Existing Employment Sites	E3 Tourism and Cultural Facilities	H1 New Housing Development
vulnerability to climate change		mitigate climate change						
13. To protect and enhance the character of the landscape and townscape, historic assets, and maintain and strengthen local distinctiveness and sense of place	<b>0</b>	<b>I</b> Depends on the proposed location/ appearance/noise outputs/landscaping etc of proposals; and whether there are cumulative impacts.	<b>0</b> although measures are only promoted subject to acceptability against wider Policies, including design/character policies.	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b> precludes detrimental impact on local amenity, character and appearance of area in existing employment areas	<b>0</b>	<b>++</b>	<b>-</b> greenfield sites, impact on landscape
14. To encourage further development of tourism and culture	<b>++</b>	<b>++</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>++</b>	<b>0</b>

SA Objective		Component/ Policy							
		SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources	SD2 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	SD3 Carbon-saving measures in Development	SD4 Pollution & Flood Risk	E1 New Employment Development	E2 Existing Employment Sites	E3 Tourism and Cultural Facilities	H1 New Housing Development
ECONOMIC	15. To safeguard the vitality and viability of the District's towns and villages, and create and sustain a vibrant rural economy	++	++	0	0	++	++	+	0
	16. To strengthen, modernise and diversify the District economy, and promote sustainable economic growth	++	++	+ Economic benefits associated with energy efficiency in terms of lower bills and stimulation of local micro-renewables suppliers etc	0	++ Support for redevelopment, intensification & improvement of existing employment areas	++	+	0
	17. To encourage and support a high and stable level of employment and	++	++	0 although could stimulate local micro-	0	++	++	+	0

SA Objective		Component/ Policy							
		SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources	SD2 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	SD3 Carbon-saving measures in Development	SD4 Pollution & Flood Risk	E1 New Employment Development	E2 Existing Employment Sites	E3 Tourism and Cultural Facilities	H1 New Housing Development
	variety of jobs to meet local employment needs			renewables suppliers etc					

SA Objective		Component/ Policy						
		H2 Affordable Housing	H3 Gypsy and Traveller Sites	TCR1 Development in the Town Centres	TCR2 Retailing Outside Town Centres	DC1 Design Considerations	DC2 The Historic Environment	DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
SOCIAL	1. To improve the quality of where people work and live, and minimise risks and nuisances	++	++	++	++	++	+	+
	2. To eliminate social exclusion by promoting, maintaining and	++	++	++	++	0	0	0

SA Objective	Component/ Policy						
	H2 Affordable Housing	H3 Gypsy and Traveller Sites	TCR1 Development in the Town Centres	TCR2 Retailing Outside Town Centres	DC1 Design Considerations	DC2 The Historic Environment	DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
improving facilities, services and opportunities for all and access to them							
3. To minimise opportunities for crime and reduce the fear of crime	I depends on design	0	I depends on details contained in Policy DC1	0	++	0	0
4. To ensure adequate quality and provision of a range of house types to meet local needs in appropriate locations, and maintain and improve the +local housing stock and provision of affordable/ social housing	++ affordable housing will be achieved although the amount will be reduced compared to previous target	++	0	0	0	0	0
5. To direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel	0	0	++	++	0	0	0
6. To strengthen transport links	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



SA Objective		Component/ Policy						
		H2 Affordable Housing	H3 Gypsy and Traveller Sites	TCR1 Development in the Town Centres	TCR2 Retailing Outside Town Centres	DC1 Design Considerations	DC2 The Historic Environment	DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
	between rural areas and towns, and improve conditions for walking, cycling and travel by public transport							
ENVIRONMENT	7. To identify, conserve and enhance biodiversity sites and to maximise opportunities for achieving Biodiversity Action Plan targets	0	0	0	0	++ Protection of biodiversity covered in policy	0	0
	8. To protect and enhance key habitats and species	0	0 Site proposals would have to conform to wider Policies, including NE1	0	0	+ promotes green infrastructure new and existing green space	0	0
	9. To reduce contamination, regenerate degraded environments and maintain soil resources and quality	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	10. To promote	0	0 Although Policy	+	+	++	+	0

SA Objective	Component/ Policy						
	H2 Affordable Housing	H3 Gypsy and Traveller Sites	TCR1 Development in the Town Centres	TCR2 Retailing Outside Town Centres	DC1 Design Considerations	DC2 The Historic Environment	DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
efficient use of resources		SD1 would still apply					
11. To reduce energy consumption and waste production. And facilitate renewable energy	0	0 Although Policy SD1 would still apply	0	0	++	0	0
12. To reduce flood risk, protect and enhance water sources and environmental assets, and reduce contributions and vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0	0	++	++	++
13. To protect and enhance the character of the landscape and townscape, historic assets, and maintain and strengthen local distinctiveness and sense of place	0	0	++	0	++	++	++

SA Objective		Component/ Policy						
		H2 Affordable Housing	H3 Gypsy and Traveller Sites	TCR1 Development in the Town Centres	TCR2 Retailing Outside Town Centres	DC1 Design Considerations	DC2 The Historic Environment	DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
	14. To encourage further development of tourism and culture	0	0	++	0	0	+	0
ECONOMIC	15. To safeguard the vitality and viability of the District's towns and villages, and create and sustain a vibrant rural economy	0	0	++	++	0	++	0
	16. To strengthen, modernise and diversify the District economy, and promote sustainable economic growth	0	0	++	++	0	0	0
	17. To encourage and support a high and stable level of employment and variety of jobs to meet local employment needs	0	0	++	++	0	0	0

SA Objective		Component/ Policy							
		C1 Creating Sustainable Communities	C2 Sport, Recreation and Open Space	C3 Green Infrastructure	R1 Rural Diversification	R2 Rural Housing	NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources	T1 Development and Sustainable Transport	T2 Other Sustainable Transport Measures
SOCIAL	1. To improve the quality of where people work and live, and minimise risks and nuisances	++	+	++ improves quality through improving provision of open space etc, linking sites, opportunities for people to enjoy countryside	+	+	0	+	+
	2. To eliminate social exclusion by promoting, maintaining and improving facilities, services and opportunities for all and access to them	++	+	+ Aims to create access for a wide range of users to enjoy the countryside	+	0	0	++	++
	3. To minimise opportunities for crime and reduce the fear of crime	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4. To ensure adequate quality and	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0

SA Objective	Component/ Policy							
	C1 Creating Sustainable Communities	C2 Sport, Recreation and Open Space	C3 Green Infrastructure	R1 Rural Diversification	R2 Rural Housing	NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources	T1 Development and Sustainable Transport	T2 Other Sustainable Transport Measures
provision of a range of house types to meet local needs in appropriate locations, and maintain and improve the +local housing stock and provision of affordable/ social housing								
5. To direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel	++	+	0	+	0	0	++	0
6. To strengthen transport links between rural areas and towns, and improve conditions for walking, cycling and travel by public transport	+	0	+ Encourages walking and cycling	0	0	0	++	++

SA Objective		Component/ Policy							
		C1 Creating Sustainable Communities	C2 Sport, Recreation and Open Space	C3 Green Infrastructure	R1 Rural Diversification	R2 Rural Housing	NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources	T1 Development and Sustainable Transport	T2 Other Sustainable Transport Measures
ENVIRONMENT	7. To identify, conserve and enhance biodiversity sites and to maximise opportunities for achieving Biodiversity Action Plan targets	0	0	++ Aims to create new wildlife habitats and increase biodiversity	+	0	++	0	0
	8. To protect and enhance key habitats and species	0	0	++ Aims to protect and enhance green infrastructure assets	+	0	++	0	0
	9. To reduce contamination, regenerate degraded environments and maintain soil resources and quality	0	0	+ create opportunities for the restoration of degraded landscapes	0	0	0	0	0
	10. To promote efficient use of resources	++	+	0	++	0	0	0	0
	11. To reduce energy consumption and waste production. And facilitate renewable energy	0	0	+ Encourages walking and cycling	0	0	0	++ promoting sustainable modes of transport / reduction in	0

SA Objective	Component/ Policy							
	C1 Creating Sustainable Communities	C2 Sport, Recreation and Open Space	C3 Green Infrastructure	R1 Rural Diversification	R2 Rural Housing	NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources	T1 Development and Sustainable Transport	T2 Other Sustainable Transport Measures
							car use	
12. To reduce flood risk, protect and enhance water sources and environmental assets, and reduce contributions and vulnerability to climate change	++	0	+ Aims to mitigate the negative effects of climate change	0	0	0	0	0
13. To protect and enhance the character of the landscape and townscape, historic assets, and maintain and strengthen local distinctiveness and sense of place	++	+	+ Aims to enhance the natural, man-made and cultural features that are crucial to the local landscape	++	0	0	0	0
14. To encourage further development of tourism and culture	+	0	+ Aims to contribute to tourist development through the enhancement of existing and provision of new facilities	+	0	0	0	+ improved access to tourism and cultural facilities

SA Objective		Component/ Policy							
		C1 Creating Sustainable Communities	C2 Sport, Recreation and Open Space	C3 Green Infrastructure	R1 Rural Diversification	R2 Rural Housing	NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources	T1 Development and Sustainable Transport	T2 Other Sustainable Transport Measures
ECONOMIC	15. To safeguard the vitality and viability of the District's towns and villages, and create and sustain a vibrant rural economy	+	0	+ Aims to contribute to the diversification of the local economy	++	0	0	0	0
	16. To strengthen, modernise and diversify the District economy, and promote sustainable economic growth	0	0	+ Aims to contribute to the diversification of the local economy	+	0	0	0	0
	17. To encourage and support a high and stable level of employment and variety of jobs to meet local employment needs	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0



## **Summary of Components that indicate significant negative impacts and/or require clarification**

### **Policy SS5 (Towns)**

This policy is likely to have a negative impact on soil resources due to the use of greenfield sites and on reducing energy consumption due to the use of new buildings, though it should be acknowledged that the new housing requirements will result in significantly less green field development than the previous proposals at Submission Stage. The impact on efficient use of resources depends on how new development meets the requirements of (revised) Policy SD1 (Sustainable Use of Resources). New development may have a negative impact on the character of the landscape in some areas.

### **Policy SS5a (Leek Area Strategy)**

This policy is likely to have a negative impact on soil resources due to the use of greenfield sites, although significantly less greenfield land is required due to the overall reduction in housing numbers being proposed. New development may have a negative impact on the character of the landscape in some areas. There may also be a negative impact on reducing energy consumption due to the use of new buildings, however this should be mitigated by maximising opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings. The impact on efficient use of resources depends on how new development meets the requirements of (revised) Policy SD1 (Sustainable Use of Resources). The presence of key habitats and species is unknown for some of the potential small urban area extension sites. Also, the addition of small urban extensions rather than larger sites on the edge of Leek could impact on energy consumption as it is harder to facilitate renewable energy on several smaller sites and also things like sustainable transport in terms of supporting new bus services.

### **Policy SSS5b (Biddulph Area Strategy)**

This policy is likely to have a negative impact on soil resources due to the use of greenfield sites although significantly less greenfield land is required due to the overall reduction in housing numbers being proposed. The Strategy does prioritise the use of previously developed sites within the Urban Area before other locations. New development may have a negative impact on the character of the landscape in some areas, particularly Area 4 where the landscape is considered to be important to the setting of Biddulph (identified in the Landscape & Settlement Character Assessment). Even though the projected number of dwellings to be accommodated on this site has reduced from 330 to 280, which will result in a lower landscape impact, it is still considered that there may be an impact on the landscape as a result of development in this location. There may also be a negative impact on reducing energy consumption due to the use of new buildings, however this should be mitigated by maximising opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings. The impact on efficient use of resources depends on how new development meets the requirements of (revised) Policy SD1 (Sustainable Use of Resources). A habitat survey has indicated that Area 4 is generally suitable for development, subject to protecting habitats along the Biddulph Valley Way, watercourse and bypass. The presence of key habitats and species is unknown for the potential small urban extension sites at present, though specific sites will not be allocated in the Core Strategy so this can be determined through work on the Site Allocations DPD. Also, the addition of small urban extensions for housing development rather than larger sites on the edge of Biddulph could impact on energy consumption as it would be harder to facilitate renewable energy on several smaller sites and also things like sustainable transport in terms of supporting new bus services.

**Policy SS5c (Cheadle Area Strategy)**

The Cheadle Area Strategy is likely to have a negative impact on soil resources due to the use of greenfield sites (though significantly less development is being proposed for Cheadle than previously). However the Strategy does prioritise the use of previously developed sites within the Urban Area before other locations. There is also likely to be a negative impact on the landscape, particularly where green field sites are concerned so carefully design and appropriate density levels for new development will be important. There may also be a negative impact on reducing energy consumption due to the use of new buildings, however this should be mitigated by maximising opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings. The impact on efficient use of resources depends on how new development meets the requirements of (revised) Policy SD1 (Sustainable Use of Resources). A habitat survey has indicated that Areas 1 and 2 are generally suitable for development however the presence of key habitats and species is unknown for some of the potential small urban extension sites at present, though specific sites will not be allocated in the Core Strategy so this can be determined through work on the Site Allocations DPD. In respect of flood risk, small parts of the broad areas are affected along watercourses, though there are opportunities for leaving these areas undeveloped and including them in amenity space. Also, the addition of small urban extensions rather than larger sites on the edge of Cheadle could impact on energy consumption as it would be harder to facilitate renewable energy on several smaller sites and also things like sustainable transport in terms of supporting new bus services.

**Policy SS6 (Rural Area Strategy)**

In terms of directing development to the most sustainable locations and reducing the need to travel, increasing the number of dwellings in the rural area in the Revised Document (albeit by a small amount – 40 dwellings over the plan period) has reduced sustainability as is likely to increase the need to travel. This is balanced with directing most of the development in the rural areas to more sustainable larger villages, enhancing their role as service centres. A negative impact of this policy has been identified relating to maintaining soil resources and quality, as development proposed in the rural areas is likely to be on green field sites thereby resulting in a loss of soil resources. Also energy consumption will take place due to the use of new buildings. The impact on efficient use of resources depends on how new development meets the requirements of (revised) Policy SD1 – Sustainable Use of Resources. New development may also have a negative impact on the character of the landscape in some areas.

**Policy SS6a (Larger Villages Area Strategy)**

This policy is likely to have a negative impact on soil resources due to the use of greenfield sites and on reducing energy consumption due to the use of new buildings. The impact on efficient use of resources depends on how new development meets the requirements of Policy SD1 – Achieving Sustainable Development. New development may have a negative impact on the character of the landscape in some areas. The presence of key habitats and species is unknown at present.

**Policy SS6c (Other Rural Areas)**

This policy is likely to have a negative impact on directing development to more sustainable locations and reducing the need to travel for major developed areas in the countryside only.

**Policy SS7 (Churnet Valley Tourism Corridor)**

This policy is likely to have a negative impact on reducing energy consumption due to the use of new buildings. The impact on efficient use of resources depends on how new development meets the requirements of (revised) Policy SD1 – Sustainable Use of Resources. However, the policy has many

positive impacts including supporting strategic footpaths / cycle routes, conserving and enhancing biodiversity sites and nature conservation sites, reuse of previously developed sites and rural buildings, strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place, creating a vibrant rural economy and employment opportunities. Flooding has been raised as an issue depending on how the policy is implemented as part of the area is within the flood plain. Advice from the Environment Agency can be sought on a case by case basis to mitigate this.

**Policy SS8 (Blythe Bridge Regional Investment Site)**

This policy is likely to have a negative impact on soil resources due to its greenfield status; on the character of the landscape; and on reducing energy consumption due to the use of new buildings. The impact on efficient use of resources depends on how new development meets the requirements of Policy SD1 – Sustainable Use of Resources. Whether the policy results in a sustainably located development or reduces the need to travel is dependent on what type of employment use the site is used for. The presence of key habitats and species is unknown at present.

**Policy SD1 (Sustainable Use of Resources)**

The impact of this policy on biodiversity and key habitats and species depends on the requirements set out in Policy NE1 being met.

**Policy SD2 (Renewable & Low Carbon Energy)**

This policy may have no impact on the character of the landscape and townscape depending on the scale of potential renewable energy schemes and where development takes place although the policy does take landscape sensitivity into account.

**Policy E1 (New Employment Development)**

This policy is likely to have a negative impact on reducing energy consumption due to the use of new buildings. The extent to which the policy minimises opportunities for crime and reduces the fear of crime depends on meeting the requirements of DC1 – Design Considerations and the impact on efficient use of resources depends on how new development meets the requirements of Policy SD1 – Sustainable Use of Resources. The presence of key habitats and species is unknown at present.

**Policy E2 (Existing Employment Sites)**

The extent to which the policy minimises opportunities for crime and reduces the fear of crime depends on meeting the requirements of DC1 – Design Considerations

**Policy H1 (New Housing Development)**

This policy is likely to have a negative impact on reducing energy consumption due to the use of new buildings and on the landscape due to the use of green field sites. The extent to which the policy minimises opportunities for crime and reduces the fear of crime depends on meeting the requirements of DC1 – Design Considerations and the impact on efficient use of resources depends on how new development meets the requirements of Policy SD1 – Sustainable Use of Resources. The presence of key habitats and species is unknown at present.

**Policy H2 (Affordable Housing)**

The extent to which the policy minimises opportunities for crime and reduces the fear of crime depends on meeting the requirements of DC1 – Design Considerations.

**Policy TCR1 (Development in the Town Centres)**

The extent to which the policy minimises opportunities for crime and reduces the fear of crime depends on meeting the requirements of DC1 – Design Considerations.



## Section M – Assessment of the Components of the Core Strategy – Cumulative Effects

- + = Positive      + + = Significantly Positive      - - = Significantly Negative      - = Negative  
 0 = Neutral (no significant positive or negative effects)  
 ? = Impact Unknown  
 I = Impact dependent on how implemented

Different components within an Option may generate varying impacts. This is indicated by '/'

\* Predicted effects are projected from the adoption of the Core Strategy

SA Objective	CORE STRATEGY POLICIES							Justification for assessment noting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likelihood/certainty of effect occurring (High/Medium/Low)</li> <li>• Geographical scale of effect</li> <li>• Whether temporary or permanent</li> <li>• Recommendation (s) for mitigation/improvement</li> </ul>
	Summary of Baseline Situation	SA Indicator	Predicted Cumulative Effects*				Long Term (5 years or more)	
			Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Assumptions made	Short Term (less than 1 year)	Medium Term (1-5 years)		

SOCIAL	SA1	<p>The Staffordshire Moorlands has the highest per capita emissions of CO2 in the West Midlands Region.</p> <p>Underused/derelict land with poor security can be used for anti-social activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net gain/loss in the total land area designated as visual open space (Ha)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development on greenfield sites will have an impact on loss of views and open space.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New areas of visual open space may be identified through the Site Allocations DPD.</li> </ul>	<p>Impact of loss of views and visual open space becomes less significant over time.</p> <p>The release of land for housing across the District is managed with priority given to the use of previously developed land.</p>	 / +	 / +	<p>- / +</p>	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Mitigation of loss of views/maximise quality of physical environment through high quality design and landscaping schemes.</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase/reduction in air quality in key locations (by site).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased air pollution associated with traffic generation created by new development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements in travel by public transport, walking and cycling.</li> </ul>	-	-- / +	-- / +	-- / +	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Medium</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> New development should include footpath improvements, new cycle ways wherever possible. Improvement of public transport.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of environmental enhancement schemes implemented/Amount spent on improvement schemes</li> </ul>	<b>Minor positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement of the physical environment.</li> </ul>	Strong landscaping in place, as part of new developments and/or through developer contributions, to mitigate the visual impact of developments.	+	+	+	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net gain/loss in the number of long-term vacant dwellings</li> </ul>	<b>No significant effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long-term vacant dwellings are not considered to be a significant issue.</li> </ul>	-	0	0	0	<b>Likely effects:</b> N/A
<b>Overall impact on SA Objective 1:</b>					- / +	- / +	- / +	
SA 2	<p>The Staffordshire Moorlands has an increasingly ageing population, a trend which looks set to continue over the next 10 years.</p> <p>Retail offered in the town centres is insufficient to meet the needs of residents. The proximity of neighbouring centres draw</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net gain/loss in retail floorspace by type (sq m)</li> </ul>	<b>Major positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater retail provision in the three towns. This should offer greater competition to neighbouring centres that draw retailers and shoppers out of the area.</li> </ul>	-	+	++	++	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net gain/loss in sport, recreation and open space provision (Ha)</li> </ul>	<b>Minor positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be additional provision created through new developments and/or developer contributions / CIL.</li> </ul>	Contributions are made towards qualitative improvements and/or additional play areas, playing pitches etc	+	++	++	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul>

	retailers and shoppers out of the District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will also be the opportunity to improve existing areas of open space to increase their use.</li> </ul>					<b>Recommendation:</b> This will be addressed through the Sport, Recreation and Open Spaces SPD.
	There is a shortfall of play areas and playing pitches throughout the District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change of use applications from non-residential to residential use, completed                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Within the towns, by type (Ha)</li> <li>b) Outside of towns, by type (Ha)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Minor positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional residential units provided through the re-use of land and buildings. Avoids use of greenfield sites and generally focuses housing where facilities and services are located.</li> </ul>	Appropriate employment sites are safeguarded.	+	+	+	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None
	Two thirds of the Staffordshire Moorlands adult population is currently overweight.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of completed retail, office and leisure development.</li> </ul>	<b>Minor positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expansion in range of retail offer, employment and leisure opportunities.</li> </ul>	Appropriate proposals come forward.	+	+	++	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None
	There has been a fall in pupil numbers, resulting in changes in educational provision in the Staffordshire Moorlands. The trend is predicted to continue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net gain/reduction in the percentage of vacant shop units.</li> </ul>	<b>Minor positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater provision of retail in the three towns leading to improved vitality and viability.</li> </ul>	Increase in retail attract more users to the town centre, and in turn encourage more retailers to locate in the District.	+	++	++	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net gain/reduction in</li> </ul>	<b>Minor positive effect:</b>	Contributions are made	0 / +	0 / +	0 / +	<b>Likely effects:</b>



		obesity and overweight among 5 and 11 year old children registered with a general practice (%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor health and obesity issues are not directly addressed through the policies. Indirect benefits through policies to encourage better pedestrian routes and cycling facilities. Also, economic improvements are likely to have a general positive impact on health.</li> </ul>	towards additional play areas, playing pitches etc.  Employment opportunities are taken by local residents.				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Low/Medium</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> None</p>
<b>Overall impact on SA Objective 2:</b>					+	++	++	
SA 3	Low levels of crime across the Staffordshire Moorlands as a whole, however, crime levels are most heavily concentrated around the areas of Biddulph, Cheadle and Leek.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fear of crime surveys</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhancement of the quality of the town environment and improvement of pedestrian links can help to reduce the fear of crime.</li> </ul>	All new development include 'designing out crime' initiatives  Restriction in the concentration of non-A1 uses in the town centres maintain active frontages and reduce/prevent anti-social behaviour.	0	0 / +	0 / +	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Low</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Review areas covered by CCTV</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recorded crime rates per 1000 population</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crime rates are not directly addressed through the policies. Development of vacant / derelict properties, upper floors of shops and</li> </ul>	All new development include 'designing out crime' initiatives	0	0 / +	0 / +	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Low</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p>

				new residential units will help to increase natural surveillance and restrict opportunities for indiscriminate behaviour.					None
<b>Overall impact on SA Objective 3:</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>0 / +</b>	<b>0 / +</b>		
SA 4	<p>Need for affordable housing remains very high. 2004 Housing Needs Survey update calculated a need for 750 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Identified over-supply in housing provision. Reducing the supply could have implications for specific housing needs such as affordable and for the elderly.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of affordable houses completed</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of affordable housing units across the District.</li> <li>(Note – still considered to be a major positive effect despite total no. of units to be provided falling from a minimum of 1700 to 1525 over the plan period as a result of changes in the Revised Core Strategy to reflect reduced housing requirements.)</li> </ul>	-	+	++	++	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Ensure that as many schemes as possible provide an element of affordable housing. Ensure appropriate mix of housing to prevent concentration of particular types of homes.</p>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing land supply/completions achieved towards</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of additional housing across the</li> </ul>	Developments come forward.	+	++	++	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> </ul>	

		RSS11, by location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District. (Note – still considered to be a major positive effect despite total number of new dwellings reducing from 6000 to 5500 as a result of changes in the Revised Core Strategy to reflect reduced housing requirements.)</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Detailed monitoring of completions and supply to manage provision</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net gain/reduction in the percentage of the housing stock in an unsatisfactory condition.</li> </ul>	<b>No significant effect identified</b>	-	0	0	0	<p><b>Likely effects:</b> N/A</p>
<b>Overall impact on SA Objective 4:</b>					+	++	++	
SA 5	<p>Very high incidence of car use for work commuting.</p> <p>National Planning Policy promotes sustainable development through re-use of previously developed land, improved non-car transport choice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of: a GP; a hospital; a primary school; a secondary school; areas of employment; and a major retail centre.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction of out-commuting for residents taking up new employment opportunities.</li> <li>Concentration of development within towns and larger villages ensures high accessibility.</li> </ul>	<p>New employment opportunities are taken by local residents.</p> <p>Public transport services are available.</p>	0	+	+	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Allow for expansion in provision of public transport</p>

	and access, mixed use development, inclusive communities and high quality design.							
<b>Overall impact on SA Objective 5:</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>+</b>	
SA 6	<p>There is a high incidence of car use (including high single occupant car use) and a high incidence of car use connected with relatively short journeys.</p> <p>Lack of frequent bus services especially to many rural areas.</p> <p>Lack of alternative travel means may encourage travel by car</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of completed non-residential development within UCOs A, B and D complying with car-parking standards set out in the local development framework.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development strategy focuses development in the three towns and larger villages.</li> </ul>	Additional housing and employment opportunities and greater retail offer in the towns reduce the need to travel to areas outside the District to work and shop.	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>+</b>	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Development is restricted outside the towns and larger villages to meet local needs only.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total length of cycleways, bridleways and footpaths (km)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall increase and improvement of cycle ways and pedestrian links across the District.</li> </ul>	-	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>+</b>	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Medium</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> None</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of Travel Plans in operation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in the number of people travelling by means other than the private car.</li> <li>Improve accessibility</li> </ul>	Existing and new employers adopt Travel Plans.	<b>0/+</b>	<b>0/+</b>	<b>0/+</b>	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Medium</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul>

				to employment areas, particularly from areas of local deprivation and need in the towns.					<b>Recommendation:</b> Allow for expansion in provision of public transport if demand exists.
<b>Overall impact on SA Objective 6:</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>+</b>	
<b>Summary Appraisal against Social Objectives:</b>						<b>- / +</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>++</b>	
Positive effect over time as growth is focussed in the towns and larger villages resulting in improved services/facilities and strengthening the retail offer in the towns Provision of additional dwellings including affordable housing will provide more choice and meet the needs of local residents. Increase in employment land will provide locations for new and expanding businesses and greater opportunity to work locally. All of these positive effects direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel. Negative effect on the loss of views resulting from development – this may become less significant in the medium to long term.									
<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>	SA7	The District has a large number of rich and varied nature conservation sites.  Of the 4942 ha of SSSI land within the Staffordshire Moorlands 80% was described as being in a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance, including: Change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value including sites of international, national, regional or sub-regional significance</li> </ul>	<b>Minor positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creation of new sites through new development.</li> <li>Green Infrastructure Policy provides integrated approach.</li> </ul>	Protection of existing biodiversity sites.  Potential to increase biodiversity with integrated approach.	<b>0</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> Mitigation measures to minimise impact from new development.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of nationally/locally important wildlife sites in the District reported as being in 'poor condition'</li> </ul>	<b>Minor positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement of condition of SSSIs through management plans.</li> </ul>	-	0	0/+	0/+	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Medium</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None
<b>Overall impact on SA Objective 7:</b>					0	+	+	
SA8	<p>The Staffordshire County Council Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) for Staffordshire identifies a number of priority habitats and species relevant to the Staffordshire Moorlands.</p> <p>The Community Strategy aims to maintain and increase species and habitats identified in the BAP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change in priority habitats and species (by type)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Minor positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creation of new sites through new development.</li> <li>Green Infrastructure Policy provides integrated approach.</li> </ul>	<p>Protection of existing biodiversity sites.</p> <p>Potential to increase biodiversity with integrated approach.</p>	0	+	+	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Medium</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> Mitigation measures to minimise impact from new development.
<b>Overall impact on SA Objective 8:</b>					0	+	+	

SA9	Limited information on contamination in the District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net gain/reduction in the total amount of derelict land (Ha).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of greenfield sites will mean loss of soil resources.</li> <li>Contamination may be exposed through redevelopment of land.</li> </ul> <p><b>Major positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas of underused/derelict land is identified in the Core Strategy for redevelopment.</li> </ul>	Impact of development on soil resources and quality will become less significant over time.	-- / +	- / ++	- / ++	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Remediation will be required where contamination is identified.</p>
<b>Overall Impact on SA Objective 9</b>					-- / +	- / ++	- / ++	
SA 10	<p>Brownfield land is a finite resource.</p> <p>76% of new dwellings built on previously developed land 2006/2007.</p> <p>82% of dwellings completed 2006/2007 were over 30 dwellings per hectare.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of completions comprising conversion/re-use of existing buildings</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-use of existing buildings/more efficient use of brownfield land.</li> </ul>	-	+	+	+	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The use of brownfield sites should be maximised wherever possible.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of new and converted dwellings on previously developed land.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development on greenfield sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Major positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target set for</li> </ul>	Not all new housing development can be accommodated on previously developed land.	-- / ++	-- / ++	-- / ++	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul>

									<b>Recommendation:</b> None
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of new dwellings completed at:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) less than 30 dph;</li> <li>ii) between 30 and 50 dph;</li> <li>and</li> <li>iii) above 50 dph.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Major positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core Strategy will set out the densities for different locations in the District.</li> </ul>	Densities will be compatible with the site and its location.	++	++	++	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of floorspace by employment type, which is on previously developed land.</li> </ul>	<b>Major negative effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development on greenfield sites.</li> </ul> <b>Major positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites suitable for employment use will be safeguarded for employment uses</li> </ul>	Not all new employment development can be accommodated on previously developed land.  Mixed use schemes will need to be considered before any redevelopment. Funding required to support off-site employment provision where this is not feasible.	-- / ++	-- / ++	-- / ++	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None	
<b>Overall Impact on SA Objective 10</b>					-- / ++	-- / ++	-- / ++		
SA 11	At present there are only a handful of functioning renewable energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Renewable energy capacity installed by type.</li> </ul>	<b>Minor negative effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on the landscape</li> <li>Impact on amenity</li> </ul>	Scale and nature of schemes reflect capacity and sensitivity of the landscape.	- / +	- / ++	- / ++	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Medium</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> </ul>	



	schemes in the District		e.g. noise/flicker etc <b>Major positive effect:</b> ▪ Core strategy supports small-scale and large scale renewable energy schemes					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Temp/Perm: Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None
		▪ Amount of household waste recycled (%)	<b>No significant effect identified</b>	-	0	0	0	<b>Likely effects:</b> N/A
<b>Overall Impact on SA Objective 11</b>					- / +	- / ++	- / ++	
SA 12	Existing flooding issues have implications upon long-term sustainability of development.	▪ Number of approvals for development incorporating sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)	<b>No significant effect identified</b>	-	0	0	0	<b>Likely effects:</b> N/A
	New development may have implications on surface water drainage and increased risk in vulnerability to flooding.	▪ Number of housing completions located within a flood-plain	<b>No significant effect identified</b>	Broad locations take into account the Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	0	0	0	<b>Likely effects:</b> N/A
		▪ Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on either flood defence grounds	<b>No significant effect identified</b>	Developments take into account recommendations made.	0	0	0	<b>Likely effects:</b> N/A
<b>Overall Impact on SA Objective 12</b>					0	0	0	

SA 13	<p>The historic environment is a key component of a high quality environment.</p> <p>Opportunities for the sustainable re-use of historic buildings.</p> <p>The Green Belt close to the Stoke-on-Trent boundary is particularly vulnerable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of hosing completions located in the countryside, which do not constitute either 'agricultural exceptions' or affordable housing schemes</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amount of new development has the potential to have a detrimental impact on both the landscape and Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies in the Core Strategy support the key role the historic environment plays.</li> </ul>	<p>Loss of countryside irreversible. Impact of this is likely to be less significant over time.</p> <p>High quality design and landscaping of development – both new build and re-use of existing buildings.</p>	-- / +	-- / +	-- / +	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> None</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of listed buildings 'at risk'</li> </ul>	<b>No significant effect identified</b>	-	0	0	0	<b>Likely effects:</b> N/A
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of grant-aided schemes.</li> </ul>	<b>No significant effect identified</b>	-	0	0	0	<b>Likely effects:</b> N/A
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of Conservation Areas with up-to-date appraisals and management plans</li> </ul>	<b>No significant effect identified</b>	-	0	0	0	<b>Likely effects:</b> N/A
<b>Overall Impact on SA Objective 13</b>					-- / +	-- / +	-- / +	
SA 14	<p>million people visited the Staffordshire Moorlands in 2004. However low levels of overnight visitors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tourism, leisure and cultural related completions, by type (Number)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies in the Core Strategy support the tourist economy particularly in the Churnet Valley and tourist accommodation</li> </ul>	<p>Greater choice and linked trips provided through new facilities and accommodation.</p> <p>Better links and overall improvement of the</p>	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Medium</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul>

		<p>– supply is particularly low in the towns.</p> <p>Poor evening/night-time economy.</p> <p>Potential to improve cycling and canal network.</p>		<p>in appropriate locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for developing the special character and heritage of the towns.</li> </ul>	<p>towns encourage more visitors.</p> <p>Redevelopment of key sites such as Boltons Copperworks.</p>					<b>Recommendation: None</b>
<b>Overall Impact on SA Objective 14</b>						++	++	++		
<b>Summary Appraisal against Environmental Objectives:</b>						-- / +	- / ++	- / ++		
<p>The cumulative effect on the environmental objectives are varied. This is mainly due to the effect of new development in terms of energy consumption, use of building materials, use of greenfield sites and impact on the character of the landscape and townscape. There are however some positive effects such as encouraging further development of tourism and culture, integrated approach to green infrastructure and opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings.</p>										

Economic	SA 15	Lack of adequate employment premises and competitive retail floorspace mean that trade and businesses continue to be lost to other centres.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Losses of employment land in:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) employment /regeneration areas; and</li> <li>ii) local authority area</li> </ul> </li> <li>Amount of employment land lost to residential development</li> </ul>	<b>Major positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of a range of sites across the District.</li> <li>Protection of suitable employment sites will safeguard the vitality and viability of settlements.</li> </ul>	New employment sites come forward.  Mixed use schemes will need to be considered before any redevelopment. Funding required to support off-site employment provision where this is not feasible.	++	++	++	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None
		Retail offered in the town centres is insufficient to meet the needs of residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of completed retail, office and leisure development</li> </ul>	<b>No significant effect identified</b>	-	0	0	0	<b>Likely effects:</b> N/A
		Areas with a poor environment affect existing businesses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes of use on main shopping streets in towns to non-A1 uses</li> </ul>	<b>Major positive effect:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional new retail floorspace will help to attract retailers and enable growth, adding to the viability of the town centres</li> </ul>	Greater number of visitors attracted to the town centres.	++	++	++	<b>Likely effects:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Semi-permanent</li> </ul> <b>Recommendation:</b> None
	<b>Overall Impact on SA Objective 15</b>					++	++	++	

SA 16	<p>Growth of the economy is not performing as well as the Region or nationally.</p> <p>Vulnerability of current economic profile – over-reliance on manufacturing.</p> <p>There is concern for the loss of small employment sites to residential use.</p> <p>The suitability of existing employment sites need to be further assessed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Employment land available by type</li> <li>▪ Amount of floorspace developed for employment by type</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Additional provision of employment land and modernisation of existing stock of employment units will enable diversification from existing manufacturing base.</li> <li>▪ Protection of suitable employment sites will safeguard the vitality and viability of settlements.</li> </ul>	<p>Increase in the range of units available will attract new employers and allow existing businesses to expand.</p> <p>Suitable employment land is safeguarded from development of other uses.</p>	++	++	++	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> High</li> <li>• <b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li>• <b>Temp/Perm:</b> Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> None</p>
<b>Overall Impact on SA Objective 16</b>					++	++	++	
SA 17	<p>There is concern that the District is low-waged and employment largely depends on industries that are declining in the wider economies.</p> <p>There is a strong</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Staffordshire Moorlands employment / unemployment rates</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Generation of additional jobs through new retail and business developments.</li> <li>▪ Decrease in unemployment rates in certain areas as opportunities arise across the District.</li> </ul>	<p>Impact of this is likely to be more significant over time.</p>	+	++	++	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Medium</li> <li>• <b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li>• <b>Temp/Perm:</b> Semi-permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> None</p>

	<p>pattern of out-commuting by residents to better paid jobs.</p> <p>There is a high proportion of residents with no qualifications or higher education qualifications.</p> <p>There are issues concerning high unemployment in certain areas of the District.</p>							
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment by sector</li> </ul>	<p><b>Major positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional provision of employment land and modernisation of existing stock of employment units will enable diversification from existing manufacturing base and provide a variety of jobs to meet local employment needs.</li> <li>Potential for growth of service sector businesses and employment in tourism.</li> </ul>	<p>New employment opportunities are provided by the Regional Investment Site at Blythe Bridge.</p>	+	++	++	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Medium</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Semi-permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> None</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Earnings by Staffordshire Moorlands residents</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased earnings are not directly addressed by the policies. Need to ensure that the District's workforce skills match employment opportunities.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreements are made with developers towards training programmes, employment support and employment access schemes.</p>	+	+	++	<p><b>Likely effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Likelihood/certainty:</b> Medium</li> <li><b>Scale:</b> District-wide</li> <li><b>Temp/Perm:</b> Semi-Permanent</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Local skills and training opportunities need to match local employment opportunities.</p>
<b>Overall Impact on SA Objective 17</b>					+	++	++	

<p><b>Summary – Appraisal against Economic Objectives</b></p> <p>The assessment shows that the preferred option has a significantly positive effect on the economic objectives. Provision of a range of sites across the District combined with the protection of suitable employment sites will safeguard the vitality and viability of the towns and larger settlements. The increase in the range of units will attract new employers and allow existing businesses to expand. There is an on-going need to ensure that the District’s workforce skills match local employment opportunities.</p>	<p>++</p>	<p>++</p>	<p>++</p>	
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

## Section N - Summary of Sustainability Impacts of the Core Strategy Policies against SA Objectives

+ = Positive      ++ = Significantly Positive      -- = Significantly Negative      - = Negative  
 0 = Neutral (no significant positive or negative effects)  
 ? = Impact Unknown  
 I = Impact dependent on how implemented

Different components within an Option may generate varying impacts. This is indicated by '/'.

SA Objective		Impact of Core Strategy		
		Short Term	Medium Term	Long Term
Social	1. To improve the quality of where people work and live, and minimise risks and nuisances	- / +	- / +	- / +
	2. To eliminate social exclusion by promoting, maintaining and improving facilities, services and opportunities for all and access to them	+	++	++
	3. To minimise opportunities for crime and reduce the fear of crime	0	0 / +	0 / +
	4. To ensure adequate quality and provision of a range of house types to meet local needs in appropriate locations, and maintain and improve the local housing stock and provision of affordable/ social housing	+	++	++
	5. To direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel	0	+	+
	6. To strengthen transport links between rural areas and towns, and improve conditions for walking, cycling and travel by public transport	0	+	+
Environment	7. To identify, conserve and enhance biodiversity sites and to maximise opportunities for achieving Biodiversity Action Plan targets	0	+	+
	8. To protect and enhance key habitats and species	0	+	+
	9. To reduce contamination, regenerate degraded environments and maintain soil resources and quality	-- / +	- / ++	- / ++
	10. To promote efficient use of resources	-- / ++	-- / ++	-- / ++
	11. To reduce energy consumption and waste production, and facilitate renewable energy	- / +	- / ++	- / ++
	12. To reduce flood risk, protect and enhance water sources and environmental assets, and reduce contributions and vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0
	13. To enhance the character of the landscape and townscape, historic assets, and maintain and strengthen local distinctiveness and sense of place	-- / +	-- / +	-- / +



	14.To encourage further development of tourism and culture	++	++	++
Economic	15. To safeguard the vitality and viability of the District’s towns and villages, and create and sustain a vibrant rural economy	++	++	++
	16. To strengthen, modernise and diversify the District economy, and promote sustainable economic growth	++	++	++
	17. To encourage and support a high and stable level of employment and variety of jobs to meet local employment	+	++	++

SA Objectives	Short Term (less than 1 year)	Medium Term (1-5 years)	Long Term (5 years or more)	Summary of Appraisal
<b>Social</b>	- / +	+	++	Positive effect over time as growth is focussed in the towns and larger villages resulting in improved services/facilities and strengthening the retail offer in the towns. Provision of additional dwellings including affordable housing will provide more choice and meet the needs of local residents. Increase in employment land will provide locations for new and expanding businesses and greater opportunity to work locally. All of these positive effects direct development to more sustainable locations and reduce the need to travel. Negative effect on the loss of views and landscape impact resulting from development – this may become less significant in the medium to long term.
<b>Environment</b>	-- / +	- / ++	- / ++	The cumulative effect on the environmental objectives are varied. This is mainly due to the effect of new development in terms of energy consumption, use of building materials, use of greenfield sites and impact on the character of the landscape and townscape. There are however some positive effects such as encouraging further development of tourism and culture and opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficient buildings.
<b>Economic</b>	++	++	++	The assessment shows the document has a significantly positive effect on the economic objectives. Provision of a range of sites across the District combined with the protection

				<p>of suitable employment sites will safeguard the vitality and viability of the towns and larger settlements. The increase in the range of units will attract new employers and allow existing businesses to expand. There is an on-going need to ensure that the District's workforce skills match local employment opportunities.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

## Section O – Sustainability Assessment of Broad Locations

The Core Strategy needs to make clear spatial choices about where developments which are key to the delivery of the Spatial and Area Strategies should go in broad terms. In order to give adequate guidance and certainty in the Core Strategy on where growth will take place, the Council needs to set out the options considered for accommodating growth in the main settlements. It is not the role of the Core Strategy to identify specific sites for development as this would make it too inflexible and restrictive, but merely to identify broad areas where sites would be identified and the anticipated scale of development in those areas. It will be the Site Allocations DPD which will subsequently identify and allocate the specific sites in those areas.

The following sections explain the various stages of assessment undertaken, the methodology used and the selection of the broad locations.

### Draft Preferred Options Stage

At preferred options stage an initial sustainability assessment was undertaken which scored all the potential areas and ranked them in order of preference. All the options for broad locations for housing and employment development were put forward for public consultation, however the Council indicated which locations were the preferred options and which locations had been discounted.

In Leek, the order of preference identified by the sustainability appraisal was the Urban Area (Area 8), Churnet Works (Area 1), East of Leek (Area 4) and fourthly North of Leek (Area 3). These four areas were included in the draft preferred options document as the preferred locations for development to take place. The consultation also included discounted Areas 5, 6 and 7. This left a shortfall of around 230 dwellings for Leek which would need to be met by identifying new broad locations or increasing capacity in the preferred locations.

In Biddulph, the order of preference identified by the sustainability appraisal was the Urban Area (Area 8), Biddulph East (Area 7), Uplands Mill (Area 2), Newpool Meadows (Area 5) and West of Biddulph (Area 4). These five areas were included in the draft preferred options document as the preferred locations for development to take place. The consultation also included discounted Areas 1, 3, 6 and 9.

In Cheadle, the order of preference identified by the sustainability appraisal was the Urban Area (Area 8), South West of Cheadle Urban Extension (Area 4), South of Cheadle Urban Extension (Area 5) and North Cheadle (Area 1). The remainder of the broad locations scored less well but it was considered that overall Area 2 (North East of Cheadle) would offer the best choice of location out of the remaining areas as it would have less of an impact on the landscape and could be linked with development in Area 1. These five areas were included in the draft preferred options document as the preferred locations for development to take place. The consultation also included discounted Areas 3, 6 and 7.

### Submission Stage

Following the draft preferred options further work was undertaken on all the broad areas including a landscape and settlement character assessment and review of potential development capacity in the urban areas of the three towns.

There were significant changes to the broad areas proposed for Leek. Since the draft preferred options document additional capacity has been identified in the urban area increasing available supply to around 600 dwellings. In light of more recent evidence provided in the landscape and settlement character assessment and detailed comments of the Countryside Section regarding the Site of Biological Importance (SBI) designation, it is considered that Area 4 (East of Leek) would be unsuitable for large-scale development and therefore should not be taken forward as a broad location for development. It is however, considered that there are some smaller parcels of land on the fringes of the urban area which are not designated as a SBI or used for recreational purposes which may be suitable for inclusion within in the Urban Area (Area 8) capacity amounting to around 50 dwellings.

At the draft preferred options stage the Environment Agency expressed concerns over the suitability of Churnet Works for residential use and as a result no allowance has been made for dwellings on the site in the housing provision calculations, although 'residential' will remain in the list of potential uses for the site until the outcome of a detailed Flood Risk Assessment is known. Area 3 (North of Leek) remains as a broad location although the extent of the area has been amended to exclude the SBI designation.

To address a possible shortfall in Leek of around a 100 dwellings, and because of the difficulties involved in developing filled land (Area 3) and the inevitable uncertainties over capacity in the urban areas, an additional broad location for housing with a capacity of 250 dwellings has been identified as an extension to the urban area to the north east/ eastern fringes of Leek (Area 5/6). Area 6 is a much reduced area than previously identified in the preferred options document to accommodate only 250 dwellings rather than the 700 -1,000 dwellings previously proposed. There is some overlap in terms of the areas covered.

There have also been changes to the broad locations proposed in Biddulph. As with Leek, there has been further work undertaken on the broad locations including a landscape and settlement character assessment and a review of potential development capacity in the urban areas. This has identified additional capacity in the urban area of around 500 dwellings which now includes Uplands Mill (formerly Area 2). Area 5 (Newpool Meadows) is also included in the Urban Area and is an existing commitment. If the village green application currently pending on Newpool Meadows is successful, then green belt land elsewhere will be required for housing as there would be insufficient capacity within the urban area to accommodate the 117 dwellings committed on this site. Area 6 (Newpool Area) has been identified as the most appropriate location to provide the additional housing if needed.

In Cheadle there has not been a change to the broad locations proposed. However, the review of potential capacity in the urban areas indicates that the housing requirement for Cheadle can be met by the Urban Area and Areas 4, 5 and 1. This means that Area 2 which scored least well in the sustainability appraisal may not be required, although if some of the sites included in the urban area do not come forward it may still be needed. It has therefore been retained with a proviso that it may not be required if the requirement is met by the development of the other preferred locations.

#### Revisions to the Submission Core Strategy

Following consultation on the Submission Version of the Core Strategy, which raised issues relating to the broad locations for housing and led to a reconsideration of these broad locations by the Council, further consultation on an Addendum to the Core Strategy was held in December 2009 / January 2010. This proposed amendments to the broad areas in each of the towns. Over 400 responses were received to this consultation, most of which were objecting to the proposals put forward for Cheadle, particularly the inclusion of the area to the east of Cheadle (Area 6/7).

In 2010, the Council decided to make further revisions to the proposals in the Core Strategy in light of new evidence on future housing requirements in the District and to address policy gaps likely to arise from the abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Consultation on these revisions took place in February / March 2011. The key change was a proposal to reduce the Council's overall figure for new housing in the period 2006-2026 from 6000 to 5500. Details of how the broad locations in each of the 3 towns have been affected by the revisions are described below.

In Leek, the number of new dwellings required over the plan period has reduced from 1800 to 1650. The broad areas for housing development have been identified as (in priority order) 'within the urban area' and 'small urban extensions'. Broad Area 3 (North of Leek) has now been deleted as it is not now required due to the housing provision being reduced in Leek. Broad Areas 5/6 (to the north-east / eastern fringes of Leek) were previously deleted at the Addendum Stage. Evidence from the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment shows that the total estimated capacity on new allocations (of 10+ dwellings) within the urban area is 642. In addition it is anticipated that there is capacity for around 100 dwellings on smaller sites (less than 10 dwellings) within the urban area. There is a requirement for around 150 dwellings on small urban extension sites (if needed), which will be identified in the Site Allocations DPD. The remaining supply of housing has already been

completed (367 dwellings) or has planning consent already in place (483 dwellings). A slippage allowance of 10% (80 dwellings) has also been factored into the figures.

In Biddulph, the number of new dwellings required over the plan period has reduced from 1200 to 1100. The broad areas for housing development have been identified as (in priority order) 'within the urban area', 'extension to the urban area to the west of the bypass (Area 4)' and 'small urban extensions in the greenbelt'. These are the same broad areas previously identified at the Addendum Stage when Area 6 (Land at Newpool) was deleted. Evidence from the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment shows that the total estimated capacity on new allocations (of 10+ dwellings) within the urban area is 312. In addition it is anticipated that there is capacity for around 100 dwellings on smaller sites (less than 10 dwellings) within the urban area. The amount of housing required on Area 4 has reduced from 330 dwellings to 280 due to concerns about the ability of the site to accommodate this level of development as landscape constraints exist. There is a requirement for around 100 dwellings on small urban extension sites (if needed), which will be identified in the Site Allocations DPD. The remaining supply of housing has already been completed (102 dwellings) or has planning consent already in place (278 dwellings). A slippage allowance of 10% (72 dwellings) has also been factored into the figures.

In Cheadle, the number of new dwellings required over the plan period has reduced significantly from 1500 to 1210. This reduction is due to reducing the overall housing requirement throughout the District as well as reducing the proportion of development allocated to Cheadle, instead increasing the proportion in the rural areas. The Council considered that this was an appropriate strategy to reduce development on greenfield sites on the edge of the town. The broad areas for housing development have been identified as (in priority order) 'within the urban area', 'extension to the urban area to the north and north east of Cheadle (Areas 1 & 2)' and 'small urban extensions'. Area 4a was previously included at Addendum Stage and this has now been removed along with Areas 6 & 7 (East of Cheadle).

Areas 1 & 2 were both included previously. Habitat survey findings do not indicate that any parts of Area 1 and 2 are unsuitable for development other than protecting the watercourse, swamp and a small area of unimproved grassland. The inclusion of small urban extensions for Cheadle is a new addition made in the most recent revisions.

Evidence from the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment shows that the total estimated capacity on new allocations (of 10+ dwellings) within the urban area is 441. In addition it is anticipated that there is capacity for around 100 dwellings on smaller sites (less than 10 dwellings) within the urban area. The amount of housing required on Areas 1 & 2 has reduced slightly from 430 dwellings to 400. There is a requirement for around 200 dwellings on small urban extension sites (if needed), which will be identified in the Site Allocations DPD. The remaining supply of housing has already been completed (103 dwellings) or has planning consent already in place (68 dwellings). A slippage allowance of 10% (104 dwellings) has also been factored into the figures.

Additional infrastructure benefits including (if required) the provision of a recreation area for younger people to serve Cheadle West and a new primary school East / North Cheadle have been included in the Cheadle policy (SS5c).

#### Revised Submission Core Strategy

Sustainability Appraisals (SA) were undertaken for the two areas in north west Cheadle put forward as alternative broad locations in representations received at the revised submission stage December to February 2011/2012. This general area was considered at the very first stage of the search for broad areas (Area 3).

In terms of specific broad areas for housing development, overall, the broad areas proposed for development in the Revised Submission Core Strategy resulted in a higher sustainability score for Leek than in the Submission Core Strategy. This was mainly due to the deletion of Areas 5 and 6 as broad locations and their replacement with 'small urban extensions' some of which are in closer proximity to services and facilities, brownfield land and non-agricultural land. In Biddulph, overall the changes

proposed to the broad locations would result in an equal or potentially higher level of sustainability than in the Submission Core Strategy. Small urban extensions scored the same as Area 6 (which has been deleted). However, there is the potential for some of the small urban extensions to be located on more sustainable sites than Area 6 resulting in a higher sustainability score. In Cheadle, the changes to the broad areas for housing development result in a lower level of sustainability than in the Submission Core Strategy as the 'small urban extensions' and Area 2 (which may not have been required for development in the Submission Version of the plan but is required in the Revised Submission Version) both have lower scores than some of the alternative broad areas which have been discounted. However, it should be emphasised that proposals in the Revised Submission Core Strategy significantly reduced the number of houses planned for Cheadle and this will result in less green field development around the town overall. Some impacts such as key habitats and species depend on the specific location of the site and will be addressed in the Site Allocations DPD.

### Modifications Stage

The Inspector considered that the inclusion of Area 2, in Cheadle as a broad area for housing was not justified by the evidence in the SA as Staffordshire County Council could not confirm that a new primary school would be required. The Council proposed the deletion of this area as a main modification to the Core Strategy. The scoring for Area 2 has been amended to reflect the Inspector's comments.

The following section sets out the methodology used to assess the broad locations.

The broad area assessments are included on pages 121 to 138.

## Methodology

The 17 SA Objectives were not considered to provide enough detailed information to fully assess the impact of development in the broad locations and more importantly allow differentiation between them so the following methodology was devised.

### 1. Location and Type of Land

This section of the assessment categorises the broad locations in terms of where they are in relation to the existing settlement and what type of land they are located on. Locations within the development boundary will generally be more sustainable because they are closer to existing facilities and services, and development on greenfield sites and green belt will generally be less sustainable because they will have an irreversible impact on the landscape and its openness. It is therefore considered that this section should carry a maximum of 10 points to adequately reflect these elements.

<b>1a Location (maximum 4 points)</b>	
Within current development boundary	4
Part within / part outside development boundary	2
Outside development boundary	0

<b>1b Land Use (maximum 4 points)</b>	
Previously developed land	4
Mix of brownfield/greenfield	2
Greenfield site	0

<b>1c Green Belt (maximum 2 points)</b>	
Not green belt	2
Green belt	0

## 2. Accessibility

This section assesses how sustainable the broad locations are in terms of access to public transport, the town centre, local facilities such as schools and doctors surgeries and also the highway network. This section carries a maximum of 8 points which is considered to adequately reflect the individual accessibility elements. Given that there are no train stations in Leek, Biddulph or Cheadle public transport includes bus services only with each broad location assessed on the existing service provided. The distance to the town centre and to local facilities from each broad location were measured and assessed. In addition the location of the broad locations in relation to the local highway network hierarchy is also included.

<b>2a Public Transport (maximum 2 points)</b>	
Hourly or more frequent daytime service	2
Less frequent service	1
Isolated location with no public transport	0

<b>2b Access to the Town Centre (maximum 2 points)</b>	
Within 500m of the town centre	2
Between 500m and 1km of the town centre	1
Over 1km from the town centre	0

<b>2c Access to local facilities (primary school, doctors surgery) (maximum 2 points)</b>	
Average to both facilities within 500m	2
Average to both facilities within 1km	1
Average to both facilities over 1km	0

<b>2d Highway Network (maximum 2 points)</b>	
Located on a Classified A road	2
Located on a Classified B road	1
Located on a C or unclassified road	0

## 3. Environmental Impact

This section assesses the environmental impact of developing each of the broad locations. It firstly assesses the proximity of the broad locations to protected sites such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Nature Conservation Sites. It also assesses if development in the broad location is likely to have a negative effect on important historical features such as historic parks and gardens, scheduled ancient monuments, conservation areas or listed buildings. It looks at the impact on agricultural land by scoring according to the grade of agricultural land (there is no grade 1 or 2 agricultural land within the district which is the highest grade). Finally, it assesses the impact of developing the broad locations on the landscape. Most of the locations are situated on the edge of settlements and it is considered that more points are appropriate in order to allow a more detailed sustainability assessment of the landscape. This section carries a maximum of 10 points.

<b>3a Protected Sites (maximum 2 points)</b>	
No protected sites in area	2
Close to protected site	1
Adjacent to protected site	0

<b>3b Heritage (maximum 2 points)</b>	
No	2
Unlikely to have a negative impact	1
Yes	0

<b>3c Agricultural Land (maximum 2 points)</b>	
Loss of Grade 5 or non-agricultural	2
Loss of Grade 4 or mix of Grades 3/4 or 4/5	1
Loss of Grade 3	0

<b>3d Landscape Impact (maximum 4 points)</b>	
Low impact – close to existing buildings etc	4
Medium impact	2
High impact – open countryside, no landscaping, impact on skyline/views	0

#### 4. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is a critical element of the sustainability appraisal and carries a maximum of 8 points, however, residential development is not appropriate in Zone 3 so any broad locations zoned as either 3a or 3b would have to be discounted and not pursued any further for housing potential. If part of the site was within the Zone 3 water compatible uses such as amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity or outdoor sports and recreation could be provided as part of the overall scheme. Less vulnerable uses such as offices, general industry, storage and distribution are acceptable in Zone 3a but not in Zone 3b which is the functional floodplain.

<b>4. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (maximum 8 points)</b>	
Location not affected by Flood Zone 3	8
Location affected by Flood Zone 3 but small in scale	4
Large part of site washed over by Flood Zone 3	Residential development will not be permitted. Employment sites are acceptable in Zone 3a but not Zone 3b

#### 5. Infrastructure/Regeneration Benefits

This section of the appraisal assesses the positive social or economic impacts that may be achieved by developing a particular broad location. Development in certain areas may mean that important infrastructure improvements such as a new road or regeneration benefits such as improving sub-standard housing could be achieved which could not otherwise be funded. Some benefits will be more strategic and score 10 points others will be more localised and score 5 points.

<b>5. Infrastructure/Regeneration Benefits (maximum 10 points)</b>	
Potential for large scale infrastructure /regeneration benefits	10
Potential for medium scale infrastructure /regeneration benefits	5
No infrastructure/regeneration benefits	0

In total a maximum of 46 points was available, which is summarised as follows:

1. Location and Type of Land – 10 points
2. Accessibility – 8 points
3. Environmental Impact – 10 points
4. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – 8 points
5. Infrastructure / Regeneration Benefits- 10 points



## INDIVIDUAL BROAD AREA ASSESSMENTS - BIDDULPH

### Broad Housing Areas Proposed for Inclusion within the Core Strategy

<b>Area 8 - Urban Area</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	2	
1c	2	
2a	2	Frequent services to town centre on routes 99, 6A & 9.
2b	1	Most of the urban area is within 1km of the town centre
2c	1	Most parts of the urban area have access to a primary school and a doctor's surgery within 1 kilometre
2d	0	Most of the urban area is not located on a classified A or B road.
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	2	Urban land
3d	4	
4	8	
5	0	
<b>Score: 30</b>		

<b>Area 4 - Extension to the Urban Area to the West of the Bypass</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	0	
1c	2	
2a	0	Change to the bus timetable means that there is now no bus route in close proximity
2b	2	0.45 kilometres from the town centre
2c	1	School – Knypersley First School, Doctors, Rupert St – average distance within 1 kilometre
2d	2	On A527 Meadows Way (Biddulph bypass)
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	1	Mixture of urban, Grade 4 and Grade 3
3d	2	Previously scored 0 but housing numbers reduced by 50 in this broad area to enable lower density developments to be built to minimise landscape impact. Potential impact on views up the valley to Mow Cop and vice versa. Identified in the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment as forming important landscape setting to the settlement.
4	8	
5	0	
<b>Score: 26</b>		

<b>Small Urban Extensions</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	All outside development boundary.
1b	0	Vast majority of land is greenfield.
1c	0	Biddulph is surrounded by greenbelt.
2a	1	Around half of the roads surrounding the town benefit from an hourly bus service.
2b	0	4 points measured – north, south, east and West of Biddulph. Distance between each point and Sainsburys roundabout measured. Averaged out all 4 distances to reach final distance of 1.3km.
2c	1	4 points measured (same as above). Measured distances between each point and nearest primary school and doctors surgery. Calculated average of both. Then calculated average of the 4 averages to reach final figure of 0.8km.
2d	0	Vast majority located off a 'C' or unclassified road.
3a	2	There are no SSSIs or nature conservation areas immediately adjacent to the Biddulph Town Development Boundary.
3b	1	There is unlikely to be a negative impact when developing small urban extensions around Biddulph as a whole. Only Biddulph Grange (historic parkland) and Knypersley Hall (listed building) constitute important historical features on the edge of the urban area.
3c	1	Vast majority of land outside the urban area surrounding Biddulph is classified as Grade 4 agricultural land, with only a small amount to the west of the town being classified as Grade 3.
3d	2	Medium impact – a majority of the land immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary is not identified in the Landscape & Settlement Setting Study as being important to the setting of Biddulph. However, small urban extensions often involve developing land which is part of the open countryside so clearly there would be some landscape impact in most cases.
4	8	Only a very small part of the area around Biddulph is affected by a flood zone. This is at the northern end of the town, through the sewage works and along part of Congleton Road. All other areas around the edge of the town are not affected by a flood zone.
5	0	Small urban extensions are unlikely to result in any infrastructure / regeneration benefits.
<b>Score: 16</b>		

Broad Areas for Employment Development Included in the Core Strategy

<b>Within the Urban Area</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	2	
1c	2	
2a	1	
2b	1	
2c	-	
2d	1	
3a	1	
3b	2	
3c	2	
3d	4	
4	8	
5	0	
<b>Score: 28</b>		

<b>EM 1 (Victoria Business Park)</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	4	
1c	2	
2a	2	Routes 6A & 9 covering Brown Lees Road.
2b	0	Over 1.6 kilometres from the town centre
2c	-	N/A
2d	2	A527 Tunstall Road
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	2	Non-agricultural land
3d	4	Undeveloped part of an existing industrial estate
4	8	
5	0	
<b>Score: 32</b>		

Broad Area Previously Considered for Housing

<b>Area 6 - Land in the Green Belt at Newpool</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	
1b	0	
1c	0	
2a	2	Routes 6A & 9 along Newpool Road
2b	1	0.97 kilometres from town centre
2c	1	Doctors – Princess Street, School – Knypersley First School average to both facilities within 1 kilometre.
2d	0	
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	0	Vast majority of land is classified Grade 3.
3d	0	This area is open countryside.
4	8	
5	0	
<b>Score: 16</b>		

**Summary - Biddulph**

Biddulph (Areas)		Broad Areas for Housing			Previously Considered Broad Area
		Area 8 Urban Area	Area 4 Extension to the Urban Area to the West of the Bypass	Small Urban Extensions	Area 6 Land in the Greenbelt at Newpool
1. Location and Type	a) Location	4	4	0	0
	b) Land Use	2	0	0	0
	c) Green Belt	2	2	0	0
2. Accessibility	a) Public Transport	2	0	1	2
	b) Access to the Town Centre	1	2	0	1
	c) Access to Local Facilities	1	1	1	1
	d) Highway Network	0	2	0	0
3. Environmental Impact	a) Wildlife site	2	2	2	2
	b) Agricultural Land	2	2	1	2
	c) Heritage	2	1	1	0
	d) Landscape Impact	4	2	2	0
4. Flood Risk		8	8	8	8
5. Community Benefit		0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>

**INDIVIDUAL BROAD AREA ASSESSMENTS – CHEADLE**

Broad Areas for Housing Included within the Core Strategy

<b>Area 8 - Urban Area</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	2	
1c	2	
2a	2	No 32 frequent service into town centre
2b	1	Varies - most sites within 500m but some greater
2c	1	Average of sites to both facilities between 500m and 1km
2d	1	Most sites with access onto the A521 / A522 or B5417 and B5032
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	1	Mix of grades 3 / 4 and non-agricultural
3d	4	Infill sites within the settlement boundary
4	4	Small areas along watercourses affected. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	0	
<b>Score: 26</b>		

<b>Area 1 - Extension to the Urban Area to the North of Cheadle</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	0	
1c	2	
2a	2	No 32 frequent service along Froghall Road plus other services
2b	1	0.7 km
2c	0	Average 1.2km
2d	2	Direct access onto A521
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	0	Grade 3
3d	2	Within the existing development boundary
4	4	Small areas along watercourses affected. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	5	Potential for new school
<b>Score: 26</b>		

<b>Small Urban Extensions</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	All outside development boundary.
1b	0	All are greenfield sites.
1c	1	Western side of Cheadle is surrounded by Green Belt, eastern side of Cheadle is not.
2a	0.5	Some are on a less frequent bus route others are not.
2b	0.5	Mixture of 500m - 1km and over 1km.
2c	0.5	Mixture of 500m - 1km and over 1km.
2d	1	Mixture of A, B and C classified roads.
3a	1	Hales Hall Pool SBI, Huntley Wood SBI, Huntley Railway Regionally Important Geological Site and Monks Wood Ancient Woodland all in

		close proximity to the edge of Cheadle.
3b	2	Unlikely to be a negative impact.
3c	1	Land outside the urban area is mix of Grades 3 and 4.
3d	1	Medium/High Impact as a significant proportion of land immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary (north west and east) is identified in the Landscape and Settlement Setting Study as being important to the setting of Cheadle.
4	8	Potential sites with small areas liable to flood along watercourses are unlikely to be necessary.
5	0	Unlikely to have any infrastructure/regeneration benefits due to the scale of development.
<b>Score: 17</b>		

Broad Areas for Employment Development included in the Revised Core Strategy

<b>Within the Urban Area</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	2	
1c	2	
2a	0.5	Some areas have a bus service, some don't.
2b	1	
2c	-	
2d	0	
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	1	1 potential area is Grade 4 and the others are Grade 5.
3d	2	1 potential area likely to have a medium impact others low impact.
4	4	Some areas affected by Flood Zone 3 but small in scale.
5	0	
<b>Score: 20.5</b>		

<b>EM1 (South West of Cheadle)</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	0	
1c	2	
2a	0	Not on a bus route
2b	0	1.1 km
2c	-	N/A
2d	0	C or Unclassified road
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	1	Mix of grades 3 and 4
3d	2	Within the development boundary and well related to the existing settlement
4	4	Small areas along watercourses affected. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	0	
<b>Score: 17</b>		

<b>EM2 (Draycott Cross Road)</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	4	
1c	2	
2a	0	Not on a bus route
2b	0	1.8 km
2c	-	N/A
2d	0	C or Unclassified road
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	2	Non-agricultural
3d	2	Previously developed site fairly well screened but on the edge of the settlement
4	8	Not affected
5	0	
<b>Score: 26</b>		

Broad Areas for Housing Previously Considered

<b>Area 2 - Extension to the Urban Area to the North East of Cheadle</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	
1b	0	
1c	2	
2a	1	No 123 less frequent service along Ness Grove and Thorpe Rise
2b	1	1km
2c	0	Average 1.2 km
2d	0	C or Unclassified road
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	0	Grade 3
3d	2	Site is fairly well related to the existing development boundary
4	4	Small areas along watercourses affected. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	0	This score has been amended to reflect the Inspectors comments regarding the lack of evidence provided by Staffordshire County Council for the need for a new school.
<b>Score: 14</b>		

<b>Area 3a – North West of Cheadle</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	Outside development boundary
1b	0	
1c	0	Green belt
2a	2	No 32 frequent service along Froghall Road plus other services
2b	1	1 km
2c	0	1.2 km
2d	2	Adjacent to A522
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	0	Grade 3
3d	0	High impact – open countryside



4	4	Small areas along watercourses affected. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	0	
<b>Score: 13</b>		

<b>Area 3b – North West of Cheadle</b>		
Question		
1a	0	Outside development boundary
1b	0	
1c	0	Green belt
2a	2	No 32 frequent service along Froghall Road plus other services
2b	1	0.95 km
2c	0	1.2 km
2d	2	Adjacent to A522
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	0	Grade 3
3d	0	High impact – open countryside
4	4	Small areas along watercourses affected. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	5	Potential for funding link road and potential for new school
<b>Score: 18</b>		

<b>Area 4a - Brookhouses</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	Within current development boundary
1b	0	
1c	2	Not green belt
2a	0	Not on a bus route
2b	1	0.9 km
2c	0	1.1 km
2d	0	C or unclassified road
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	1	Grades 3 and 4
3d	2	Area is fairly well related to the existing edge of Cheadle
4	4	Small areas along watercourses affected. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	5	Provision of open space means there is potential for medium scale infrastructure benefits
<b>Score: 23</b>		

<b>Areas 4 &amp; 5 - South West Cheadle Urban Extension</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	2	Part within / part outside development boundary
1b	0	
1c	0	Part within green belt
2a	2	No 32 frequent service along Tean Road plus other services
2b	0	Over 1 km from the town centre
2c	0	Over 1 km
2d	2	Southern part of area has a direct access onto the A522
3a	1	Close to the Huntley Railway Regionally Important Geological Site
3b	2	
3c	0	Grade 3
3d	2	Well related to the existing edge of Cheadle
4	4	Small areas along watercourses affected. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	10	Potential for funding southern link road
<b>Score: 25</b>		

<b>Areas 6 &amp; 7 – East Cheadle Urban Extension</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	Outside development boundary
1b	0	
1c	2	Not green belt
2a	1	Less frequent service along Oakamoor Road and Thorley Drive
2b	1	0.85 km
2c	1	0.8 km
2d	1	Access onto B5032 / B5417
3a	0	Monks Wood found to be of SBI quality when undertaking ecological survey.
3b	2	
3c	0	Grade 3
3d	0	Significant intrusion into open countryside – land north and south of Ashbourne Road identified in Settlement and Landscape Character Assessment as being important to the setting of Cheadle.
4	4	Small areas along watercourses affected. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	5	Potential for funding link road and potential for new school
<b>Score: 17</b>		

<b>Area 10 – Dilhorne Road</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	Outside development boundary
1b	0	
1c	0	Green Belt
2a	0	Not on a bus route
2b	1	0.7 km
2c	1	0.9 km
2d	0	C or unclassified road
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	1	Grade 4
3d	0	Significant intrusion into open countryside – most of area identified

		in Settlement and Landscape Character Assessment as being important to the setting of Cheadle. Sloping and rises significantly.
4	4	Watercourse dissects western part of site. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	0	
<b>Score: 11</b>		

<b>Area 11 - Leek Road</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	
1b	0	
1c	0	
2a	0	Not on a bus route
2b	1	0.7 km
2c	1	0.9 km
2d	2	Adjacent A522
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	0	Grade 3
3d	0	Significant intrusion into open countryside – identified in Settlement and Landscape Character Assessment as area important to the setting of Cheadle.
4	4	Small areas along watercourses affected. Could be incorporated into amenity space.
5	0	
<b>Score: 12</b>		

Summary - Cheadle

		Revised Core Strategy Housing Broad Areas			Previous Broad Areas or Areas Previously Considered							
		Area 8 – Urban Area	Area 1 – North Cheadle	Small Urban Extensions	Area 2 – North East Cheadle	Area 4a – Brookhouses	Area 4 & 5 – South West Cheadle Urban	Area 6 & 7 – East Cheadle Urban Extension	Area 10 – Dilhorne Road	Area 11 – Leek Road	Area 3a – North West	Area 3b – North West
1. Location and Type	a) Location	4	4	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0
	b) Land Use	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	c) Green Belt	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
2. Accessibility	a) Public Transport	2	2	0.5	1	0	2	1	0	0	2	2
	b) Access to the Town Centre	1	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
	c) Access to Local Facilities	1	0	0.5	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
	d) Highway Network	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	2	2
3. Environmental Impact	a) Wildlife site	2	2	1	2	2	1	0	2	2	2	2
	b) Heritage	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	c) Agricultural Land	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
	d) Landscape Impact	4	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
4. Flood Risk		4	4	8	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5. Community Benefit		0	5	0	0	5	10	5	0	0	0	5
<b>Total</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>

## INDIVIDUAL BROAD AREA ASSESSMENTS – LEEK

### Broad Areas Included within Core Strategy

<b>Area 8 - Urban Area</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	2	
1c	2	
2a	2	No 16, 18, 165 and 166
2b	1	Most within 500m but some greater
2c	1	Most have access to a primary school and doctors within 500m but some greater
2d	1	Most have access onto A523, A53 and A520
3a	1	
3b	1	
3c	1	Non-agricultural and Grade 4 agricultural land
3d	4	Low impact close to existing buildings
4	8	No sites within Flood Zone 2 and 3 although some within close proximity
5	0	
<b>Score: 28</b>		

<b>Small Urban Extensions</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	2	Some are within the current development boundary and some are outside development boundary.
1b	2	Mixture of both greenfield and brownfield areas.
1c	2	Extensions into the Green Belt are unlikely to be necessary
2a	1	Some are on a bus route others are not
2b	0	Majority are over 1km from the town centre
2c	1	Some average to both facilities is within 1km, some are over 1km
2d	1	Some are located on a Classified A road, most are on a C or unclassified road
3a	1	Some are located in close proximity to protected sites
3b	1	Unlikely to have a negative impact
3c	1	Some are grade 4 and others are non agricultural land.
3d	2	Varies with some likely to have a high impact, some medium and some likely to have a low impact.
4	8	None of the current potential areas are in Flood Zone 3
5	0	Unlikely to have any infrastructure/ regeneration benefits due to the scale of development.
<b>Score: 22</b>		

### Broad Areas for Employment Development in the Revised Core Strategy

<b>Within the Urban Area</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	2	
1c	2	
2a	1	Most have a less frequent than hourly bus service.
2b	1	
2c	-	

2d	1	
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	2	
3d	4	
4	4	Some of potential areas are affected by Flood Zone 3.
5	0	
<b>Score: 25</b>		

<b>EM1 (South of Leek) - Cornhill</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	0	
1c	2	
2a	0	Not on a bus route but close to Cheddleton Road (no 16 hourly or more frequent)
2b	1	950 m
2c	-	N/A
2d	0	
3a	0	
3b	2	
3c	2	Non-agricultural/ Grade 4
3d	4	
4	8	
5	10	
<b>Score: 33</b>		

<b>EM2 (Leekbrook)</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	
1b	0	
1c	2	
2a	0	Not on a bus route
2b	0	2.8 km
2c	-	N/A
2d	0	C or Unclassified
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	1	Grade 4
3d	2	Close to existing industrial area but intrusion into open countryside
4	4	Northern part of location in Flood Zone 3
5	0	
<b>Score: 13</b>		

<b>Churnet Works</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	2	
1b	2	
1c	2	
2a	1	No 108, 423 424 and 447 less frequent service along Macclesfield Road
2b	1	
2c	1	
2d	2	Located on a Classified A road (A523)

3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	2	
3d	2	
4	2	Site specific flood risk assessment now been completed and EA satisfied that residential development can be accommodated on part of the site but some areas still subject to flooding.
5	10	
<b>Score: 31</b>		

#### Broad Areas Previously considered for Housing

<b>Area 3 - Extension to the Urban Area to the North of Leek</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	4	
1b	2	Former tipped area, 1.2ha vacant greenfield and employment site therefore a mix of brownfield and greenfield land.
1c	2	
2a	2	New addition to area is on bus route which runs along Ball Haye Road/ Ball Haye Green/ Haregate Road (hourly or more frequent service number 18 and less frequent service number 165 and 166).
2b	1	Over 1km from the town centre
2c	1	
2d	0	
3a	0	Tipped area and agricultural field have recently been designated as a SBI
3b	2	
3c	2	Part is greenfield vacant land (Grade 4) although majority is non-agricultural
3d	2	Impact on views from the north. Much of the area is identified in the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment as forming important landscape setting to the settlement.
4	4	Small part affected by Flood Zone 3 excluded from net area
5	5	Opportunity to address contamination issues associated with previous use
<b>Score: 27</b>		

NB The school playing fields were considered for inclusion but have subsequently been determined to be unsuitable for inclusion and therefore the SA score has been amended to reflect this.

<b>Area 5 - Extension to the Urban Area on the Eastern fringes</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	
1b	0	
1c	2	
2a	0	Not on a bus route closest route runs along Buxton Road – no 118, 443, 445, 456 and 458 less frequent service
2b	0	Over 1km from the town centre
2c	1	
2d	0	
3a	1	Part of location close to Ladydale SBI
3b	2	
3c	1	Grade 4
3d	0	Significant intrusion into open countryside
4	8	
5	0	
<b>Score: 15</b>		

<b>Area 6 - Extension to the Urban Area to the North East of Leek</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	
1b	0	
1c	2	
2a	0	Not on a bus route closest route runs along Buxton Road – no 118, 443, 445, 456 and 458 less frequent service. No 446 less frequent service along Thorncliffe Road.
2b	0	Over 1km from the town centre
2c	1	
2d	0	Smaller broad area has no access onto a Classified A road
3a	1	Close proximity of Edge End Farm (north of SBI)
3b	2	
3c	1	Grade 4
3d	0	Significant intrusion into open countryside
4	8	
5	0	
<b>Score: 15</b>		

<b>Area 6a - Extension to the Urban Area to the North East of Leek</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	
1b	0	
1c	2	
2a	0	Not on a bus route closest route runs along Buxton Road – no 118, 443, 445, 456 and 458 less frequent service. No 446 less frequent service along Thorncliffe Road.
2b	0	Over 1km from the town centre
2c	1	
2d	0	No access onto a Classified A or B road
3a	2	
3b	2	
3c	2	Vacant greenfield land (non-agricultural)
3d	0	Significant intrusion into open countryside. Area is identified in the Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment as forming important landscape setting to the settlement.
4	8	
5	0	
<b>Score: 17</b>		



		Core Strategy Housing Broad Areas			Broad Areas or Areas Previously Considered			
Leek (Areas)		Area 8 Urban Area	Small Urban Extensions	Churnet Works (mixed development included within Area 8)	Area 6a Urban Extension to the North East of Leek	Area 3 Urban Extension to the North of Leek	Area 5 (Eastern Fringes)	Area 6 (North East of Leek)
1. Location and Type	a) Location	4	2	2	0	4	0	0
	b) Land Use	2	2	2	0	2	0	0
	c) Green Belt	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
2. Accessibility	a) Public Transport	2	1	1	0	2	0	0
	b) Access to the Town Centre	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
	c) Access to Local Facilities	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	d) Highway Network	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
3. Environmental Impact	a) Wildlife site	1	1	2	2	0	1	1
	b) Heritage	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
	c) Agricultural Land	1	1	2	2	2	1	1
	d) Landscape Impact	4	2	2	0	2	0	0
4. Flood Risk		8	8	2	8	4	8	8
5. Community Benefit		0	0	10	0	5	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

## MAJOR DEVELOPED AREAS IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

<b>Anzio Camp, Blackshaw Moor</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	
1b	4	
1c	2	
2a	1	On bus routes 118, 443, 445, 456, 458 – less frequent service
2b	0	
2c	0	Close to Blackshaw Moor CE (VC) First School but nearest GP surgery is in Leek
2d	2	
3a	0	Adjacent to Anzio Training Camp SBI
3b	1	
3c	2	Non-agricultural land
3d	0	Visual impact on setting of the Peak Park
4	8	
5	10	
<b>Score: 30</b>		

<b>Bolton Copperworks, Froghall</b>		
Question	Score	Comments
1a	0	
1b	4	
1c	2	
2a	1	On bus routes 234, 235, 236 – less frequent service
2b	0	
2c	0	Nearest primary school is St. Werburgh's CE (VA) Primary School, Kingsley. Nearest GP surgery is in Ipstones
2d	2	
3a	0	Adjacent to Harston Hill SBI, Froghall Bridge (east of) SBI, Churnet Valley SSSI
3b	0	Adjacent to Caldon Canal Conservation Area
3c	2	Non-agricultural land
3d	0	
4	0	Flood Zone 3 runs through part of the area
5	10	
<b>Score: 21</b>		

## Section P – Problems Encountered/ Issues Identified

Stage		Who carried this out	When	Problems encountered/issues identified
SA scoping Report	Collection of baseline data	Data sources identified by SMDC Planners	August / October 2006	Collection of the baseline data for the Core Strategy is ongoing. Any new sources of relevant data will be included in the baseline when it becomes available. New information or issues may emerge and these may have sustainability implications for the Core Strategy.
	Identification of links to other relevant plans, programmes and objectives	Plans, Programmes and Objectives identified by SMDC	September / October 2006	The huge number of plans and policies identified for the Core Strategy made it difficult to analyse each one in depth. The list includes those documents regarded to be most relevant to the Core Strategy.
	Formulation of SA Objectives	SA Objectives formulated and checked against requirements of the SEA Directive by SMDC Planners.	September / October 2006  Consultation November 2006 - January 2007	A number of revisions were made in response to representations received to the Scoping Report consultation. These were predominantly in response to English Heritage, Environment Agency and English Nature.
	Identification of key sustainability issues	Issues identified by SMDC Planners.	September / October 2006	Up-to-date and quantifiable data not available to substantiate all of the identified problems. Past trends and issues observed and identified through recent studies have been indicated.
	Selection of Indicators	Indicators selected by SMDC Planners in conjunction with other SMDC Officers.	September / October 2006	Difficulty in identifying targets for the measurement of achievements. Further work will be carried out on this.
SA of Initial Options	Initial SA	Initial SA of Options assessed and checked by SA Team. (SA Team comprised- Forward Plans Planning Officers, Development Control Officer, LSP Manager and Sustainability Manager.)	August 2007	At this stage of the SA it was not possible to split the spatial options into detailed components. This meant many elements were so similar that differences between some of the seven spatial options were marginal. As a result two additional impacts were added, 'significantly positive' and 'significantly negative' to enable a greater emphasis to be given to the impact of each spatial option.

SA of Preferred Option	SA of Preferred Option(s)	Preferred Option assessed by SA Team (see above).	December 2007 – July 2008	Difficulty in predicting actual effects of the Core Strategy, including time-scales of likely occurrence. This was an on-going process as changes made to the Preferred Option as a result of ongoing consultation had to be incorporated within the SA.
	SA of Broad Locations	Broad Locations assessed by SMDC Planners with input from the Environment Agency, SMDC Countryside Service	June – July 2008	A scoring system was devised to enable an assessment of how sustainable the broad locations in the three towns were and enable comparison between them.
SA of Submission Version	SA of Submission Version	Submission Version checked by SA Team (see above).	February – March 2009	Any changes made since the Preferred Options Stage checked and rescored were appropriate.
SA of Addendum to Submission Core Strategy	SA of the Addendum to the Staffordshire Moorlands Submission Core Strategy	SA of the Addendum to the Staffordshire Moorlands Submission Core Strategy checked by SA Team (see above).	September - November 2009	Focused changes made since the Submission Stage checked and rescored where appropriate.
SA of Revisions to Submission Core Strategy	SA of the Revisions to the Staffordshire Moorlands Submission Core Strategy	SA of the Revisions to the Staffordshire Moorlands Submission Core Strategy carried out by Forward Plans Team and checked by new SA Team (consisting of the Forward Plans Team, Policy Officer at High Peak Borough Council and a Sustainability Officer from High Peak Borough Council).	August - September 2011	Revisions made since the Submission Stage checked and rescored where appropriate.  Problems encountered in forming an SA Team due to staff changes. A new SA Team had to be formed to check the scoring at this stage.

## Section Q – Equality Impact Assessment

The District Council has a statutory duty under the Equality Act 2010 to eliminate any discrimination on the basis of:

- Age (including children and young people)
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

Such considerations must be taken into account in determining the effects of particular policies, programmes or strategies, with the aim of promoting fair and equal opportunity in employment, training and access to services.

The Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) matrix below provides a suitable way of assessing all these effects together.

The likely equality implications of spatial objectives have been estimated and assessed. The impacts have been recorded as being high, medium, low or neutral (where the effects are likely to be neither positive nor negative).

### Equality Impact Assessment of the Core Strategy Spatial Objectives

Plan (Spatial) Objective	Impact on Equality		
	Positive	Negative	Details
<b>Spatial Objective 1:</b> To make provision for the overall land-use requirements for the District, consistent with national and regional policy, local evidence, the role of Staffordshire Moorlands within North Staffordshire and the role of each settlement.	Neutral	Neutral	No significant impacts on equality.
<b>Spatial Objective 2:</b> To create a District where development minimises its impact on the environment, helps to mitigate and adapt to the adverse effects of climate change and makes efficient use of resources.	Neutral	Neutral	No significant impacts on equality.
<b>Spatial Objective 3:</b> To develop and diversify in a sustainable manner the District's economy and meet local employment needs in the	Medium	Neutral	Positive benefits through improved economic environment and employment opportunities.

towns and villages.			
<b>Spatial Objective 4:</b> To provide housing that is affordable, desirable, well-designed and meets the needs of residents of the Moorlands.	High	Neutral	Positive benefits through improved access to housing for all groups particularly for older, younger and disabled people.
<b>Spatial Objective 5:</b> To ensure the long-term vitality and viability of the three market towns of Leek, Biddulph and Cheadle.	Medium	Neutral	Improved range and access to services and facilities within town centres – generating positive benefits for all.
<b>Spatial Objective 6:</b> To maintain and promote sustainable regenerated rural areas and communities with access to employment opportunities, housing and services for all.	High	Neutral	Positive benefits through improved range of services and facilities.
<b>Spatial Objective 7:</b> To support and enhance the tourism, cultural, recreation and leisure opportunities for the District's residents and visitors.	Low	Neutral	Positive benefits for all through improved tourism, cultural, recreation and leisure opportunities.
<b>Spatial Objective 8:</b> To promote local distinctiveness by means of good design and the conservation, protection and enhancement of historic, environmental and cultural assets throughout the District.	Neutral	Neutral	No significant impacts on equality.
<b>Spatial Objective 9:</b> To protect and improve the character and distinctiveness of the countryside and its landscape, biodiversity and geological resources.	Neutral	Neutral	No significant impacts on equality.
<b>Spatial Objective 10:</b> To deliver sustainable, inclusive, healthy and safe communities	High	Neutral	Positive benefits through promoting sustainable, inclusive, healthy and safe communities.
<b>Spatial Objective 11:</b> To reduce the need to travel or make it safer and easier to travel by more sustainable forms of transport	Medium	Neutral	Promoting better access to services and facilities and by more sustainable forms of transport positive benefits for all.
<b>Conclusions:</b> Spatial Objectives 1, 2 and 9 are unlikely to deliver any significant positive or negative impacts on			

equality.

Spatial Objectives 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 aim to deliver greater choice for residents through greater range of uses and careful location of development. Also, greater employment opportunities and access to housing will be delivered through new economic and residential developments.

Spatial Objective 6 and 11 are likely to improve access to services and facilities.

## Conclusion

The adopted Core Strategy will have positive benefits for all through improved access to housing for all groups, and particularly for older, younger and residents with disabilities. It will also have positive benefits for all, and in particular older, younger and residents with disabilities, through improved access to services and facilities in the towns and larger villages. It will also have positive benefits in particular for children/younger people through improved access to play and sports facilities.

## Section R – Sign-Posting to Information required by the SEA Directive

Requirement of the SEA Directive		Location in SA Report
1	An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;	Section 3.0, 4.0 and 5.0 and Appendix 1 of Scoping Report and Issues and Evidence base Background Reports.
2	The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme;	Section 6.0, 7.0, Appendix 2 of Scoping Report and Issues and Evidence base background Reports.
3	The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;	Section 6.0, 7.0, Appendix 2 of Scoping Report and Issues and Evidence base background Reports.
4	Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;	Appendix 2 – Scoping Report and Issues and Evidence base background Reports.
5	The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;	Appendix 1 – Scoping Report and Issues and Evidence base background Reports.
6	The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects);	Sections L and M - Core Strategy SA Report
7	The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;	Section M – Core Strategy SA Report
8	An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;	Sections A to G and Section P – Core Strategy SA Report
9	A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Art. 10;	Section T – Core Strategy SA Report
10	A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	Sections 1 – 9 – Core Strategy SA Report
11	The report must include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment (Art. 5.2)	All relevant information has been considered in undertaking the SA of the Core Strategy.
12	<b>Consultation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information which must be</li> </ul>	Appendix 5 – Scoping Report



	included in the environmental report (Art. 5.4)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public, shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Art. 6.1, 6.2)</li> </ul>	Methodology set out in Section 15.0 – Scoping Report.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other EU Member States, where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country (Art. 7).</li> </ul>	N/A
13	<b>Taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision-making (Art. 8)</b>	Sections A to G - Core Strategy SA Report
14	<p><b>Provision of information on the decision:</b> When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any countries Consulted under Art.7 must be informed and the following made available to those so informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan or programme as adopted</li> <li>a statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report of Article 5, the opinions expressed pursuant to Article 6 and the results of Consultations entered into pursuant to Art. 7 have been taken into account in Accordance with Art. 8, and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and</li> <li>the measures decided concerning monitoring (Art. 9)</li> </ul>	Public informed regarding adoption of Core Strategy. Sustainability Appraisal Report accompanies adopted Core Strategy.
15	<b>Monitoring</b> of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation (Art. 10)	Section 17.0 – Scoping Report, and Section T - Core Strategy SA Report
16	<b>Quality Assurance:</b> environmental reports should be of a sufficient standard to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive	Section S – Core Strategy SA Report

Relevant reports:

- Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for Local Development Framework
- Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Report
- Core Strategy Issues and Evidence Base Background Report Versions 1 and 2
- Core Strategy Initial Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment Screening Report
- Core Strategy Draft Preferred Options Consultation Report
- Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal of Draft Preferred Options
- Staffordshire Moorlands District Council Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment (May 2008)
- Staffordshire Moorlands District Council Update of Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment (April 2009)
- Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal of the Submission Version
- Core Strategy Addendum to Submission Document
- Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal of the Addendum to the Submission Version
- Staffordshire Moorlands District Council Update of Core Strategy Appropriate Assessment to Reflect Revised Submission Core Strategy (August 2011)
- Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal of Revisions to Submission Version
- Core Strategy Revised Submission Stage (August 2012)
- Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Update (Incorporating Habitat Regulations Assessment)
- Main Modifications (June 2013)

## Section S – Quality Assurance Check

<b>Objectives and Context</b>	
- The appraisal is conducted as an integral part of the plan-making process.	√
- The plan/strategy's purpose and objectives are made clear.	√
- Sustainability issues and constraints, including international and EC environmental protection objectives, are considered in developing objectives and targets.	√
- SA objectives, where used, are clearly set out and linked to indicators and targets where appropriate.	√
- Links with other related plans, programmes and policies are identified and explained.	√
- Relates the requirements of the SEA Directive to the wider SA.	√
<b>Scoping</b>	
- Authorities and other key stakeholders with a range of interests that are relevant to the plan and SA are consulted in appropriate ways and at appropriate times on the content and scope of the SA Report.	√
- The assessment focuses on the significant issues.	√
- Technical, procedural and other difficulties encountered are discussed; assumptions and uncertainties are made explicit.	√
- Reasons are given for eliminating issues from further consideration.	√
<b>Options</b>	
- Realistic options are considered for key issues, and the reasons for choosing them are documented.	√
- Options include 'do nothing' scenario wherever relevant.	N/A
- The sustainability effects (both adverse and beneficial) of each option are identified and compared.	√
- Inconsistencies between the options and other relevant plans, programmes or policies are identified and explained.	√
- Reasons are given for selection or elimination of options.	√
<b>Baseline Information</b>	
- Relevant aspects of the current state of the plan area (including social, environmental, and economic characteristics) and their likely evolution without the plan are described.	√
- Characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected are described.	√
- Difficulties such as deficiencies in data or methods are explained.	√
<b>Prediction and Evaluation of Likely Significant Effects</b>	
- Effects identified include the types listed in the SEA Directive (biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climate factors, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape), as well as other wider sustainability issues (employment, housing, transport, community cohesion, education, etc).	√
- Both positive and negative effects are considered, and the duration of effects (short, medium or long-term) is addressed.	√
- Likely cumulative (including secondary and synergistic) effects are identified where practicable.	√
- Inter-relationships between effects are considered where practicable.	√
- Where relevant, the prediction and assessment of effects makes use of accepted standards, regulations, and thresholds.	N/A
- Methods used to appraise the effects are described.	√
<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	
- Measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the plan are indicated.	√
- Issues to be taken into account in project consents are identified.	√
<b>The SA Report</b>	
- Is clear and concise in its layout and presentation.	√
- Uses simple, clear language and avoids or explains technical terms.	√
- Uses maps and other illustrations where appropriate.	√
- Explains the methodology used.	√

- Explains who was consulted and what methods of consultation were used.	√
- Identifies sources of information, including expert judgement and matters of opinion.	√
- Contains a non-technical summary covering the overall approach to the appraisal, the objectives of the plan, the main options considered, and any changes to the plan resulting from the appraisal.	√
<b>Consultation</b>	
- Authorities and the public likely to be affected by, or having an interest in, the plan are consulted in ways and at times which give them an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinions on the draft plan and SA Report.	√
<b>Decision-making and Information on the Decision</b>	
- The SA Report and the opinions of those consulted are taken into account in finalising and adopting the plan.	√
- An explanation is given of how they have been taken into account.	√
- Reasons are given for choosing the plan as adopted, in the light of other reasonable options considered.	√
<b>Monitoring Measures</b>	
- Measures proposed for monitoring are clear, practicable and linked to the indicators and objectives used in the appraisal.	√
- Proposals are made for action in response to significant adverse effects.	N/A
- Monitoring enables unforeseen adverse effects to be identified at an early stage. These effects should include predictions which prove to be incorrect.	N/A
- During implementation of the plan, monitoring is used where appropriate to make good deficiencies in baseline information in the appraisal.	N/A

## Section T – Implementation of the Core Strategy

The delivery of the Core Strategy will require a partnership approach to implementing the policies and proposals. The Council cannot deliver everything itself nor can the outcomes be achieved just through the granting or refusal of planning permission. Implementation will involve other organisations and groups who will work within the framework of their own strategies and plans as well as the spatial plan for the District. It will be very important therefore for the Council to work closely with its partners to ensure the success of the LDF and to be clear about what is required to deliver development, who will deliver it and when it will be required.

The Core Strategy Infrastructure Plan is a stand-alone document that will sit alongside the Core Strategy and the Staffordshire Moorlands Sustainable Community Strategy. The Infrastructure Plan identifies as far as possible infrastructure needs and costs, phasing of development, funding sources and who has responsibility for delivery. It will be reviewed each year as part of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). This will enable projects and schemes to be moved in and out as part of the AMR process. It will enable key parties and outside organisations to identify and prioritise infrastructure provision as part of an integrated approach to planning and infrastructure development. This will ensure services can match demand and that growth is sustainable.

The Core Strategy must also be able to respond to changing circumstances, nationally, regionally and locally, over the plan period and demonstrate that there is flexibility and contingency measures to continue to deliver the development required. Monitoring how well the LDF is performing will be an essential element of this. By assessing how well the policies are being achieved against clear targets, decisions can be made as to whether policies or documents need to be adjusted or replaced. In particular, monitoring will provide the context for reviewing housing delivery against the Housing Trajectory and the impact of the Strategy on a selected range of sustainability indicators. These indicators have been developed to provide a consistent basis for monitoring performance of the Strategy against the spatial objectives. However, it must be recognised that not all of the indicators will be influenced solely by the implementation of the Core Strategy. Other, external factors will often have an influence. Appendix A of the Core Strategy contains an Implementation and Monitoring Plan.