

**South Lakeland District Council
Local Development Framework**

**Core Strategy
Inspector's Possible Changes (IPCs)**

Sustainability Appraisal Addendum

June 2010

1. Introduction

- 1.1 South Lakeland District Council is preparing a Local Development Framework (LDF) that will replace the South Lakeland Local Plan and will apply to the area of South Lakeland outside the Lake District and Yorkshire Dales National Parks. The LDF will contain a range of documents known as Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) detailing different aspects of spatial planning for the district. These DPDs and SPDs need to be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA) under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 1.2 The Council published its Core Strategy in August 2009, prior to submitting it to the Secretary of State in November 2009. It also published an accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Addendum report on the published Core Strategy which is available on the Council's website at <http://www.southlakeland.gov.uk/Default.aspx?page=1973>
- 1.3 Following the Examination in Public on the Core Strategy in March 2010, the Inspector has published 7 possible changes to the Core Strategy DPD for consultation until Thursday 17 June 2010, which are set out on the website at <http://www.southlakeland.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/local-development-framework/core-strategy/core-strategy-examination.aspx> - document reference ED50, also with ED49, ED 50.1, ED50.2 and ED50.3.
- 1.4 Of the 7 possible changes (IPCs) put forward for consultation, as listed in the table below, it is considered that 3 have no material import on policy and do not therefore merit further sustainability appraisal: these are IPC2, IPC4 and IPC6. In regard to IPC2, it is considered that the possible change clarifies that retail will be taken into account at Canal Head Area Action Plan. The actual extent of any additional retail will be determined through that document, and be the subject of later separate sustainability appraisal.
- 1.5 This report therefore sets out the results and conclusions from the appraisal of the 4 possible changes IPC1, IPC3, IPC5 and IPC7.

	Inspector's Possible Changes (IPCs) to Core Strategy for Consultation
IPC1	<u>Policy CS1.2 The Development Strategy</u> ❖ Change target of development on PDL from 50% to "at least 28%"
IPC2	<u>Policy CS2 - para 3.32 Kendal Area Strategy – Canal Head Area Action Plan</u> ❖ Add to development options list: “• The potential provision of an appropriate scale of retail development.”
IPC3	<u>Policy CS31 – Ulverston and Furness Area</u> ❖ Reduce the numbers of houses proposed for Ulverston in 2003-2025 and redistribute 'lost' homes to Kendal &/or other Key and Local Service Centres
IPC4	<u>Policy CS6.1 The Housing Requirement</u> ❖ Substitute grouped or global target numbers for (a) Key Service Centres and (b) Local Service Centres
IPC5	<u>Policy CS6.3 – Provision of affordable housing/local occupancy housing</u> ❖ Two different options - Alternatives 1 or 2 - to reduce the proposed policy's requirement for the delivery of houses with Local Occupancy conditions outside Principal & Key Service Centres – for details see attached ANNEX A, Document Ref; ED49 on the web page noted at 1.3 above.
IPC6	<u>Policy CS2 Kendal Area Strategy text at para 3.43</u> ❖ Replace explanatory text agreed by Cumbria County Council re need to properly address detailed traffic constraints as a key part of the Allocations of Land DPD – for details see Annex B, document reference ED 50.2 available from the web page at 1.3 above.
IPC7	<u>Policy CS7.2 and Monitoring and Implementation Framework – Employment Land and Sectoral Split</u> ❖ Add new paras 8.1 – 8.9 to Implementation Plan explaining need for sequential

	approach to identification of Strategic Employment Sites in Kendal & Ulverston and site selection criteria – For details see attached ANNEX C, document reference ED 50.3 available from the web page at 1.3 above.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2. Methodology

2.1 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework utilised for the SA has been developed in conjunction with Cumbria County Council, other Local Authorities in Cumbria and with agreement from the 3 statutory consultation bodies. This framework, together with further details of how it was developed and the methodology for the appraisal are set out in the South Lakeland Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report April 2006. The Framework also utilises a panel of professionals in each of the main sustainability topics - social, environmental, economic and natural resources, drawing on the Panel members at each stage of the appraisal process. The appraisal of the Core Strategy objectives is set out in the SA Addendum Report. Officers of SLDC through workshop sessions undertook the SA of the Inspector's possible changes to the Core Strategy.

2.2 The Inspector's proposed changes and those which are considered to require a sustainability appraisal are summarised in the table below:

3. Appraisal of Inspector's Possible Changes (IPCs)

3.1 IPC1

- Overall policy CS1.2 continues to score well, taking account of the Inspector's possible change.
- The appraisal indicates that the possible change to reduce the residential brownfield land target from 50% to a minimum of 28%, could improve provision of decent and affordable homes (SP3), as the likelihood of improved on greenfield would assist delivery of housing – both open market and affordable. Improved delivery of housing would also have benefits for the local economy (EC3).
- The change scores less well in relation to EN2 (Conserving and Enhancing Landscape Quality) in view of the additional Greenfield land needed to accommodate development. In mitigation, the policy would need to be supported by other policies such as CS8.1 and CS8.2, as well as by landscape assessments to ensure this objective is met.
- The change also scores less well in relation to NR3 (to Restore and Protect Land and Soil), reflecting the likely additional development on Greenfield land. In mitigation, this option would need to be supported by other policies in order to meet this objective, including CS6.6.

3.3 IPC3

- Several, mainly negative, impacts would arise from the possible change to reduce the numbers of houses proposed for Ulverston in 2003-2025 and redistributing 'lost' homes to Kendal &/or other Key and Local Service Centres;
- Redistributing a proportion of dwellings to Local Service Centres would mean an overall reduction in access to services and facilities in Key and Principal Service Centres (SP2);
- The change would reduce the provision of housing/affordable housing in Ulverston, although this would be counter-balanced by a greater proportion of affordable housing need being met elsewhere. More affordable housing could be provided overall however, if a proportion is redistributed to Local Service Centres, as a site size threshold of 3+ units applies in LSCs compared to a threshold of 10+ units in Ulverston (SP3)
- The change is likely to have an added negative impact on landscape and the environment in Kendal and the Local Service Centres, although this would be offset in part by the reduced impacts in Ulverston. Significant additional development in Kendal could cause concern, as surplus residential capacity is restricted here.
- The change could exacerbate air quality issues if significant numbers of dwellings were redistributed to Kendal. The possible change could also increase the need to travel to larger

service centres, if significant numbers of dwellings were redistributed to smaller Key and Local Service Centres.

- Reducing the number of new houses in Ulverston would reduce the positive benefits of open market housing on Ulverston's economic regeneration. Additional dwellings in Local Service Centres is not likely to have the same level of benefit as less employment development and economic regeneration is proposed in Local Service Centres.

3.4 IPC5

- Overall the change from local occupancy to sole or main residence reduces the score for policy CS6.3 in relation to sustainability objectives. The change could reduce the sense of well being and affect the strength of local communities, insofar as more local people may have to move further away from their current employment and community to access cheaper housing. (SP5 and SP6).
- The use of local occupancy conditions would meet local housing need better, but on the other hand, sole or main residence conditions may also assist the delivery of more housing (and hence of affordable housing) by increasing the viability of housing schemes (SP3);
- In relation to economic objectives, overall it is considered that the change could increase the possibility of some local people having to move further away from an area, and possibly their employment, to access the housing they need. The sole and main occupancy restriction would not limit access to new homes to people living and working locally. On the other hand, the reduced restrictions could make housing - and hence (local needs) affordable housing – more viable, which would assist some (on lower wages) who need to live and work locally. Employers want to be confident of a secure workforce who can access local affordable accommodation. The local occupancy policy is considered more likely overall to improve housing opportunities for those living and working locally, and hence it is considered that 'sole or main residence' would reduce the policy's ability to retain existing jobs and help create new jobs. (EC1, EC2 and EC3)

3.5 IPC7

- This possible change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet the sustainability appraisal objectives and the scoring remains unchanged. The purpose of the change is to clarify the sequential approach (and the criteria) in selecting the location of a strategic employment site. This does not in itself affect the likelihood of a development taking place, its nature, or the possibility of it being located in a more or less sustainable location.

SA Objectives – Inspectors Changes - Overall scores

* = score has changed as a result of the Inspector’s change
 (36) = previous overall score

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives		IPC1 (CS1.2) Change target of development on PDL from 50% to “at least 28%”	IPC3 (CS1.2) Reduce the numbers of houses proposed for Ulverston in 2003-2025 and redistribute ‘lost’ homes to Kendal &/or other Key and Local Service Centres	IPC5 (CS6.3) Two different options - Alternatives 1 or 2 - to reduce the proposed policy’s requirement for the delivery of houses with LOCs outside Principal & Key Service Centres – for details see attached ANNEX A, Document Ref; ED49	IPC7 (CS7.2) Add new paras 8.1 – 8.9 to Implementation Plan explaining need for sequential approach to identification of Strategic Employment Sites in Kendal & Ulverston and site selection criteria – For details see attached ANNEX C
SP1	Increase Participation in Democratic Process	+2	+2	+2	0
SP2	Improve Access to Services & Facilities, the Countryside and Open Spaces	+2	+2*	+2	0
SP3	Decent Affordable Housing	+4	+4	+4	+2
SP4	Improve Skills, Education, Training	+2	+2	0	+2
SP5	Improve Health & Wellbeing	+2	+2	0*	+2

SP6	Create Vibrant, Active and Inclusive Communities	+4	+4	0*	+2
EN1	Protect and Enhance Biodiversity and Geodiversity	0	0	0	0
EN2	Conserve and Enhance Landscape Quality and Character	0*	+2	0	-2
EN3	Improve the Quality of the Built Environment	+2	+2	0	0
NR1	Improve Local Air Quality, Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Promote Renewable Energy and Reduce the Need to Travel	0	-2*	0	0
NR2	Improve Water Quality and Water Resources	0	0	0	0
NR3	Restore and protect Land & Soil	0*	+2	0	0
NR4	Manage Mineral Resources Sustainably, Minimise Waste and Encourage Recycling	0	0	0	0
EC1	Retain Existing Jobs and Create New Employment Opportunities	+4	+2*	0*	+4
EC2	Improve Training & Access to Jobs	+4	+2*	0*	+4

EC3	Strengthen Local Economy	+4	+2*	0*	+4
TOTALS		<u>30</u> (36)	<u>26</u> (36)	<u>8</u> (18)	<u>18</u> (18)

Main Table

Red = Negative score; consider strengthening objective, to reduce negative effects/increase positive.

Pale green = Low positive score; consider ways to improve positive effects/reduce negative aspects.

Orange = Neutral score, consider ways to make positive

Dark green = High positive score

Table Totals

(original score in brackets; revised score is underlined)

Red = Reduced Total Score

Green = Improved Total Score

Grey = No Change to Total Score

APPENDIX A - Detailed Recording of Appraisal and Scoring of Inspector's Proposed changes to the Core Strategy

Appraisal Recording and Scoring

Key	
Impact	Timeframe
Major Positive +4	Short Term S
Positive +2	Medium Term M
No Impact 0	Long Term L
Negative -2	
Major Negative -4	
Uncertain ?	
Geographic Scale	
	Local L
	District Wide D
	Urban U
	Rural R
Comments and Mitigation: (describe nature of impact; reasons for impact assessment and score; and suggestions for mitigation)	
Inspectors Proposed Changes – IPC1 Policy CS1.2 The Development Strategy Change target of development on PDL from 50% to “at least 28% (CS1.2)”	
SOCIAL PROGRESS	
Sustainability Objective SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	No
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<u>Comments</u> It is accepted that with regards the LDF, the key driver for this will be through the SCI and document consultations rather than planning policies themselves. Under this policy, focusing development in the settlements where most facilities, services and transport opportunities are available should help to facilitate people's involvement in democratic processes. This change in itself is unlikely to further increase the ability of policy CS1.2 to meet this objective.	
<u>Mitigation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring SCI is adhered to in LDF document consultations • Demonstrate that account is being taken of parish plans in Core Strategy preparation • Producing clear consultation reports for LDF documents, showing how consultees' responses have contributed to shaping documents 	

Sustainability Objective SP2: To improve access to services & facilities, the countryside & open spaces

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2 (change from +4)

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 This policy will still focus new development in settlements where access to services, facilities and transport is greatest, taking into account both settlement capacity and local need. It provides the benefits of having basic services available across a range of settlements with centralised main services available in larger settlements meaning that there will be increased opportunities for people to walk to day-to-day services whilst other services will be accessible by sustainable forms of transport.
 Due to the rural nature of the district, residents generally have easy access to the countryside, even for those without their own transport.
 This change may mean that residents of new developments might be slightly more peripheral from the focus of services but they would be closer to the countryside. Other policies will still ensure that Important Open Spaces are protected from development.

Mitigation

- This option will be supported in meeting this objective by other policies including CS8.1, CS8.2, CS8.3, CS8.4, CS9.1 and CS10.1

Sustainability Objective SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+4

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 This policy will still help to ensure that local housing needs are met across the district by focusing development in Principal, Key and Local Service Centres but also allowing development in smaller settlements outside services centres. It will help to address issues of affordability as locally as possible. This change may well help to make the provision of affordable housing more viable and overall, may enable the delivery of more housing, both open market and affordable.

Mitigation

- This policy will be supported by the CS6 policies, which focus on housing
- The concept of decent housing is also determined by high quality, sustainable design; this aspect will be addressed primarily through policies such as CS8.8.
- Policies relating to the provision of higher quality employment opportunities will also support this policy in meeting this objective by helping to reduce the house price: income ratio.

Sustainability Objective SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This policy, by applying a settlement hierarchy and focusing development in service centres but allowing for appropriate levels of development in smaller settlements should still offer increased opportunities for developing skills, education and training through links with new and existing establishments and businesses. The spread of development offered by this option will also help to support existing establishments, for example, small village primary schools, to remain viable by enabling more young families to remain living in villages rather than having to leave to find homes in more affordable locations. This change would have negligible impact on the ability of policy CS2.1 to meet this objective.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy will be supported in meeting this objective through policies such as CS7, CS9.1 and CS9.2 as well as the work of partners 	
Sustainability Objective SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	
Timeframe	M
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>The approach set out in policy CS1.2 will help to ensure that levels of development in particular settlements are appropriate to meet local needs in terms of housing and service/facility provision in accordance with the environmental and infrastructure capacity of the area. Addressing problems relating to housing affordability and access to services and facilities should impact positively on people health and feelings of well-being. This change would support the delivery of housing to meet local need, meaning fewer people living in unsuitable homes. In addition, residents of the new developments could experience improved amenity, although they would perhaps have marginally reduced access to services. The amenity of existing edge-of-settlement residents could also be reduced.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to ensure that any possible negative knock-on effects of this policy on general quality of life are minimised. For example, where new developments bring more traffic to a village, ensuring that this is not going to compromise air quality or prevent children crossing the road to access the local play area. • This option will be supported by other policies, such as those in CS9 as well as by the work of partners. 	

Sustainability Objective SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open-minded communities with a strong sense of local history	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+4
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Whilst this policy does not seek to meet the criteria of SP6 directly, it supports the addressing of the local needs of each settlement and provides the basis for appropriate development to take place in accordance with each settlement's environmental and infrastructure capacity. It will enable local services and facilities such as shops and schools to remain viable and local people to remain living in their home village or town. This change would have limited impact on the ability of CS1.2 to meet this objective. Whilst there would be potential for sense of place to be affected, other policies, such as the policy on design, should ensure that aspects such as sense of place are taken fully into account as part of developments.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option will need to be supported by a number of other policies and initiatives in order to fully meet this objective. These include the area strategies and CS9 policies. 	
EFFECTIVE PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT	
Sustainability Objective EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Whilst this policy does not specifically seek to protect or enhance biodiversity or geodiversity, it does aim to ensure that development is within settlements' environmental capacity. Focusing development primarily in two main settlements and taking the capacity of settlements to take development into full account should help to ensure that the impact of development on biodiversity and geodiversity is minimised, though care will need to be taken to ensure that this is the case. This change would not have a significant impact on the ability of CS1.2 to meet this objective. Agricultural land is often less bio-diverse than brownfield land and other policies will continue to protect sites of biodiversity and geodiversity value.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies, including CS8.1, CS8.5 and CS9.2 and relevant National and International policy and legislation in order to fully meet this objective Core Strategy is clear about the local and wider importance of those species and habitats and geological features that are not fortunate enough to be designated, how they will be protected and to what extent Emphasis to the recognition of settlement character and environmental capacity in determining where development will go 	

Sustainability Objective EN2: To conserve and enhance landscape quality and character	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0 (change from +2)
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> Focusing development primarily in two main settlements and taking the character and environmental capacity of settlements into full account should help to ensure that development has minimal impact on the landscape. However, there are likely to be some negative impacts, as although brownfield land will be prioritised over greenfield, some green field land will be needed to accommodate development. This change has the potential to have a greater negative impact on landscape quality and character as a result of the prospect of more residential development on greenfield sites. This score is reduced accordingly.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as CS8.1 and CS8.2 as well as by landscape assessments in order to ensure this objective is met 	
Sustainability Objective EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	U – primarily in built up settlements
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> Focusing development in main centres whilst allowing development in smaller settlements also is likely to offer the greatest opportunities for improving the built environment whether through complimentary design of new build or through the sympathetic reuse and refurbishment of existing buildings. This change would still enable opportunities for development to improve the built environment to be implemented and the priority remains for brownfield land to be developed in preference to Greenfield. Therefore this change would have no significant effect on the ability of CS1.2 to meet this objective.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as CS6.6, CS7.5, CS8.2 and CS8.8 in order to achieve this objective. Consideration must be made of the potential for improvements to be made to the built environment in smaller service centres and rural settlements as well as in terms of buildings in the wider countryside 	

SUSTAINABLE USE AND MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	
Sustainability Objective NR1: To improve local air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote renewable energy and energy efficiency and reduce need to travel	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D & L
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This option does not, in itself, seek to address the issues considered in NR1, however, applying the settlement hierarchy will concentrate development in settlements, primarily the two PSCs, where services and facilities as well as transport options are most readily accessible. This should reduce people's need to travel. However, this may also attract greater densities of traffic, which could cause further reductions in air quality at existing trouble spots as well as creating new ones. In addition, people living in KSCs, LSCs and rural settlements/areas will always have to travel to PSCs for certain services and facilities. Concentrating development in two PSCs may present more viable opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficiency than more dispersed development might due to greater numbers of larger developments; this is less likely to be the case in KSCs, LSCs and other smaller settlements. This change could increase the need for people to travel by car to some extent, as residents of new developments will be marginally further away from the focus of services. However, the potentially improved viability of developments may increase the likelihood of developer contributions towards sustainable transport and renewable energy.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option will need to be supported by a range of other policies, including CS7.7, CS8.1, CS8.8 and CS10 as well as wider initiatives in order to fully meet this objective 	
Sustainability Objective NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Any development is likely to increase demands on water resources and sewage infrastructure. This policy does aim to ensure that development takes place in accordance with environmental capacity and the capacity of existing infrastructure provision. This change would not have a significant impact on the ability of CS1.2 to meet this objective.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option needs to be supported by other policies in order to meet this objective including CS1.1 and CS8.8 in order to secure the installation of water use efficiency measures in new developments Consider adding recognition of the fact that some settlements may need additional water infrastructure capacity in order to grow 	

Sustainability Objective NR3: To restore and protect land and soil

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	U – primarily in and around PSCs. KSCs and LSCs
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0 (change from +2)

Comments and Mitigation

Comments

This policy seeks to apply a settlement hierarchy meaning that development will take place in accordance with the character and environmental capacity of individual settlements. The policy also prioritises the reuse of existing buildings and brownfield land. However, significant new development will need to take place on greenfield land in South Lakeland due to a lack of brownfield sites. The settlement hierarchy will mean that the impact of this will be most significant around PSCs, KSCs and to a lesser degree, LSCs.

The reduced score reflects the potential for greater negative impact on land and soil due to the prospect of more residential development on Greenfield sites. However priority for development on brownfield land in the Core Strategy would remain; and other policies would continue to seek to protect land and soil.

Mitigation

- This option needs to be supported by other policies in order to meet this objective, including CS6.6
- Imaginative and proactive ways to enable the re-use of existing buildings and brownfield sites should be considered wherever possible

Sustainability Objective NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably, minimise waste and encourage recycling

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0

Comments and Mitigation

Comments

This policy does not specifically seek to meet this objective. However, applying the settlement hierarchy may have the benefit of meaning that the majority of people do not have to travel far to reach recycling and waste disposal facilities/civic amenity sites as these are most readily available in larger villages and towns and also that waste and recycling collection services do not have to cover such great distances in order to collect every household's waste/recyclables. However, new development will increase the amount of waste generated in the district overall and will require minerals/aggregate for construction.

As the priority remains for brownfield land to be developed in preference to Greenfield land, it is considered this change would not have a significant effect on the ability of policy CS1.2 to meet this objective.

Mitigation

- This option will require support from other policies such as CS1.1, CS6.6, CS8.8 and CS8.10 in order to meet this objective. Support from wider initiatives and the work of partners will also be necessary.
- Consider adding more emphasis to recognition of capacity of existing infrastructure provision and possibly list what infrastructure types we mean i.e. could waste be included.

BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY IN WHICH ALL CAN PROSPER	
Sustainability Objective EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+4
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Focusing development in the main centres whilst also allowing appropriate levels of development across the hierarchy supports the retaining of existing jobs by enabling existing businesses to expand and/or relocate. It also helps to create opportunities for new businesses to develop in both larger and smaller settlements. The change would indirectly support policy CS1.2 in meeting this objective as Greenfield sites may offer improved viability and hence assist in the delivery of housing and affordable housing. Improved delivery of housing would help employees and existing businesses to stay in the area and also attract local graduates to return to the area after university.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option will need to be supported by other policies such as those in CS7 in order to fully meet this objective 	
Sustainability Objective EC2: To improve training and access to jobs	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+4
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Focus of development in main towns and appropriate development across the hierarchy should mean that people generally obtain better physical access to jobs by ensuring that homes and employment opportunities are located close to one another and where access to transport options is greatest. However, aspects of practicable access such as overcoming obstacles to getting a job such as securing appropriate childcare and having the right skills cannot be dealt with through this policy.</p> <p>This change may marginally reduce the level of access to jobs for new residents in relation to the level of access they would have had if the development was on a brownfield site as Greenfield developments are likely to be further from the focus of services. However, employment areas are often on the outskirts of towns and thus, this change would not have a significant impact on the ability of policy CS1.2 to meet this objective.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies such those in CS7 and CS10.1 and by the work of partners in order to fully meet this objective 	

Sustainability Objective EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy

Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+4

Comments and Mitigation

Comments

Focusing development in the main centres whilst also allowing appropriate levels of development across the settlement hierarchy supports the diversification and strengthening of the economy by ensuring that there are opportunities for existing businesses to develop and diversify and to attract new businesses to the district, including in rural areas.

The change would indirectly support policy CS1.2 in meeting this objective as Greenfield sites may offer improved viability and hence assist in the delivery of housing and affordable housing. Improved delivery of housing would help employees and existing businesses to stay in the area and also attract local graduates to return to the area after university.

Mitigation

- This option will need to be supported by other policies in CS7 as well as the work of partners in order to meet this objective.

Key		
Impact		Timeframe
Major Positive +4		Short Term S
Positive +2		Medium Term M
No Impact 0		Long Term L
Negative -2		
Major Negative -4		
Uncertain ?		
		Geographic Scale
		Local L
		District Wide D
		Urban U
		Rural R
<u>Comments and Mitigation:</u> (describe nature of impact; reasons for impact assessment and score; and suggestions for mitigation)		
Inspectors Proposed Changes – IPC3 Policy CS3.1 Ulverston & Furness Area		
Reduce the numbers of houses proposed for Ulverston in 2003-2025 and redistribute ‘lost’ homes to Kendal and/or other Key and Local Service Centres (CS1.2)		
SOCIAL PROGRESS		
Sustainability Objective SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes		
Timeframe		L
Geographic Scale		D
Cumulative Impact?		No
Impact Score		+2
Comments and Mitigation		
<u>Comments</u>		
It is accepted that with regards the LDF, the key driver for this will be through the SCI and document consultations rather than planning policies themselves.		
Under this policy, focusing development in the settlements where most facilities, services and transport opportunities are available should help to facilitate people’s involvement in democratic processes.		
This change will not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS3.1 (or CS1.2) to meet this objective.		
<u>Mitigation</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring SCI is adhered to in LDF document consultations • Demonstrate that account is being taken of parish plans in Core Strategy preparation • Producing clear consultation reports for LDF documents, showing how consultees’ responses have contributed to shaping documents 		

Sustainability Objective SP2: To improve access to services & facilities, the countryside & open spaces

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2 (change from +4)

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 This policy will focus new development in settlements where access to services, facilities and transport is greatest, taking into account both settlement capacity and local need. It provides the benefits of having basic services available across a range of settlements with centralised main services available in larger settlements meaning that there will be increased opportunities for people to walk to day-to-day services whilst other services will be accessible by sustainable forms of transport.
 Due to the rural nature of the district, residents generally have easy access to the countryside, even for those without their own transport.
 Assuming that in light of this change, more houses go to Local Service Centres (LSCs) rather than Key Service Centres (KSCs), the positive nature of this score would reduce as a result, as fewer houses would be close to the areas of most services and facilities. Performance would be dependent on where the 'lost' houses went however.

Mitigation

- This option will be supported in meeting this objective by other policies including CS8.1, CS8.2, CS8.3, CS8.4, CS9.1 and CS10.1

Sustainability Objective SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+4

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 This policy will help ensure that local housing needs are met across the district by focusing development in Principal, Key and Local Service Centres but also allowing development in smaller settlements outside services centres. It will help to address issues of affordability as locally as possible.
 Whilst this change would reduce the ability of policy CS3.1 (and CS1.2) to provide housing/affordable housing in Ulverston, this would be counterbalanced by the change meeting a greater proportion of affordable housing need in those areas to which the requirement is redistributed. More affordable housing could however be provided overall, if a proportion is redistributed to Local Service Centres, where a site size threshold of 3+ units applies, rather than the threshold of 10+ units which applies in Ulverston.

Mitigation

- This policy will be supported by the CS6 policies, which focus on housing
- The concept of decent housing is also determined by high quality, sustainable design; this aspect will be addressed primarily through policies such as CS8.8.
- Policies relating to the provision of higher quality employment opportunities will also support this policy in meeting this objective by helping to reduce the house price: income ratio.

Sustainability Objective SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes. Over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This policy, by applying a settlement hierarchy and focusing development in service centres but allowing for appropriate levels of development in smaller settlements should offer increased opportunities for developing skills, education and training through links with new and existing establishments and businesses. The spread of development offered by this option will also help to support existing establishments, for example, small village primary schools, to remain viable by enabling more young families to remain living in villages rather than having to leave to find homes in more affordable locations.</p> <p>This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS3.1 (and CS1.2) to meet this objective.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy will be supported in meeting this objective through policies such as CS7, CS9.1 and CS9.2 as well as the work of partners 	
Sustainability Objective SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	
Timeframe	M
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes. Over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>The approach set out in this policy will help to ensure that levels of development in particular settlements are appropriate to meet local needs in terms of housing and service/facility provision in accordance with the environmental and infrastructure capacity of the area. Addressing problems relating to housing affordability and access to services and facilities should impact positively on people health and feelings of well-being.</p> <p>This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS3.1 (and CS1.2) to meet this objective.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to ensure that any possible negative knock-on effects of this policy on general quality of life are minimised. For example, where new developments bring more traffic to a village, ensuring that this is not going to compromise air quality or prevent children crossing the road to access the local play area. • This option will be supported by other policies, such as those in CS9 as well as by the work of partners. 	

Sustainability Objective SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open-minded communities with a strong sense of local history

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+4

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 Whilst this policy does not seek to meet the criteria of SP6 directly, it supports the addressing of the local needs of each settlement and provides the basis for appropriate development to take place in accordance with each settlement’s environmental and infrastructure capacity. It will enable local services and facilities such as shops and schools to remain viable and local people to remain living in their home village or town. This change would not significantly reduce the extent to which policy CS3.1 meets this objective in Ulverston. There may be some marginal additional benefits in relation to this objective insofar as ‘lost’ houses are reassigned to LSCs (CS1.2).

Mitigation

- This option will need to be supported by a number of other policies and initiatives in order to fully meet this objective. These include the area strategies and CS9 policies.

EFFECTIVE PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Sustainability Objective EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 Whilst this policy does not specifically seek to protect or enhance biodiversity or geodiversity, it does aim to ensure that development is within settlements’ environmental limits. Focusing development primarily in two main settlements and taking the capacity of settlements to take development into full account should help to ensure that the impact of development on biodiversity and geodiversity is minimised, though care will need to be taken to ensure that this is the case. The impact of this change on the ability of CS3.1 (and CS1.2) to meet this objective would depend heavily on the specific development sites involved. No significant impact on the score previously assigned to this policy is anticipated however, as other policies in the Core Strategy remain in place to protect areas of biodiversity and geodiversity importance.

Mitigation

- This policy will need to be supported by other policies, including CS8.1, CS8.5 and CS9.2 and relevant National and International policy and legislation in order to fully meet this objective
- Ensure that the Core Strategy is clear about the local and wider importance of those species and habitats and geological features that are not fortunate enough to be designated, how they will be protected and to what extent
- Consider adding more emphasis to the recognition of settlement character and environmental capacity in determining where development will go.

Sustainability Objective EN2: To conserve and enhance landscape quality and character	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Focusing development primarily in two main settlements and taking the character and environmental capacity of settlements into full account should help to ensure that development has minimal impact on the landscape. However, there are likely to be some negative impacts, as although brownfield land will be prioritised over greenfield, some green field land will be needed to accommodate development. The impact of this change on the ability of CS3.1 (and CS1.2) to meet this objective would depend on the settlements and (later) the sites to which the requirement is redistributed. While it would probably mean some added negative impact on landscape and environment in Kendal and the LSCs, this would be offset in part by the reduced landscape impact in Ulverston. If the change resulted in significant additional development in Kendal, this would cause concern as spare residential capacity is restricted here.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as CS8.1 and CS8.2 as well as by landscape assessments in order to ensure this objective is met 	
Sustainability Objective EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	U – primarily in built up settlements
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Focusing development in main centres whilst allowing development in smaller settlements also is likely to offer the greatest opportunities for improving the built environment whether through complimentary design of new build or through the sympathetic reuse and refurbishment of existing buildings. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS3.1 (and CS1.2) to meet this objective. The houses 'lost from Ulverston would be 'lost' mainly from Greenfield land and the impact on the location to which they redistributed would depend on the settlement and choice of development sites available. This change may result in increased pressure on the built environment in such locations but could also increase opportunities for improvements.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as CS6.6, CS7.5, CS8.2 and CS8.8 in order to achieve this objective. • Consideration must be made of the potential for improvements to be made to the built environment in smaller service centres and rural settlements as well as in terms of buildings in the wider countryside 	

SUSTAINABLE USE AND MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	
Sustainability Objective NR1: To improve local air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote renewable energy and energy efficiency and reduce need to travel	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D & L
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	-2 (change from 0)
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This option does not, in itself, seek to address the issues considered in NR1, however, applying the settlement hierarchy will concentrate development in settlements, primarily the two PSCs, where services and facilities as well as transport options are most readily accessible. This should reduce people's need to travel. However, this may also attract greater densities of traffic, which could cause further reductions in air quality at existing trouble spots as well as creating new ones. In addition, people living in KSCs, LSCs and rural settlements/areas will always have to travel to PSCs for certain services and facilities. Concentrating development in two PSCs may present more viable opportunities for renewable energy and energy efficiency than more dispersed development might due to greater numbers of larger developments; this is less likely to be the case in KSCs, LSCs and other smaller settlements. The possible change could exacerbate air quality issues, if significant numbers of dwellings were redistributed to Kendal. The possible change could also increase the need to travel to larger service centres, if significant numbers of dwellings were to be redistributed to smaller Key and Local service Centres. Either way, this change is likely to result in decreases in air quality.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option will need to be supported by a range of other policies, including CS7.7, CS8.1, CS8.8 and CS10 as well as wider initiatives in order to fully meet this objective 	
Sustainability Objective NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Any development is likely to increase demands on water resources and sewage infrastructure. This policy does aim to ensure that development takes place in accordance with environmental capacity and the capacity of existing infrastructure provision. It is unlikely that the possible change would have a significant impact on policy CS3.1 (and CS1.2) in relation to this objective. Infrastructure providers are confident that the proposed strategy is deliverable, although the precise impact could vary between sites and the issue would need to be looked at in detail in relation to the development sites involved.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option needs to be supported by other policies in order to meet this objective including CS1.1 and CS8.8 in order to secure the installation of water use efficiency measures in new developments Consider adding recognition of the fact that some settlements may need additional water infrastructure capacity in order to grow 	

Sustainability Objective NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	U – primarily in and around PSCs. KSCs and LSCs
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This policy seeks to apply a settlement hierarchy meaning that development will take place in accordance with the character and environmental capacity of individual settlements. The policy also prioritises the reuse of existing buildings and brownfield land. However, significant new development will need to take place on greenfield land in South Lakeland due to a lack of brownfield sites. The settlement hierarchy will mean that the impact of this will be most significant around PSCs, KSCs and to a lesser degree, LSCs.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that this change would result in a significant impact on the ability of CS3.1 (and CS1.2) to support this objective as development of brownfield land would remain the priority. Transferring the 'lost' houses to brownfield land at their new location would be the priority, but if they had to be built on greenfield land, this would still not represent a net loss of green land as the houses lost from Ulverston would be 'lost' from greenfield land, thus reducing the greenfield land take-up there.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option needs to be supported by other policies in order to meet this objective, including CS6.6 • Imaginative ways of enabling the use of existing buildings and brownfield sites should be considered wherever possible – consider drawing up a list of empty buildings and brownfield sites to raise awareness of them and ensure that priority can be given to these. • Consider requiring developer contributions (CS9.2) to help remediate or make readily available otherwise difficult to develop sites or to improve the quality of land and soil elsewhere 	
Sustainability Objective NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably, minimise waste and encourage recycling	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This policy does not specifically seek to meet this objective. However, applying the settlement hierarchy may have the benefit of meaning that the majority of people do not have to travel far to reach recycling and waste disposal facilities/civic amenity sites as these are most readily available in larger villages and towns and also that waste and recycling collection services do not have to cover such great distances in order to collect every household's waste/recyclables. However, new development will increase the amount of waste generated in the district overall and will require minerals/aggregate for construction.</p> <p>This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS3.1 (and CS1.2) to meet this objective.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option will require support from other policies such as CS1.1, CS6.6, CS8.8 and CS8.10 in order to meet this objective. Support from wider initiatives and the work of partners will also be necessary. • Consider adding more emphasis to recognition of capacity of existing infrastructure provision and possibly list what infrastructure types we mean i.e could waste be included. 	

BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY IN WHICH ALL CAN PROSPER	
Sustainability Objective EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2 (change from +4)
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Focusing development in the main centres whilst also allowing appropriate levels of development across the hierarchy supports the retaining of existing jobs by enabling existing businesses to expand and/or relocate. It also helps to create opportunities for new businesses to develop in both larger and smaller settlements.</p> <p>The possible change would reduce the number of new houses in Ulverston also reduce the positive impact of more (open market) housing on Ulverston's economic regeneration. Additional houses in Local Service Centres is less likely to have the same level of impact in the LSCs as less employment development and economic regeneration is proposed in LSCs.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option will need to be supported by other policies such as those in CS7 in order to fully meet this objective 	
Sustainability Objective EC2: To improve training and access to jobs	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2 (change from +4)
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Focus of development in main towns and appropriate development across the hierarchy should mean that people generally obtain better physical access to jobs by ensuring that homes and employment opportunities are located close to one another and where access to transport options is greatest. However, aspects of practicable access such as overcoming obstacles to getting a job such as securing appropriate childcare and having the right skills cannot be dealt with through this policy.</p> <p>If the proposed change were to result in more houses going to LSCs rather than KSCs, the positive score would reduce as fewer dwellings would be located near to the main areas of employment in KSCs.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies such those in CS7 and CS10.1 and by the work of partners in order to fully meet this objective 	

Sustainability Objective EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy

Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2 (change from +4)

Comments and MitigationComments

Focusing development in the main centres whilst also allowing appropriate levels of development across the settlement hierarchy supports the diversification and strengthening of the economy by ensuring that there are opportunities for existing businesses to develop and diversify and to attract new businesses to the district, including in rural areas.

The possible change would reduce the number of new houses in Ulverston also reduce the positive impact of more (open market) housing on Ulverston's economic regeneration. Additional houses in Local Service Centres is less likely to have the same level of impact in the LSCs as less employment development and economic regeneration is proposed in LSCs.

Mitigation

- This option will need to be supported by other policies in CS7 as well as the work of partners in order to meet this objective.

Key		
Impact		Timeframe
Major Positive +4		Short Term S
Positive +2		Medium Term M
No Impact 0		Long Term L
Negative -2		
Major Negative -4		
Uncertain ?		
		Geographic Scale
		Local L
		District Wide D
		Urban U
		Rural R
<u>Comments and Mitigation:</u> (describe nature of impact; reasons for impact assessment and score; and suggestions for mitigation)		
Inspectors Proposed Changes – IPC5		
Policy CS6.3 Provision of affordable housing/local occupancy housing		
Two different options - Alternatives 1 or 2 - to reduce the proposed policy's requirement for the delivery of houses with local occupancy conditions (LOCs) outside Principal & Key Service Centres – for details see attached ANNEX A, Document Ref ED49		
SOCIAL PROGRESS		
<u>Sustainability Objective SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes</u>		
Timeframe	L	
Geographic Scale	D	
Cumulative Impact?	No	
Impact Score	+2	
Comments and Mitigation		
<u>Comments</u>		
It is accepted that with regards the LDF, the key driver for this objective will be through the SCI and document consultations rather than planning policies themselves. Under this policy, helping to ensure that people can afford homes that meet their needs and ensuring that local people have access to local housing should help to facilitate people's involvement in democratic processes. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS6.3 to meet this objective.		
<u>Mitigation</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring SCI is adhered to in LDF document consultations • Demonstrate that account is being taken of parish plans in Core Strategy preparation • Producing clear consultation reports for LDF documents, showing how consultees' responses have contributed to shaping documents 		

Sustainability Objective SP2: To improve access to services & facilities, the countryside & open spaces	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This policy will help to ensure that people can afford homes that meet their needs and ensuring that local people have access to local housing in locations where their service and facility needs are met. This possible change could impact on access to services and facilities, by changing the level of need for and support for certain services in certain communities. A move from 'local occupancy' to 'sole or main residence' could increase the proportion of (capital-rich) retirees in some communities, compared to those economically active who are living and working locally. A 'sole or main residence' restriction would still ensure that homes do not become second homes, meaning that overall, the level of support for (and therefore access to) services could increase. The possible change could also increase the viability of housing development and thus improve access to services by helping deliver more housing and affordable housing. As the change could affect some services positively and others negatively, it is not possible to determine an overall balance of impact.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option will be supported in meeting this objective by other policies including CS8.1, CS8.2, CS8.3, CS8.4, CS9.1 and CS10.1 	
Sustainability Objective SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time as cumulative total of development increases
Impact Score	+4
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This policy will help to ensure that people can afford homes that meet their needs, that local people have access to local housing and that people will not have to move away from their home town or village in order to secure a suitable home. Local occupancy would arguably meet local need better than the sole or main residence restrictions, as sole or main occupancy restrictions would not prevent incomers outbidding locals. However the reduced restriction may improve scheme viability and thus deliver housing - and hence also a proportion of local need affordable housing - more quickly. Overall it is considered the possible change would not have a significant adverse effect on the positive score.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option will be supported in meeting this objective by other CS6 policies The concept of decent housing is also determined by high quality, sustainable design; this aspect will be addressed primarily through policies such as CS8.8. Policies relating to the provision of higher quality employment opportunities will also support this policy in meeting this objective by helping to reduce the house price: income ratio. 	

Sustainability Objective SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes. Over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Whilst it is difficult to establish a direct link between this policy and this objective, ensuring that people can afford homes that meet their needs locally should mean that people will be more easily able to stay living in their home communities rather than having to leave to find homes in more affordable locations. This in turn should help particularly smaller, rural educational facilities including schools and community centres to remain viable.</p> <p>This change may reduce the ability of local people to stay living in the area, particularly the young and families, meaning that local educational establishments may be less well supported. This would depend however on the type of people that moved into the new houses in the absence of a local occupancy restriction. If any incomers were also young families, then locals schools etc would be supported, but if they were retirees, this would not be the case. Incomers may also bring new skills to the area however.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy will be supported in meeting this objective through policies such as CS7, CS9.1 and CS9.2 as well as the work of partners 	
Sustainability Objective SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes. Over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0 (change from +2)
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>The approach set out in this policy will help to ensure that people can afford homes that meet their needs and that local people have access to local housing. Addressing problems relating to housing, such as ensuring that people can afford homes that meet their needs and that local people have access to local housing, should improve people's health and feelings of well-being for example, in that living in unsuitable accommodation can have a negative impact on both physical and mental health and being forced to move away from family or your home village/town due to a lack of housing they can afford can be upsetting and distressing for those involved.</p> <p>This change could reduce the sense of well-being insofar as more local people could have to move further away from their current employment and community to access cheaper housing.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option will be supported by other policies, such as those in CS9 as well as by the work of partners. 	

Sustainability Objective SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open-minded communities with a strong sense of local history

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes. Over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0 (change from +2)

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 This policy will help to enable local people to remain living in their home village or town by providing affordable and local occupancy housing based on each settlement’s particular needs and thus will help local services and facilities such as shops and schools to remain viable. It will also help to ensure that communities retain and develop vibrancy, inclusivity and open-mindedness by reducing the likelihood of certain groups such as young adults and families being excluded from areas due to issues around housing affordability. Indirectly, this policy could also help to retain a strong sense of local history as people who might have lived in a community for a long time and that might have otherwise had to move away due to a lack of appropriate housing, will have the choice to stay. The possible change could mean that CS6.3 offers less assurance of the above benefits, if the sole or main occupancy restriction means that some local people cannot find accommodation locally and have to move to access cheaper accommodation.

Mitigation

- This option will need to be supported by a number of other policies and initiatives in order to fully meet this objective. These include the area strategies and CS9 policies.

EFFECTIVE PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Sustainability Objective EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time as cumulative total of development increases
Impact Score	0

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 This policy does not specifically seek to protect or enhance biodiversity or geodiversity, and care will need to be taken to ensure that the provision of housing does not compromise the District’s wealth of biodiversity and geodiversity. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS6.3 to meet this objective.

Mitigation

- This policy will need to be supported by other policies, including CS8.1, CS8.5 and CS9.2 in order to fully meet this objective
- Ensure that the Core Strategy is clear about the local and wider importance of those species and habitats and geological features that are not fortunate enough to be designated, how they will be protected and to what extent
- Consider adding cross-reference to CS1.1 and CS1.2

Sustainability Objective EN2: To conserve and enhance landscape quality and character	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time as cumulative total of development increases
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> This policy does not specifically seek to conserve or enhance landscape quality or character, and care will need to be taken to ensure that the provision of housing does not compromise the District's high quality landscapes. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS6.3 to meet this objective.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as CS8.1 and CS8.2 as well as by landscape assessments in order to ensure this objective is met 	
Sustainability Objective EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	
Timeframe	M
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as cumulative total of development increases
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> Development of affordable and local occupancy housing may present some opportunities for improving the built environment. However, there is also potential for innovative design opportunities to be restricted by costs to the developer when building affordable housing and this may reduce the opportunities to support the character of the existing built environment. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS6.3 to meet this objective.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as CS6.6, CS7.5, CS8.2 and CS8.8 in order to achieve this objective. 	
SUSTAINABLE USE AND MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	
Sustainability Objective NR1: To improve local air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote renewable energy and energy efficiency and reduce need to travel	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D & L
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as cumulative total of development increases
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> This policy does not specifically seek to improve local air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote renewable energy and energy efficiency and reduce need to travel, and care will need to be taken to ensure that the provision of affordable and local occupancy housing does not compromise but supports the District's efforts to meet this objective. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS6.3 to meet this objective.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option will need to be supported by a range of other policies, including CS7.7, CS8.1, CS8.8 and CS10 as well as wider initiatives in order to fully meet this objective Consider adding cross-reference to CS1.1 and CS1.2 	

Sustainability Objective NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> This policy does not specifically seek to improve water quality and water resources, and care will need to be taken to ensure that the provision of affordable and local occupancy housing does not compromise and supports the District's efforts to meet this objective. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS6.3 to meet this objective.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option needs to be supported by other policies in order to meet this objective including CS1.1 and CS8.8 in order to secure the installation of water use efficiency measures in new development • Consider adding cross-reference to CS1.1 and CS1.2 	
Sustainability Objective NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	U – primarily in and around PSCs. KSCs and LSCs
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> This policy does not specifically seek to restore or protect land and soil, and care will need to be taken to ensure that the provision of affordable and local occupancy housing does not compromise and supports the District's efforts to meet this objective. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS6.3 to meet this objective.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option needs to be supported by other policies in order to meet this objective, including CS6.6 • Consider adding cross-reference to CS1.1 and CS1.2. 	
Sustainability Objective NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably, minimise waste and encourage recycling	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> This policy does not specifically seek to manage mineral resources sustainably, minimise waste and encourage recycling and care will need to be taken to ensure that the provision of affordable and local occupancy housing does not compromise and supports the District's efforts to meet this objective. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS6.3 to meet this objective.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option will require support from other policies such as CS1.1, CS6.6, CS8.8 and CS8.10 in order to meet this objective. Support from wider initiatives and the work of partners will also be necessary. • Consider adding cross-reference to CS1.1 and CS1.2 	

BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY IN WHICH ALL CAN PROSPER	
Sustainability Objective EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0 (change from +2)
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Development of affordable and local occupancy housing will help to support existing jobs by helping to ensure that local workers can access and afford the right type of accommodation locally to enable them to stay in the area and that those who have left the area to undertake higher education can access and afford the right type of accommodation locally to enable them to return and thus, raise local employers confidence in maintaining their workforce into the future. This policy will help to create new employment opportunities in the construction industry.</p> <p>This change could increase the possibility of some local people having to move further away from an area, and possibly their employment, to access the housing they need. The sole and main occupancy restriction would not limit access to new homes to people living and working locally. On the other hand, the reduced restrictions could make housing - and hence (local needs) affordable housing – more viable, which would assist some (on lower wages) who need to live and work locally.</p> <p>Employers want to be confident of a secure workforce who can access local affordable accommodation. The local occupancy policy is considered more likely overall to improve housing opportunities for those living and working locally, and hence it is considered that 'sole or main residence' would reduce the policy's ability to retain existing jobs and help create new jobs.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as those in CS7 as well as other initiatives and the work of partners in order to fully meet this objective. 	
Sustainability Objective EC2: To improve training and access to jobs	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0 (change from +2)
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Development of affordable and local occupancy housing should help to improve access to jobs by helping to ensure that local workers can afford accommodation in the area and enable them to stay living close to their work.</p> <p>The possible change would impact negatively on the viability of rural businesses, insofar as it makes it less easy for people living and working locally to access new housing and may require them to live further away from existing jobs and training.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as those in CS7, CS9.1 and CS10.1 as well as other initiatives and the work of partners in order to fully meet this objective. 	

Sustainability Objective EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy

Timeframe	M
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, over time and in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0 (change from +2)

Comments and MitigationComments

Development of affordable and local occupancy housing will help to diversify and strengthen the local economy by helping to ensure that local workers can access and afford the right type of accommodation locally to enable them to stay living and working in the area, providing security in the workforce for employers and that those who have left the area to undertake higher education can access and afford the right type of accommodation locally to enable them to return and apply their skills whether in existing businesses or by initiating business-start ups.

This change could increase the possibility of some local people having to move further away from an area, and possibly their employment, to access the housing they need. The sole and main occupancy restriction would not limit access to new homes to people living and working locally. On the other hand, the reduced restrictions could make housing - and hence (local needs) affordable housing – more viable, which would assist some (on lower wages) who need to live and work locally.

Employers want to be confident of a secure workforce who can access local affordable accommodation. The local occupancy policy is considered more likely overall to improve housing opportunities for those living and working locally, and hence it is considered that 'sole or main residence' would reduce the policy's ability to retain existing jobs and help create new jobs.

Mitigation

- This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as those in CS7 as well as the work of partners and wider initiatives in order to meet this objective

Key		
Impact		Timeframe
Major Positive +4		Short Term S
Positive +2		Medium Term M
No Impact 0		Long Term L
Negative -2		
Major Negative -4		
Uncertain ?		
		Geographic Scale
		Local L
		District Wide D
		Urban U
		Rural R
<u>Comments and Mitigation:</u> (describe nature of impact; reasons for impact assessment and score; and suggestions for mitigation)		
Inspectors Proposed Changes – IPC7 CS7.2 & Monitoring & Implementation Framework Employment Land & Sectoral Split		
Add new paras 8.1 – 8.9 to Implementation Plan explaining need for sequential approach to identification of Strategic Employment Sites in Kendal & Ulverston and site selection criteria – for details see attached ANNEX C (CS7.2)		
SOCIAL PROGRESS		
Sustainability Objective SP1: To increase the level of participation in democratic processes		
Timeframe	L	
Geographic Scale	D	
Cumulative Impact?	No	
Impact Score	0	
Comments and Mitigation		
<u>Comments</u>		
It is accepted that with regards the LDF, the key driver for this objective will be through the SCI and document consultations rather than planning policies themselves.		
This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective.		
<u>Mitigation</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring SCI is adhered to in LDF document consultations • Demonstrate that account is being taken of parish plans in Core Strategy preparation • Producing clear consultation reports for LDF documents, showing how consultees' responses have contributed to shaping documents 		

Sustainability Objective SP2: To improve access to services & facilities, the countryside & open spaces

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 This policy does not, in itself, seek to improve access to services & facilities, the countryside & open spaces. However, it may have indirect effects as a stronger economy may give more people (e.g. by improved incomes or through providing a wider choice of jobs to better suit different lifestyles/needs) access to certain facilities, the countryside and open spaces.
 This change would not result in a change to the score for CS7.2 as people generally access services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces from home rather than work. There may be some minor impact due to potentially reduced opportunities to walk or cycle to work if the strategic site, as a result of the sequential approach, had been located away from the Principal Service Centres. However, the proposed criteria for selecting the location of a strategic employment sites seek to address this and other issues.

Mitigation

- This policy will be supported in meeting this objective by other policies including CS8.1, CS8.2, CS8.3, CS8.4, CS9.1 and CS10.1

Sustainability Objective SP3: To provide everyone with a decent home

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 This policy will assist in providing everyone with a decent home by helping to ensure the availability of a range of employment opportunities, including high quality B1 employment, which in turn should help to increase the average income and thus improve the affordability of homes meaning that more people will be able to afford homes that are suited to their needs. It should be borne in mind that retaining people in the area who might otherwise have left due to a lack of suitable employment opportunities or by attracting people to the area with new, jobs could actually further increase the need for housing.
 This change would not have a significant effect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective as the same employment benefits (supporting the aim to raise average incomes and thus affordability of housing) will be achieved - only the location may potentially be different.

Mitigation

- This policy will be supported in meeting this objective by CS6 policies
- The concept of decent housing is also determined by high quality, sustainable design; this aspect will be addressed primarily through policies such as CS8.8.
- Other CS7 policies relating to the provision of higher quality employment opportunities will support this policy in meeting this objective by helping to reduce the house price : income ratio.

Sustainability Objective SP4: To improve the level of skills, education and training	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This policy should help to raise the level of skills, education and training by attracting new employers to the area that could provide training schemes and develop links with local educational establishments. The increased availability of skilled jobs in the area might encourage people to undertake training in order to qualify for such jobs, in addition, local people who left the area to gain higher education qualifications might be more able to return and apply their skills locally rather than staying away to find skilled work.</p> <p>This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective. The same benefits as detailed above will still apply; only the location could be potentially different.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will be supported in meeting this objective through policies such as other CS7 policies, CS9.1 and CS9.2 as well as the work of partners 	
Sustainability Objective SP5: To improve the health and sense of well-being of people	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>Whilst this policy does not seek to improve health or wellbeing in itself, the provision of land for new, higher quality employment opportunities should help to improve people's health and sense of wellbeing by increasing average incomes and thus reducing the house price : income ratio. A wider choice of jobs and increased number of skilled jobs should also enable people to find work that suits their circumstances and qualifications, helping them to achieve a better work/life balance. Although unemployment in South Lakeland is low, it may also provide opportunities for those who are unemployed, increasing self-esteem and reducing inequalities based on income.</p> <p>The possible change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective. The same benefits as detailed above will still apply.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will be supported by other policies, such as those in CS9 as well as by the work of partners. 	

Sustainability Objective SP6: To create vibrant, active, inclusive and open-minded communities with a strong sense of local history

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	+2

Comments and Mitigation

Comments

The key benefits of this policy to this objective relate to money. The provision of land to provide new jobs will have indirect benefits to community vibrancy, activity and inclusivity in that average incomes should be raised. People with greater disposable income often have greater opportunities to play an active role in community/cultural events than those with lower incomes. This change would not result in a change to the score for CS7.2 as people generally access services, facilities, the countryside and open spaces from home rather than work.

Mitigation

- This policy will need to be supported by a number of other policies and initiatives in order to fully meet this objective. These include the area strategies and CS9 policies.

EFFECTIVE PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Sustainability Objective EN1: To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity

Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as the take up of land for employment increases
Impact Score	0

Comments and Mitigation

Comments

Significant development is required to meet the employment needs of the district and there is therefore potential for employment development to have significant negative impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the take up of land for employment development does not compromise the District's wealth of biodiversity and geodiversity. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective.

Mitigation

- This policy will need to be supported by other policies, including CS8.1, CS8.5 and CS9.2 in order to fully meet this objective
- Ensure that the Core Strategy is clear about the local and wider importance of those species and habitats and geological features that are not fortunate enough to be designated, how they will be protected and to what extent
- Consider adding cross-reference to CS1.1 and CS1.2

Sustainability Objective EN2: To conserve and enhance landscape quality and character	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as the take up of land for employment increases
Impact Score	-2
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> Significant development is required to meet the employment needs of the district and due to the lack of land within towns, much development will need to take place on the edge of towns on greenfield sites. There is therefore potential for the take up of land for employment development to have significant negative impacts on the quality and character of the landscape. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the take up of land for employment development does not compromise the District's high quality landscapes. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as CS8.1 and CS8.2 as well as by landscape assessments in order to ensure this objective is met 	
Sustainability Objective EN3: To improve the quality of the built environment	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D-U
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as the take up of land for employment increases
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> Significant development is required to meet the employment needs of the district and as such there is potential for employment development to have a negative effect on the built environment, particularly as this type of development is often significant in size and can consist of particular types of buildings. However, the bulk of these developments are likely to be in predominantly commercial areas/industrial estates where all development is of comparable architectural style and thus the negative effects should be limited. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as CS7.5, CS8.2 and CS8.8 in order to achieve this objective. 	

SUSTAINABLE USE AND MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	
Sustainability Objective NR1: To improve local air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote renewable energy and energy efficiency and reduce need to travel	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This policy does not specifically seek to improve local air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote renewable energy and energy efficiency and reduce need to travel, however, the development of employment sites, particularly for high quality B1 uses, should present opportunities to make use of renewable technologies and energy efficiency measures. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the development of employment sites does not compromise but supports the District's efforts to meet this objective.</p> <p>This location of a strategic employment site some distance from a Principal Service Centres could reduce opportunities to walk or cycle to work and increased car travel. This in turn could result in reduced air quality However the possible change simply clarifies the sequential approach to determining the location of a strategic employment site and does not itself increase the likelihood of such a location being required.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy will need to be supported by a range of other policies, including CS7.7, CS8.1, CS8.8 and CS10 as well as wider initiatives in order to fully meet this objective • Consider adding cross-reference to CS1.1 and CS1.2 	
Sustainability Objective NR2: To improve water quality and water resources	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as the take up of land for employment increases
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u></p> <p>This policy does not specifically seek to improve water quality and water resources. New employment development is highly likely to increase demands on water resources and sewage infrastructure. Construction techniques, location and the use-type proposed are also factors in the level of impact new employment development will have on local water quality and resources. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the development of employment sites does not compromise and supports the District's efforts to meet this objective.</p> <p>This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective. There is a chance that the site could be more remote from water infrastructure but this would depend on the individual site location.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy needs to be supported by other policies in order to meet this objective including CS1.1 and CS8.8 in order to secure the installation of water use efficiency measures in new development • Consider adding cross-reference to CS1.1 and CS1.2 	

Sustainability Objective NR3: To restore and protect land and soil	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as the take up of land for employment increases
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> This policy does not specifically seek to restore or protect land and soil. Significant land take up is required to meet the employment needs of the district and due to the lack of available land within towns, much development will need to take place on the edge of towns, thus, there is potential for damage to be caused to land and soil. However, there may also some opportunities to help restore damaged / remediate contaminated land. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the development of employment sites does not compromise but supports the District's efforts to meet this objective. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective as the net uptake of land would be the same, only the location would be different.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy needs to be supported by other policies in order to meet this objective • Consider adding cross-reference to CS1.1 and CS1.2. 	
Sustainability Objective NR4: To manage mineral resources sustainably, minimise waste and encourage recycling	
Timeframe	L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as the take up of land for employment increases
Impact Score	0
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> This policy does not specifically seek to manage mineral resources sustainably, minimise waste and encourage recycling. New employment development will increase the amount of commercial waste generated in the district overall and will also require minerals/aggregate for construction. Greater numbers of employment areas/sites will also require increased infrastructure to collect and deal with the waste. Recycling collections for commercial properties are only currently available through private companies, not the Council. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the development of employment sites does not compromise but supports the District's efforts to meet this objective. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy will require support from other policies such as CS1.1, CS8.8 and CS8.10 in order to meet this objective. Support from wider initiatives and the work of partners will also be necessary. • Consider adding cross-reference to CS1.1 and CS1.2 	

BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY IN WHICH ALL CAN PROSPER

Sustainability Objective EC1: To retain existing jobs and create new employment opportunities

Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as the total number of sites developed increases
Impact Score	+4

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 This policy will help to retain existing jobs by providing sites for existing businesses to expand/relocate to if needed as well as encouraging new businesses and thus new employment opportunities to the area by providing a range of sites for employment development, including higher quality B1 uses. The possible change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective, as it simply clarifies the sequential approach to the selection of a location for a strategic employment site.

Mitigation

- This policy will need to be supported by other policies in CS7 as well as other initiatives and the work of partners in order to fully meet this objective

Sustainability Objective EC2: To improve access to jobs

Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as the total number of sites developed increases
Impact Score	+4

Comments and Mitigation

Comments
 This policy will help to improve access to jobs by helping to ensure that there is a range of different employment opportunities across the District to meet different people’s skills and the needs of different people’s circumstances. Practicable aspects of access to jobs will need to be addressed through other policies and initiatives. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective. It would still increase access by increasing the number of jobs available but whether physical access would also be improved would depend on the site location. However, the sequential criteria seek to address the issues around this.

Mitigation

- This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as others in CS7, CS9.1 and CS10.1 as well as other initiatives and the work of partners in order to fully meet this objective.

Sustainability Objective EC3: To diversify and strengthen the local economy	
Timeframe	M-L
Geographic Scale	D
Cumulative Impact?	Yes, in conjunction with other policies and as the total number of sites developed increases
Impact Score	+4
Comments and Mitigation	
<p><u>Comments</u> This policy seeks to provide land for new employment development, providing for a wider choice and higher quality of jobs across the District, whilst enabling existing businesses to expand and diversify and attracting new businesses, including local start-ups as well as those relocating from elsewhere/adding additional branches. This change would not have a significant affect on the ability of policy CS7.2 to meet this objective as it aims to clarify the sequential approach and criteria to be applied in selection of a location for a strategic employment site.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy will need to be supported by other policies such as others in CS7 as well as the work of partners and wider initiatives in order to meet this objective 	