

*Local Development Framework*  
**Draft Final Sustainability Report: Core Strategy 2007**

*November 2007*

**Huntingdonshire**  
district council

**Steve Ingram BA(Hons), BTP, DMS, MRTPI**  
*Head of Planning Services*

Further copies of this document can be obtained from:

Planning Division,  
Operational Services Directorate,  
Huntingdonshire District Council,  
Centenary House  
St Mary's Street,  
Huntingdon,  
PE29 3PR.

Telephone: 01480 388421 / 388432/ 388433

e-mail: [LDF@huntsdc.gov.uk](mailto:LDF@huntsdc.gov.uk)

# CONTENTS

1.	Summary of outcomes - Non technical summary	1
2.	Methodology	9
3.	Sustainability Objectives, Baseline and Context	19
4.	Plan Issues and Options	34
5.	Implementation	48
6.	Conclusions	49

## List of tables

1.	Stages involved in the SA of a DPD	11
2.	Issues and Options Consultees	12
3.	Relevant Plans and Programmes	19
4.	Sustainability Issues in Huntingdonshire	24
5.	Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	31
6.	How the ISA influenced Preferred Options	38
7.	Main social, economic and environmental effects of draft policies	44

## Appendices

1	SA Framework	50
2	Detailed assessments of draft policies	53
3	Indicators and baseline data	90
4	Assessments of reasonable alternatives	96
5	Assessments of further options for strategic growth	109
6	Performance indicators and targets to be included in monitoring framework	118

## **1. Summary and Outcomes**

### **Non technical summary**

- 1.1 This report documents the processes of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the Huntingdonshire Core Strategy 2007 Preferred Options report as required by planning legislation<sup>1</sup> and Government guidance (Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents, ODPM 2005 hereafter referred to as SA guidance). SA and SEA assist the Council through helping to integrate sustainability considerations into the Core Strategy. The purpose of the Core Strategy is to set out the long term spatial vision for Huntingdonshire and the strategic policies to deliver that vision.

### **Purpose of Sustainability Appraisal**

- 1.2 Huntingdonshire District Council's Core Strategy 2007 Preferred Options Report forms the lead document in the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework (LDF). The Council is required, by law, to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of local development documents which comprise the LDF. SA guidance recommends that the two requirements are met through one process. This SA incorporates both the SA and SEA requirements, and throughout the document these two processes will be referred to as 'Sustainability Appraisal' (SA). Its overarching aim is to achieve sustainable development.
- 1.3 The most widely used definition of this concept is "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs<sup>2</sup>."
- 1.4 The purpose of the SA was to assist Huntingdonshire District Council's Development Plan Team prepare its Core Strategy 2007 Preferred Options for consultation by carrying out the following:
- Identifying the key sustainability issues facing the District
  - Assessing the likely effects on the Preferred Options on these issues
  - Putting forward recommendations that might mitigate against these effects
- 1.5 The SA aims to ensure that the Preferred Options report has as many positive effects as possible, and that negative effects are avoided.

1. Sections 18 & 19 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004  
2. World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987

**How was the SA carried out?**

- 1.6 The draft Final SA was undertaken in house by members of the Development Plans Team.
- 1.7 SA guidance sets out the various stages and tasks involved in completing the SA process. To date, three main phases have been carried out by Huntingdonshire District Council including:
- Scoping Report for SA (Stages A1-A4)
  - Initial SA of Issues and Options paper
  - Initial SA *Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire* (hereafter both Initial SAs will be referred to jointly as ISA)
  - SA of Core Strategy Preferred Options Report
- 1.8 The Council, in partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council and Scot Wilson Ltd produced a Scoping Report in 2005. This Scoping Report has recently been up-dated and revised to be in accordance with SA guidance. The Scoping Report sets out the following:
- Stage A1: Review of plans, policies and programmes**
- 1.9 Relevant international, national, regional and local documents were identified within this review, with the regional and local documents reviewed in more detail in terms of identifying key objectives or strategies. This review led to the development of key themes for which baseline data (Stage A2) was required.
- Stage A2: Baseline data**
- 1.10 Data was collated according to the themes identified in A1. This led to an understanding of key issues (Stage A3).
- Stage A3: Key issues**
- 1.11 A description of the key issues in the District was given with consideration of how the LDF could address the issues. Indicators from the A2 baseline data were identified which were considered appropriate to measure sustainability of the LDF.
- Stage A4: SA objectives**
- 1.12 From the key issues, SA objectives were developed which provide the main tool for assessing the Preferred Options Report.
- 1.13 The Initial SA of the Core Strategy Issues and Options paper used the SA Framework set out in the Scoping Report 2005. It suggested a series of mitigation measures for policy areas where needed in order to mitigate or limit the anticipated affects of particular emerging policies. These mitigation measures or recommendations (for example preferred options or revisions/additions to the wording of objectives and policies) have been incorporated into the Preferred Options Report.
- 1.14 The revised Scoping Report (2007) sets out a SA Framework based on that in the 2005 Report however, minor modifications have been made to reduce the number of SA

Objectives and simplify the process. The revised SA Framework has been used in the Initial SA of *Towards a Spatial Strategy* and this draft Final SA. Table 1 presents the SA Objectives and Appendix 1 sets out the SA Framework.

### **Key sustainability issues facing the District**

- 1.14 The key sustainability issues identified in section 4 of the Scoping Report (2007). The following section summarises these issues:

#### **Land, water and resources**

- Growth pressures on Greenfield land
- Strain placed on water supply by additional development

#### **Biodiversity**

- The impact of new development on biodiversity

#### **Landscape, townscape and archaeology**

- New development needs to maintain and enhance the District's historic and architectural heritage

#### **Climate change and pollution**

- High risk of flooding in some areas
- Pattern of development has encouraged car usage leading to pollution being a problem in some areas
- Development will place increased demand on existing landfill sites and household waste processing centres
- Development will increase the demand on energy from non renewable energy sources

#### **Healthy communities**

- Need to reduce health inequalities across the District
- Pressure put on existing open space by new development

#### **Inclusive communities**

- High average house prices are pricing key workers/first time buyers out of the area
- Limited access to services and facilities in some rural areas

**Economic activity**

- High incidence of out commuting

**SA Objectives**

1.15 At stage A4 of the Scoping process, SA objectives were developed which will be used to assess all local development documents. The SA Objectives are:

<b>Sustainability Topic</b>	<b>SA Objective</b>
Land, water and resources	1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value
	2. Minimise the use of water
Biodiversity	3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity & green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity & green infrastructure
Landscape, townscape and archaeology	4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character
	5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods
Climate change and pollution	6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change
	7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (for example air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)
	8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling
	9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways)
	10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies
Healthy communities	11. Encourage healthy lifestyles
	12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife
	13. Reduce and prevent crime, anti-social behaviour

	and the fear of crime
Inclusive communities	14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of local services and facilities including education, health, training and leisure opportunities
	15. Redress inequalities related to gender, age, disability, race, faith, sexuality, location and income
	16. Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing
Economic activity	17. Improve access to satisfying work, appropriate to skills, potential and place of residence
	18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy

### **Plan Objectives and Outline of Contents**

- 1.16 The Core Strategy DPD will set the framework for how Huntingdonshire will develop up to 2026. The Core Strategy DPD will contain strategic policies to manage growth and guide new development. It will also help provide a framework for developing appropriate indicators and targets for monitoring purposes.
- 1.17 The Preferred Options Report sets out the Council's Preferred Options and policies; it is the culmination of continuous stakeholder engagement. The Preferred Options Report has been set out in two volumes – volume one takes the form of a draft plan with policies and their reasoned justification and volume two records the development of policies, including results from public participation and conclusions drawn from the Initial SAs. This second volume comprises the audit trail of plan development.
- 1.18 The Initial SA of the Issues and Options paper informed preparation of Preferred Options. Refinement of the Preferred Options report has also had regard to the Initial SA of *Towards a Spatial Strategy*. This additional consultation document formed part of Regulation 25 pre-submission consultation<sup>3</sup> and was produced in light of responses to the Issues and Options paper. It set out a revised spatial vision, objectives and options for strategic growth as well as an option for Gypsies and Travellers.
- 1.19 This draft Final SA report documents the appraisal of the Preferred Options and will inform the development of the Core Strategy DPD as it moves towards Submission (Regulation 28) stage<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>3</sup>The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

<sup>4</sup>The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004



**How the process of SA influenced the Core Strategy Preferred Options**

- 1.20 The baseline data assembled as part of the Scoping process has provided a useful analytical resource which has recently been updated and will be used to assess all DPDs and SPDs in a consistent manner.
- 1.21 The SA of the Core Strategy Issues and Options paper highlighted certain policy areas which may require mitigation measures, such as policy re-wording. Areas that were highlighted included affordable housing thresholds and targets, energy use and the settlement hierarchy. This has fed into and influenced the preparation of the Preferred Options Report. Initial SA consultation was undertaken with specific consultation bodies.<sup>5</sup>
- 1.22 The Initial SA of *Towards a Spatial Strategy* identified a number of issues relating to the spatial strategy and, alongside consultation responses, contributed to the development of a Preferred Option for strategic growth

**What alternatives to the Core Strategy were considered?**

- 1.23 The Core Strategy Preferred Options Report is the outcome of evidence gathering and continuous stakeholder engagement, through the publication of two consultation documents and a stakeholder presentation and meeting. The following section provides a summary of the alternatives considered and is derived from the Initial SA of the Core Strategy Issues and Options paper (summaries of which are provided in appendix 4). The Initial SA indicated that the use of spatial planning areas would be the most sustainable option for use when identifying strategic directions of growth. It also suggested that the use of a settlement hierarchy based on settlement size and access to facilities would be the most sustainable way in which to locate growth. The alternative option to spatial planning areas, that development should be located only within the four market towns, and the alternative to the settlement hierarchy, that additional layers added to focus development, were not taken forward into the Preferred Options Report.
- 1.24 In terms of distributing strategic growth within the Key Service Centres, the option that was considered most sustainable was distributing development according to the size and level of facilities. The option not taken forward into the Preferred Options proposed limiting growth to those settlements which have recently received growth.
- 1.25 For employment options for growth the SA identified the most sustainable as being a higher target for employment land based on projection trends since 2002. The alternative option taken forward proposed a lower target which acknowledged the constraints on availability of labour and climate change. This has been informed by the Employment Land Review (2007).

<sup>5</sup> As listed in Annex E of PPS12

- 1.26 For the scale of housing growth, the option that was assessed to be most sustainable defines a scale in terms of major, moderate, minor or infill. The alternative that has not been carried forward into the Preferred Options Report proposed a more limited number of categories. For the location of housing growth the Initial SA indicated that the most sustainable option was to define spatial priorities for unallocated housing growth opposed to allowing a more dispersed distribution of growth.
- 1.27 Additional options for strategic growth were identified in section 3 of the consultation document *Towards a Spatial Strategy*. These additional options were based on achieving a higher level of growth than that proposed in the emerging East of England Plan. None of these options have been taken forward into the Preferred Options report.
- 1.28 Further recommendations were made which have been tabulated for ease of reference in Table 4. The commentary above covers the options which will be used for deciding strategic levels of growth and the location and scale of housing growth for unallocated residential development. These policy areas were identified as potentially raising issues within the Initial SA.

### **Conclusions**

- 1.29 The Preferred Policies have been assessed using the SA Framework and, have been found to be sustainable. The key area – the spatial strategy – has been influenced by consultation and accompanying ISAs. The preferred approach is one that identifies spatial planning areas for accommodating housing, employment and retail growth in the most sustainable locations and concentrates the majority of growth within the St Neots and Huntingdon spatial planning areas.
- 1.30 There is a tangible commitment to manage growth in a sustainable manner that respects the characteristics of the District and promote environmental issues and a number of policies and objectives reflect this. Environmental concerns are balanced against economic interests with the preferred policy for employment scale acknowledging the challenge posed by climate change and the distribution accommodated in the most sustainable locations.
- 1.31 Throughout the draft plan there is an emphasis on improving the quality of life for residents and visitors to the District. Key to this is the provision of adequate housing that meets local needs, a number of policies and objectives reflect this.
- 1.32 The draft Final SA is structured as shown below:
- Section 1: Non Technical Summary
  - Section 2: Methodology
  - Section 3: Sustainability Objectives, Baseline and Context
  - Section 4: Plan Issues and Policies
  - Section 5: Implementation
  - Section 6: Conclusions

**How to comment on this report**

You can comment on this document using the response forms available on our website [www.huntsdc.gov.uk](http://www.huntsdc.gov.uk) or you can download and send a copy of the response form to us at the following address:

Planning Division  
Huntingdonshire District Council  
Pathfinder House  
St Mary's Street  
Huntingdon  
PE29 3PE

## **2. Methodology**

### **Purpose of Sustainability Appraisal**

- 2.1 Huntingdonshire District Council's Core Strategy 2007 Preferred Options Report forms the lead document in the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework (LDF). The Council is required, by law<sup>6</sup>, to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of local development documents which comprise the LDF. Government guidance 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (November 2005) (hereafter referred to as SA Guidance) recommends that the two requirements are met through one process. This SA incorporates both the SA and SEA requirements, and throughout the document these two processes will be referred to as 'Sustainability Appraisal' (SA). Its overarching aim is to achieve sustainable development.
- 2.2 The most widely used definition of this concept is "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs<sup>7</sup>."
- 2.3 The purpose of the SA was to assist Huntingdonshire District Council's Development Plans Team prepare its Core Strategy 2007 Preferred Options for consultation by carrying out the following:
- Identifying the key sustainability issues facing the District
  - Assessing the likely effects on the Preferred Options on these issues
  - Putting forward recommendations that might mitigate against these effects
- 2.4 The SA aims to ensure that the Preferred Options Report has as many positive effects as possible, and that negative effects are avoided.

### **Legislative context**

- 2.5 European Directive 2001/42/EC requires an 'environmental assessment' of plans and programmes prepared by public authorities that are likely to have a significant effect upon the environment. This process is commonly referred to as 'Strategic Environmental Assessment' (SEA) and covers relevant plans and programmes whose formal preparation began after 21 July 2004. Among the documents to which this requirement will apply are land use plans that cover a wide area, such as the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework.

<sup>6</sup> Section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

<sup>7</sup> World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987

- 2.6 At the same time the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires sustainability appraisal (SA) of all emerging Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) which form the Huntingdonshire LDF.
- 2.7 The difference between SA and SEA, lies in the fact that SEA focuses on environmental effects whereas SA is concerned with the full range of environmental, social and economic matters. SA guidance incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive, and therefore a single appraisal process can be carried out. However, the SA Report must clearly show that the Directive's requirements have been met by sign posting the places in the SA Report where the information required by the Directive is required.
- 2.8 The term Sustainability Appraisal is used in the context of meaning compliance with both sets of requirements.
- 2.9 This report does not represent an Appropriate Assessment under Article 6(3) and 6(4) of the Habitats Directive 92/42/EEC. A separate report will be compiled by Scott Wilson Ltd, on behalf of the Council, to meet the requirements of the aforementioned legislation.

#### **Relationship between Sustainability Appraisal and the Development Plan**

- 2.10 The production of a Scoping Report is the first stage in incorporating the Sustainability Appraisal process within the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework. The full process varies for the production of Development Plan Documents (DPD) or Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). However for both of these processes, sustainability appraisal is an integral part of the plan preparation process. SA Guidance sets out guidance on how to carry out SA as an integral part of plan making. The stages involved in carrying out a sustainability appraisal of a DPD is set out in Table 1.
- 2.11 The purpose of the Scoping Report was to set the context and objectives, and decide on the scope of the sustainability appraisal. This process generated a set of sustainability appraisal (SA) objectives that form the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework used to appraise the policies contained in the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report.
- 2.12 The preparation of this draft Final SA report is covered by Stage C and consultation on the Report covered under Stage D. It should be stressed that this is an iterative process and the tasks and stages overlap and inform each other.

**Table 1: Stages involved in the SA of a DPD**

<b>DPD Stage 1: Pre-production – Evidence gathering</b>	
<b>SA stages and tasks</b>	
<b>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes and sustainable development objectives</li> <li>• A2: Collecting baseline information</li> <li>• A3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems</li> <li>• A4: Developing the SA framework</li> <li>• A5: Consulting on the scope of the SA</li> </ul>
<b>DPD Stage 2: Production</b>	
<b>SA stages and tasks</b>	
<b>Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B1: Testing the DPD objectives against the SA framework</li> <li>• B2: Developing the DPD options</li> <li>• B3: Predicting the effects of the draft DPD</li> <li>• B4: Evaluating the effects of the draft DPD</li> <li>• B5: Considering the ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects</li> <li>• B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD</li> </ul>
<b>Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C1: Preparing the SA Report</li> </ul>
<b>Stage D: Consulting on preferred options of the DPD and SA Report</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D1: Public participation on the preferred options of the DPD and the SA report</li> <li>• D2(i): Appraising significant changes</li> </ul>
<b>DPD Stage 3: Examination</b>	
<b>SA stages and tasks</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D2(ii): Appraising significant changes resulting from representations</li> </ul>
<b>DPD Stage 4: Adoption and monitoring</b>	
<b>SA stages and tasks</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D3: Making decisions and providing information</li> </ul>
<b>Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the DPD</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring</li> <li>• E2: Responding to adverse effects</li> </ul>

**Preparation of the Core Strategy Preferred Options SA**

- 2.13 Preparation of the SA process, including producing the Scoping Report and the two Initial SAs carried out as part of Issues and Options consultation has been completed in house by members of the Development Plans Team.
- 2.14 The formal consultation process for Issues and Options involved the consultees listed in table 2

**Table 2: Issues and Options consultees**

<b>Statutory consultees and other agencies</b>	<b>Health care and welfare bodies</b>
Environment Agency	Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust
English Heritage	East of England Strategic Health Authority
Highways Agency	Cambridgeshire ACRE
Natural England	<b>Other national or regional bodies</b>
<b>Regional governmental bodies</b>	East of England Tourist Board
Government Office for the East of England	Sport England
East of England Development Agency	Sustrans
East of England Regional Assembly	The Gypsy Council
East Midlands Assembly	Citizens Advice Bureau
<b>Local authorities</b>	<b>Infrastructure and service providers</b>
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Cambridge Water Company
Fenland District Council	Anglian Water Services
Peterborough City Council	Network Rail
Cambridgeshire County Council	TRANSCO
Northamptonshire County Council	National Grid
East Northamptonshire District Council	Mobile Operators Association
Bedford Borough Council	<b>Housing associations and other bodies</b>
Bedfordshire County Council	Cambridge Housing Society
Mid Bedfordshire District Council	Luminus
Parish and Town Councils in Huntingdonshire	Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association
Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils	Muir Group Housing Association
<b>Biodiversity and rural affairs</b>	Nene Housing Association
CPRE Cambridgeshire	Granta Housing Society
The British Horse Society	The Guinness Trust
Wildlife Trust	CABE
Cambs and Peterborough Biodiversity Partnership	<b>Other local groups and bodies</b>
The Ramblers Association	Huntingdon Town Centre Partnership
	St Neots Town Centre Initiative
	Ramsey Town Centre Initiative
	St Ives Town Centre Initiative
	Civic Trust
	Cambridgeshire Horizons

- 2.15 The draft Final SA has been produced alongside preparation of the Preferred Options Report and has informed development of the Preferred Options. The SA process was

carried out during November 2007. The draft Final SA report accompanies the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report and forms pre-submission public participation under Regulation 26 of the Local Development Regulations<sup>9</sup>.

- 2.16 The Planning Officer responsible for carrying out the SA appraised the policies in the Preferred Options Report against the SA framework developed in the Scoping process (see Appendix 1) and produced a number of detailed appraisal matrices (see Appendix 2) from which conclusions were drawn (see section 6). Once complete, the draft report was reviewed in house by other officers before undergoing consultation alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report.

#### **Difficulties encountered in writing the SA**

- 2.17 Timing and resources have been significant challenges throughout the SA process, from beginning the Scoping process to writing the draft Final SA report. The baseline data collated as part of the Scoping process presented specific problems as, in some cases, data was simply not available. The recent update of the Scoping Report has made the baseline data more reliable, but there still remain gaps in data collection which present challenges when carrying out SA of local development documents.
- 2.18 A particular difficulty encountered when carrying out the Initial SA as part of Issues and Options consultation on the Core Strategy, was that options presented were deliberately not specific. This made carrying out the SA, specific by its nature, difficult. The subsequent recommendations or mitigation measures offered within the ISA were often very broad. This was less of an issue when carrying out the ISA of *Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire*. However, lack of information on the exact type of location of development presented problems, particularly when assessing impacts on, for example, biodiversity. Similar issues have been encountered when carrying out this draft Final SA however, as the policy becomes more detailed so too can the SA process. Issues surrounding gaps in data collection still presented challenges.

#### **Judgements and assumptions**

- 2.19 Throughout the SA judgements of the effects have had to be made. Attempts to remedy this have been made by ensuring an external review of the Scoping process and ensuring an internal review was carried out for the draft Final SA.
- 2.20 This draft Final SA has been undertaken on the basis of the likely effects of the implementation of the Council's Preferred Options. Judgements have therefore been made on the basis of:
- The current sustainability issues and trends facing the region
  - The likely influence of the Preferred Options on these trends compared to other factors such as government policies, market forces and funding priorities
  - The powers available to the planning system to achieve what the Preferred Options DPD sets out to achieve

<sup>9</sup>The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004



- 2.21 Throughout the SA process, the cumulative and synergistic effects have been looked at in accordance with government SA guidance. Where reference is made to 'long term effects,' this is assumed to cover the lifespan of the plan period. Short and medium timescales will vary according to particular types of effect, but are assumed to occur within the plan period and approximately take effect during the first 5-10 years (short term) and during years 10-15 (medium) with long term effects assumed to occur thereafter.

**Outline of Core Strategy content and objectives**

- 2.22 The Core Strategy will set the framework for how Huntingdonshire will develop up to 2026. It will contain strategic policies to manage growth and guide new development. The Core Strategy forms the lead document in Huntingdonshire's Local Development Framework which will comprise a suite of Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents. These all have to be consistent with the Core Strategy once it is adopted.
- 2.23 Having undertaking Issues and Options consultation with key stakeholders earlier in the summer, the Core Strategy is now at Regulation 26 pre-submission public participation<sup>10</sup>. This means that the emerging policies presented in the Report are those preferred by the Council and have been informed by the responses received to previous consultation and the ISA of the Issues and Options paper and *Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire*.
- 2.24 The Preferred Options Report comprises a number of thematic chapters in which the preferred spatial vision for the LDF is given followed by a chapter on sustainable development which is the overarching principle underpinning the DPD. Chapter 3 of the Preferred Options Volume One sets out the preferred spatial strategy for the District. The remaining chapters look at other strategic issues and a monitoring framework. The final chapter deals with monitoring and review and lists suggested indicators for monitoring the effectiveness of Huntingdonshire's LDF.
- 2.25 The Spatial Vision is made up of a number of constituent parts which should all be read together. It contains a Spatial Portrait which describes the key characteristics of the District, then sets out the Planning Context in which the plan has to operate and is followed by the Spatial Vision which develops the key characteristics identified in the Spatial Portrait and the challenges set out in the Planning Context. This is followed by the Spatial Objectives which articulate how the Vision can be achieved a set of Spatial Principles which indicate the direction that more detailed policy will take.

<sup>10</sup> The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

- 2.26 The Spatial Vision set out in the Preferred Options which derives from the Spatial Portrait and Planning Context is:

'In 2026, Huntingdonshire will have retained its distinct identity as a predominantly rural area of villages and market towns whilst accommodating the development of homes and jobs required as part of a major growth area, taking advantage of the economic vitality of the Cambridge Sub Region, in a sustainable manner which respects, maintains and enhances the special characters of its towns, villages and countryside. Its residents will have an improved quality of life with increased access to local jobs, housing and high quality services, facilities and green infrastructure.'

- 2.27 The Spatial Principles are:

Huntingdonshire will play a proactive role in accommodating future growth in the Cambridge-sub region. The majority of growth will be concentrated in the most sustainable locations of Huntingdon, St Neots and St Ives where there is access to existing and improving public transport, new road infrastructure and where the use of amenities and facilities can be maximised.

RAF Brampton and the industrial area west of Huntingdon town centre will provide significant opportunities for development on previously developed land within the District. Further opportunities to maximise the use of previously developed land on a smaller scale will be encouraged within the market towns of the Cambridge-Sub region.

The visual quality, viability and vitality of the four market town centres in Huntingdonshire will be enhanced by identifying and implementing appropriate development opportunities and opportunities to improve the public realm. Improvements to the public realm, improving the quality of both place and culture, will encourage local people to use local facilities and will attract visitors.

The regeneration of run down areas will be encouraged with particular attention paid to areas of deprivation within St Neots, Huntingdon and Ramsey through neighbourhood management and regeneration projects.

Opportunities for retail growth will be encouraged within all market towns and in larger villages which are identified as key service centres in order to respond to competitive pressure from other centres and further strengthen the District's economy. A large proportion of future retail growth will be accommodated within the town centre of Huntingdon, with additional, complementary development to the west of the town centre facilitated through an Area Action Plan. Further growth will be accommodated in St Neots where a large scale urban extension to the east of the town will require a district centre which will complement the town centre. There will be a lesser scale of growth in St Ives and Ramsey.

Future employment development will mostly be located in the most sustainable locations of the market towns and will be commensurate with housing growth to ensure the creation of balanced communities. The provision of a wider range of local employment opportunities will help limit levels of out commuting to London, Peterborough and Cambridge and ensure the continued success of the District's economy.

Development in most of the key service centres outside the Spatial Planning Areas will be restricted to a level that will help sustain the existing facilities and amenities, without encouraging growth in these less sustainable locations. In smaller settlements future housing will be restricted to small scale development and that necessary to meet local housing needs.

The further expansion of Peterborough will respect the separate identities of Yaxley, Facet, Folksworth, Stilton and Alwalton by maintaining green separation. However, it is important to ensure those settlements enjoy the benefits of future of development within Peterborough through improved access to a greater range of amenities and facilities. The areas of greenspace around those settlements close to the boundary with Peterborough will also be important areas of open space resource for the expanded population of Peterborough.

The landscape and countryside of Huntingdonshire will be protected and enhanced. Areas identified for enhancement include the Ouse Valley from St Neots to Earith, the woodlands around Grafham Water and Brampton and the wetland and woodlands of the Great Fen Project. These areas will also have improved access for informal recreation. Further opportunities for improved recreation and biodiversity/green infrastructure will be identified. The growth in the Huntingdon and St Neots areas will reinforce the need to protect and enhance areas of greenspace around them.

The A14 improvements will create significant opportunities for new development in the Huntingdon area. The changes will improve access problems to the town centre and facilitate the extension of the town centre in a westerly direction. Other improvements to the transport network will also influence the delivery of housing and employment growth in more sustainable locations. Projects with particular importance include the Cambridge to St Ives Guided Bus, the A428 road improvements and High Quality Public Transport Corridor and the A15 improvements at Hampton near Peterborough. Improvements in public transport will enable the promotion of sustainable travel options.

Any redundant military bases in Huntingdonshire will need careful consideration to ensure that any potential re-use or redevelopment maximises the economic benefit to the District. RAF Brampton, subject to its release by the MoD, offers the opportunity for mixed use development on an appropriate scale in a sustainable location within the plan period. The future potential of Alconbury Airfield and Wyton Airfield will need to be considered in the longer term as part of the next review of the Regional Spatial Strategy. That review will need to take into account wider strategic issues for the region and the range of sustainable options available.

2.28 The Core Strategy Preferred Spatial Objectives are as follows:

1. To enable required growth to be accommodated in locations which limit the need to travel, while catering for local needs
2. To ensure that the types of dwellings built are suited to the requirements of the local population, and that an appropriate proportion is 'affordable' to those in need
3. To enable specialist housing needs of particular groups to be met in appropriate locations
4. To facilitate business development in sectors that have potential to meet local employment needs and limit out commuting

5. To strengthen the vitality and viability of Huntingdonshire's town centres as places for shopping and leisure
6. To enable business development in rural areas, in locations and on a scale which helps to provide local jobs, limits commuting and avoids adverse environmental impacts
7. To maintain and enhance the availability of key services and facilities including communications services
8. To maintain, enhance and conserve Huntingdonshire's characteristic landscapes, habitats and species
9. To identify opportunities to increase and enhance major strategic greenspace
10. To conserve and enhance the special character and separate identities of Huntingdonshire's villages and market towns
11. To ensure that design of new development integrates effectively with its setting and promotes local distinctiveness
12. To promote developments that conserve natural resources, minimise greenhouse gas emissions and help to reduce waste
13. To secure developments which are accessible to all potential users, and which minimise risks to health as a result of crime (or fear of crime), flooding or pollution and climate change
14. To increase opportunities for pursuing a healthy lifestyle, by maintaining and enhancing recreation opportunities and encouraging walking and cycling
15. To provide a framework for securing adequate land and infrastructure to support business and community needs

### **Requirements of the SEA Directive**

2.29 Annex 1 of the SEA Directive<sup>11</sup> sets out the information that must be provided in the Environmental Report. This is set out in the table below and the information which has been included within this SA Report has been identified.

<b>Environmental Requirements (as set out in Annex I of the SEA Directive)</b>	<b>Where covered in the SA Report / Scoping Report (2007)</b>
(a) an outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programmes and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;	Section 2 outlines the content of the Core Strategy , Table 3 lists relevant programmes and Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report (2007) details the relationship to the Plan
(b) the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	Detailed in Section 4 Scoping Report with main aspects summarised in Table 4 in this report

(c) the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;	Detailed in Section 4 in Scoping Report and summarised in Table 4 of this report
(d) any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC (The Birds Directive) and 92/43/EEC (The Habitats Directive)	Detailed in Section 4 in Scoping Report and summarised in Table 4 of this report
(e) the environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;	Identified during the context review of the baseline data and reflected in the plan objectives (section 2)
(f) the likely significant effects <sup>12</sup> on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors;	Appendix 2 with summary provided in Section 4 of this report, including Table 7
(g) the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;	Appendix 2 of this report
(h) an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;	Section 3 of this report
(i) a description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10;	Section 5 and Appendix 5 of this report
(j) a non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	Section 1 of this report

<sup>11</sup> Directive 2001/42/EEC

<sup>12</sup> These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects

### 3. Sustainability Objectives, baseline and context

#### Review of relevant plans, programmes and policies (Stage A1)

- 3.1 The Core Strategy needs to take into account a wide range of other plans, policies and programmes. These may contain policy objectives or specific requirements that need to be addressed through the new plan. Identifying and reviewing these documents is an important element of the SA process, as it can help to shape the objectives against which emerging policies should be appraised, as well as pointing to particular issues and problems that need to be tackled.
- 3.2 The review of plans and programmes are relevant in setting the context for the Core Strategy Preferred Options – table 3 lists the relevant plans and policies and appendix 2 of the Scoping Report (2007) contains a detailed review of these.
- 3.3 The findings of the review of relevant plans and programmes carried out for the Scoping Report (2007) has informed the identification of key sustainability issues, a summary of which are presented in the following sections.

**Table 3 – Relevant Plans and Programmes**

<b>Plan/Programme</b>
<b>International</b>
Commitments arising from the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg (2002)
Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC (2002)
European Strategy on Sustainable Development (2001)
Directive on Electricity Production from Renewable Energy Sources 2001/77/EC (2001)
The Sixth Environmental Action Programme of the European Community 1600/2002/EEC
The UN Millennium Declaration and Millennium Development Goals (2000)
European Spatial Development Perspective (May 1999)
EC Council Directive 99/31/EC on the Landfill of Waste (1999)
European Biodiversity Strategy (1998)
Kyoto Protocol (1992)
EC Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (1992)
Air Quality Framework Directive 96/92/EC (1996)
EC Council Directive 85/337/EEC & 97/11/EC on the Assessment of the Effects of certain Public and Private Projects in the Environment (1985)
EC Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the Conservation of Wild Birds (1979)
Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (1979)
Bonn Convention the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (1979)
Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (1971)
<b>National</b>
Homes for the Future: more affordable, more sustainable, DCLG (July 2007)
Eco Town Prospectus, DCLG (July 2007)
Building a Greener Future: Towards Zero Carbon Development, DCLG (2006)
Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006)
The Disability Discrimination Act, DDA (2005)
Securing the Regions' Future – Strengthening the Delivery of Sustainable Development in the English Regions, DEFRA (2006)
Local Quality of Life Indicators – A Guide to Local Monitoring to Complement the Indicators in the UK Government Strategy, The Audit Commission (Aug 2005)
Securing the Future – Delivering UK Sustainable Development Strategy, DEFRA (March 2005)
One Future Different Paths – the UK's Shared Framework for Sustainable Development, DEFRA

(March 2005)
Working with the Grain of Nature – A Biodiversity Strategy for England, DEFRA (2002)
Planning Policy Statement 1: Creating Sustainable Communities, ODPM, (2005)
Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change (Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1) (DCLG, 2006)
Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing, DCLG (2006)
Planning Policy Guidance Note 4: Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms, DoE (1992)
Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres, ODPM (2005)
Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
Planning Policy Guidance Note 8: Telecommunications, DETR (2001)
Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, ODPM (2005)
Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, ODPM (Aug 2005)
Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks, ODPM (2004)
Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport, DETR (2001)
Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment, DoE, (1994)
Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning, DoE (1993)
Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning For Open Space, Sport and Recreation, ODPM (2002)
Planning Policy Guidance Note 19: Outdoor advertisement control, DoE (1992)
Planning Policy Guidance Note 21: Tourism, DoE (1992)
Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism, DCLG (2006)
Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy, ODPM (2004)
Planning for Renewable Energy A Companion Guide to PPS 22 ODPM (2004)
Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control, ODPM (2004)
Planning Policy Guidance Note 24: Planning and Noise, ODPM (2001)
Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk, DCLG (2006)
Development and Flood Risk A Companion Guide to PPS25 'Living Draft'
Transport Ten Year Plan, Department of Transport (2000)
The Future of Transport: A Network for 2030 White Paper, DfT (July 2004)
Climate Change, the UK Programme 2006, HM Government (2006)
Energy White Paper: Our Energy Future – Creating a Low Carbon Economy, DTI (2003)
The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, DETR (2000)
UK Waste Strategy, DEFRA (2000)
Choosing Health: Making Healthier Choices White Paper, DoH (Nov 2004)
Delivering Choosing Health: Making Healthier Choices Easier, DoH (March 2005)
Sustainable Communities Plan: Building For The Future, ODPM (2003)
Sustainable Communities: Homes for All, ODPM (2005)
Sustainable Communities: People, Places and Prosperity, ODPM (2005)
ODPM Circular 01/2006: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites, ODPM
<b>Regional</b>
Sustainable Communities in the East of England, ODPM (2003)
A Sustainable Development Framework for the East of England, EERA (2001)
Our Environment, Our Future: Regional Environment Strategy for the East of England, EERA (2003)
A Better Life: The role of Culture in the sustainable development of the East of England, Living East (Sept 2006)
A Shared Vision The Regional Economic Strategy for the East of England, EEDA (2004)
EEDA Corporate Plan 2005/06-2007/08, EEDA (Aug 2005)
Regional Planning Guidance for the East of England, RPG6, GO-East (2000)
Regional Spatial Strategy 14: The East of England Plan – The Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the Draft Revision of the Regional Spatial Strategy, GO-East (Dec 2006)
East of England Regional Waste Management Strategy, East of England Waste Technical Advisory Body (2002)
Sustainable Tourism Strategy for the East of England, East of England Tourist Board (March 2004)
Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action, (FRESA) EEDA (2003)
Regional Social Strategy, EERA (2004)

Woodland for Life: The Regional Woodland Strategy for the East of England, EERA and The Forestry Commission, (2003)
Regional Housing Strategy 2005-2010, EERA (July 2005)
Affordable Housing Study: The Provision of Affordable Housing in the East of England 1996-2021 (2003)
East of England Affordable Housing Study Stage 2: Provision for Key Workers and Unmet Housing Need. Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research (2005)
Water Resources for the Future: A Strategy for the Anglian Region, Environment Agency (2001)
Towns and Cities Strategy and Action Plan, EEDA (2003)
Towards Sustainable Construction, A Strategy for the East of England, EP, CE, GO-East, PECT (2003)
Living with Climate Change in the East of England, East of England Sustainable Development Roundtable (2003)
Healthy Futures- A Regional Health Strategy for the East of England 2005-2010, EERA (Dec 2005)
Great Ouse Catchment Flood Management Plan, Summary of Draft Plan, Environment Agency (Feb 2007)
<b>County/Cambridge Sub-Region</b>
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, 2003 CCC & PCC (2003)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan, CCC & PCC (2003)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste, Core Strategy Development Plan Document Preferred Options, CCC & PCC (Nov 2006)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste, Site Specific Proposals Development Plan Document Preferred Options, CCC & PCC (Nov 2006)
Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2006-2011, CCC (March 2006)
Environment Strategy and Action Plan CCC (2002)
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Waste Management Strategy 2002-2022, CCC & PCC (2002)
A County of Culture – A Cultural Strategy for Cambridgeshire 2002-2005, CCC
Cambridgeshire Landscape Guidelines, CCC 1991
Biodiversity Checklist for Land Use Planners in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, CCC (2001)
Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Action Plan, CCC (2004)
Delivering Renewable Energy in the Cambridge Sub-region, Cambridge Sub-Regional Partners (2004)
Balanced and Mixed Communities – A Good Practice Guide, Cambridgeshire Horizons (March 2006)
Sustainable Construction in Cambridgeshire – A Good Practice Guide, Cambridgeshire Horizons (March 2006)
Major Sports Facilities Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region, Cambridgeshire Horizons (2006)
The Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region, Cambridgeshire Horizons (2006)
Cambridgeshire Local Area Agreement 2006-2009
Tackling Climate Change in Cambridgeshire, CCC (2005)
Cambridgeshire Environment Report 2005, CCC (2005)
Cambridgeshire Horizons Business Plan 2004/07 (2004)
A Rural Strategy for Cambridgeshire 2006-2010 (Cambridgeshire ACRE)
Public Library Position Statement 2003 (CCC 2003)
Prospects for Learning (CCC, 2001)
<b>District</b>
Aging Well in Hunts, NHS, HDC (2005)
Cambridgeshire Sub-Regional Housing Strategy (CCC, ECDC, FDC, FHDC, HDC, StEDC, SDCD,) 2004
Children and Young People's Interim Plan 2005-2006 CCYPSP, (2005)
Community Safety Strategy 2005-2008 HCSP (2005)
Draft Access Strategy, Huntingdonshire PCT (2002)
Draft Strategic Service Development Plan, Huntingdonshire PCT, (2002)
Huntingdonshire Community Strategy, HDC, (2004)
Huntingdonshire District Council Housing Strategy 2006-2011, HDC (2006)
Huntingdonshire Local Delivery Plan, PCT. (2003)



Local Economic Strategy, Medium Term, 2002-2007, HDC (2002)
Equality and Inclusion Strategy, HDC (2005)
Tourism Strategy for Huntingdonshire 1999-2004, HDC (1999)

**Collection of baseline data and description of the social, environmental and economic baseline characteristics likely to be effected (stage A2)**

- 3.4 Collection of baseline information is fundamental to the SA process to provide a background to and evidence base for identifying both sustainability problems in Huntingdonshire and alternative ways of dealing with them. The baseline information has informed the development of the SA Framework and provides the basis for monitoring effects of plans.
- 3.5 Appendix 3 sets out the baseline information that has been collected. The baseline data is presented in the form of indicators and identifies the current situation for the District and also a comparator – usually Cambridgeshire or the Structure Plan area of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, or the East of England and was collated from district, county and regional monitoring.

**Difficulties and limitations in collecting and analysing the data**

- 3.6 The Council's difficulties in collecting the baseline data are consistent with those of other authorities and reflect some deep-rooted problems with the reliability of information sources informing this process. A number of specific problems were identified:

*Data availability / applicability*

- Data for some indicators is not available because it is derived from external sources which do not monitor it, or which have not yet established monitoring systems. (The same limitation applies to government sustainability targets, many of which are not yet defined.)
- The same issue affects data at sub-District level and their absence may reflect the high cost of data collection and / or monitoring to the Council or to other bodies such as the Environment Agency.
- Boundaries of natural features (landscape areas; river catchments) extend beyond the administrative boundaries so that data on some larger contiguous features is difficult to collect

*Data quality / comparability*

- Data on the same topic area are often calibrated in different ways, the calibration system has been changed in the last 10-15 years, or the way a parameter is defined has been changed creating difficulties in drawing comparisons between past and current performance
- Time series data are very limited, and if they exist often only a couple of data points are available
- The best or most consistently monitored data is for contextual indicators, whereas recent LDF monitoring guidance identifies the need to prioritise local outcome indicators which monitor the impacts of the DPD as directly as possible.

**Summary of information collected and reviewed**

- 3.7 Key information in relation to social, economic and environmental issues that are likely to be affected is presented in Table 4. A full commentary can be found in Section 4 of the Scoping Report (2007). The review of relevant plans and programmes highlighted a number of key characteristics and sustainability issues facing Huntingdonshire.

**General**

- 3.8 Huntingdonshire remains a predominantly rural district in character with an area of approximately 350 square miles. The estimated population in of the District in 2006 was 160,813<sup>13</sup> people with approximately half living in the four market towns of Huntingdon, St Neots, St Ives and Ramsey and Bury. The residents of Huntingdonshire are predominantly white. Life expectancy is high in the District with both males and females living on average a year and a half longer than the national average. The level of educational attainment is close to the national average.

<sup>13</sup> County Council Research Group

**Table 4: Key sustainability issues in Huntingdonshire (Stage A3)**

<b>Sustainability Issue</b>	<b>Implications for Local Development Documents</b>	<b>Evidence base</b>	<b>Policy Context</b>
<b>Land, water and resources</b>			
Growth pressures will put increased demands on Greenfield land.	Need to prioritise development on previously developed land (PDL) and ensure that where necessary only the most sustainable Greenfield sites are developed	For Huntingdonshire the percentage of housing completed on PDL was 55.3% for 2005/06	PPS3: Housing (2006) states that the national annual target that at least 60% of new housing should be provided on PDL.
Development needs to make efficient use of land.	Need make sure the density of development makes efficient use of land.	In 2005/06 the average density of residential development in Huntingdonshire was 36.33	PPS3: Housing sets a national indicative minimum of 30dph.
Development may put an additional strain on water supply	Future development will need to be underpinned by adequate infrastructure and measures taken to ensure the efficient use of resources incorporated through sustainable design	In 2002/03 159 litres were consumed in unmetered households in the Anglian region and 123litres per head per day in metered households.	Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC (2002)  Water Resources for the Future: A Strategy for the Anglian Region, Environment Agency (2001)  Policies relating to water in Proposed Changes to the Draft East of England Plan (2006)
<b>Biodiversity</b>			
The impact of new development on biodiversity needs to be considered.	New developments should maximise the potential for biodiversity and reconnecting habitats that have become fragmented	86.2% of SSSI's across the District are in a favourable or unfavourable recovering condition	PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, ODPM (Aug 2005)  Proposed Changes to the draft East of England Plan (2006)  Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Action Plan, Cambridgeshire County Council (2004)

Sustainability Issue	Implications for Local Development Documents	Evidence base	Policy Context
<b>Landscape, townscape and archaeology</b>			
<p>New development needs to maintain and enhance the District's historic and architectural heritage</p>	<p>National policy will be used to protect listed buildings, conservation areas and sites of archaeological interest.</p>	<p>In the District 13.1% of Listed Buildings were at risk in 2005/06.</p> <p>21% of the Conservation Areas in the District were covered by an up-to-date character assessment in 2005/06.</p>	<p>PPS15: Planning and the Historic Environment, DoE (1994)</p> <p>Policy on protected and enhancing the historic environment in the Proposed Changes to the draft East of England Plan (2006)</p> <p>Huntingdonshire Conservation Area Statements</p> <p>Huntingdonshire District Council's Corporate Plan 2007/08 -Growing Success stresses that heritage assets and conservation areas need to be maintained and enhanced</p> <p>The Huntingdonshire Community Strategy emphasizes the need to improve the quality and distinctiveness of the local environment and protect historic sites as well as understand the heritage of the landscape</p>
<b>Climate change and pollution</b>			
<p>There is a high risk of flooding in some areas of the District and new development may put additional pressure on land drainage systems and lead to an increase in flooding. Flooding is likely to increase as a result of</p>	<p>Need to ensure that new developments incorporate methods/solutions in their design to reduce the risk of flooding, for example the use of sustainable drainage systems where appropriate</p>	<p>In 2005/06 there was one instance of planning permission being granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on either</p>	<p>Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC (2002)</p> <p>PPS25 Development and Flood Risk, DCLG (2006)</p> <p>Flood risk management policy in Proposed Changes to the draft East</p>

*Sustainability Appraisal: Core Strategy Preferred Options*

climate change		flood defence grounds or water quality	of England Plan (2006)
The pattern of development in the District has encouraged private car use leading to congestion and air pollution being problems in some areas. New development will need to be accommodated in sustainable locations to minimise the need to travel	Need to ensure that development is accommodated in sustainable locations to reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable travel modes	In 2005/06 76.8% of completions were in Market Towns and Key Service Centres	PPG13 Transport, DETR, (2001)  Transport Ten Year Plan, DfT (2000)  The Future of Transport: A Network for 2030 White Paper, Dft (July 2004)  Proposed Changes to the draft East of England Plan (2006)  Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2006-11 Cambridgeshire County Council, (March 2006)  Huntingdonshire District Council Travel Plan, HDC
Development will place increased pressure on existing landfill sites and household waste processing centres	Need to ensure that new developments make adequate provision for recycling facilities	In 2005/06 48.8% of household waste collected in the District was recycled	EC Council Directive 99/31/EC on the landfill of Waste (1999)  PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management, ODPM (July 2005)  UK Waste Strategy, DEFRA (2000)  Waste management policies in the Proposed Changes to the draft East of England Plan, (2006)  East of England Regional Waste Management Strategy, East of England Waste Technical Advisory Body, (2002)  Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan,

			<p>Cambridgeshire County Council (2003)</p> <p>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste LDF – Preferred Options (November 2006)</p>
<p>Development will increase the demand for energy from non-renewable energy sources and increase carbon dioxide emissions</p>	<p>Opportunities for renewable energy sources should be encouraged and used to their full potential. Developments should make provision to provide a percentage of on-site energy requirements from renewable sources</p>	<p>There is currently no data available for the % of predicted energy requirements from on-site renewable energy technologies on major developments</p>	<p>Kyoto Protocol</p> <p>Directive on Electricity Production from Renewable Energy Sources 2001/77/EEC (2001)</p> <p>PPS22: Renewable Energy, ODPM (2004)</p> <p>PPS: Planning and Climate Change, Supplement to PPS1 (consultation draft) DCLG, (2006)</p> <p>Climate Change, the UK Programme 2006, HM</p> <p>Energy White Paper: Our Energy Future</p> <p>Proposed Changes to draft East of England Plan, (2006)</p> <p>Living with Climate Change in the East of England Sustainable Development Roundtable (2003)</p> <p>Delivering Renewable Energy in the Cambridge Sub-region, Cambridge Sub-regional Partners (2004)</p> <p>The Huntingdonshire Community Strategy (2004) identifies increasing sources of</p>

			renewable energy as a key objective
<b>Healthy Communities</b>			
Need to reduce health inequalities across the District	Need to ensure equal access to facilities for all members of the community across Huntingdonshire. Some urban areas of market towns, in particular Huntingdon North Ward and Eynesbury Ward in St Neots both experience higher levels of relative deprivation and are in the 10% most deprived wards in Cambridgeshire. (Although these wards are less deprived than the most deprived areas nationally.)	Across the District in 2005/06 there were 36 urban wards with a primary school and 18 with a doctor's surgery	Saving Lives: Our Healthier Nation White Paper, DoH (1999)  Healthy Futures – A Regional Health Strategy for the East of England 2005-2010, EERA (Dec 2005)
New development will put pressure on existing open space in some settlements	Need to ensure that existing open space is protected and enhanced, and adequate and readily accessible open space is provided through new development	In 2005/06 in Huntingdonshire there was 1.61ha of sports pitches available for public use per 1000 population	PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation, ODPM (2002)  Huntingdonshire District Council Open Space, Sports and Recreation Needs Assessment and Audit, PMP, (2006)
<b>Inclusive Communities</b>			
High average house prices are pricing key workers/first time buyers out of the area	Future development must include adequate affordable housing	In Huntingdonshire 50.4% of housing completions on eligible sites within the Cambridge Sub region were affordable and 42.8% of housing completions on eligible sites outside the Cambridge Sub region were affordable in	PPS3 (2006) states that local development documents should set a plan wide target for the amount of affordable housing to be provided  Proposed Changes to the draft East of England Plan (2006) sets out the regional housing provision. In Huntingdonshire the minimum additional number of homes to be achieved during April 2006 to March 2021 is 8,310. In order to be consistent with PPS3

*Sustainability Appraisal: Core Strategy Preferred Options*

		2005/06	<p>local planning authorities need to plan for a continuous supply of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption of housing allocation DPDs. It also stresses that opportunities for maximising higher growth rates should be taken.</p> <p>Huntingdonshire District Council Housing Strategy 2006-2011, HDC, (2006)</p> <p>Huntingdonshire Community Strategy (2004) stresses the need to provide housing that meets local needs</p>
<p>New development will need to be accommodated in sustainable settlements with good access to facilities and services</p>	<p>Need to ensure that access to facilities and services is taken into account when considering the scope for development in different locations</p>	<p>34.9% of rural households within Cambridgeshire were located within 13 minutes walk of an hourly or better public/community service in 2005/06</p>	<p>PPG13: Transport, DETR, (2001)</p> <p>Regional Transport Strategy, Proposed Changes to draft East of England Plan, (2006)</p> <p>Regional Transport Strategy, Development of Options Report, Faber Maunsell, EERA (2002)</p> <p>Huntingdonshire Community Strategy (2004) sets out a priority to work towards easy and affordable access to services and facilities</p>



<b>Sustainability Issue</b>	<b>Implications for Local Development Documents</b>	<b>Evidence base</b>	<b>Policy Context</b>
<b>Economic Activity</b>			
There is a high incidence of out commuting across the district and identified skills shortages among skilled and basic occupations.	Need to ensure employment provision is accommodated in sustainable locations and meets the needs of all groups	The 2001 Census results show that 35.3% of employed people living in the District commute out of the District to work	PPG13: Transport, DETR (2001)  Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan, 2006-2011 (CCC)  Huntingdonshire Community Strategy (2004) recognises the challenge of out commuting
The provision of employment development will need to be sustainably located so as to reduce the need to travel between work and home and provide local employment opportunities to help limit out commuting	Need to ensure employment provision is accommodated in sustainable locations and meets the needs of all groups	Across Huntingdonshire 529.87ha of employment land was available in 2005/06	PPG4: Industrial, commercial development and small firms, ODPM  Huntingdonshire Community Strategy identifies measures to help strengthen the vitality and viability of Huntingdonshire's economy through increasing investment and creating local employment opportunities  Huntingdonshire Employment Land Review (2007)

#### **The SA Objectives (Stage A4)**

- 3.9 The SA Objectives are separate to the Spatial Objectives of the Core Strategy although some overlap may occur and make up part of the SA Framework. Table 5 sets out the topic, sustainability appraisal objectives and decision aiding questions which are used when appraising options.
- 3.10 The SA Framework developed as part of the Scoping process (Appendix 1) has been used to assess the sustainability of each option. This Framework includes the SA objectives along with targets and indicators that make up part of the monitoring and review process.

3.11 It is important that the SA Framework reflects local circumstances that can be influenced by the new development planning system. The SA Objectives are used to appraise each policy or option, the detailed matrices for which can be found in Appendix 2 and summaries in section 4.

**Table 5: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives**

<b>Sustainability Topic/ SEA topic</b>	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision aiding questions</b>
Land, water and resources  <i>Soil and water</i>	1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it use land that has been previously developed?</li> <li>▪ Will it use land efficiently?</li> <li>▪ Will it protect the best and most versatile agricultural land?</li> </ul>
	2. Minimise the use of water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it reduce water consumption?</li> <li>▪ Will it conserve ground water resources?</li> </ul>
Biodiversity  <i>Biodiversity fauna and flora</i>	3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity & green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity & green infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it help achieve Biodiversity Action Plan targets?</li> <li>▪ Will it conserve species, reverse their decline, and help to enhance diversity?</li> <li>▪ Will it reduce habitat fragmentation?</li> <li>▪ Will it protect sites designate for their nature conservation interest?</li> </ul>
Landscape, townscape and archaeology  <i>Cultural heritage and landscape</i>	4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it protect or enhance sites, features or areas of historical, archaeological, or cultural interest (including conservation areas, listed buildings, historic parks and gardens and scheduled ancient monuments)?</li> <li>▪ Will it maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character?</li> <li>▪ Will it maintain and enhance the character of settlements?</li> </ul>
	5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality of design and use of sustainable construction methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it improve the satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods as places to live?</li> <li>▪ Will it lead to developments built to a high standard of design?</li> </ul>
Climate change and pollution	6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	Will it minimise risk to people and property from flooding, storm events or subsidence?

<i>Climate factors &amp; Air</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it improve the adaptability of buildings to changing temperatures?</li> </ul>
	7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (for example air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases?</li> <li>▪ Will it improve air quality?</li> <li>▪ Will it reduce traffic volumes?</li> <li>▪ Will it reduce levels of noise or noise concerns?</li> <li>▪ Will it reduce or minimise light pollution?</li> <li>▪ Will it reduce diffuse and point source water pollution?</li> </ul>
	8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it reduce household waste?</li> <li>▪ Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?</li> </ul>
	9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it increase accessibility to cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways?</li> <li>▪ Will it help improve the quality of cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways?</li> </ul>
	10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources?</li> </ul>
<i>Healthy communities</i>  <i>Population and human health</i>	11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it encourage healthy lifestyles, including travel choices?</li> </ul>
	12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it increase the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space?</li> <li>▪ Will it maintain and, where possible, increase the area of high quality green space in the district?</li> <li>▪ Will it protect and enhance open spaces of amenity and recreational value?</li> </ul>
	13. Reduce and prevent crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it reduce actual levels of crime?</li> <li>▪ Will it reduce the fear of crime?</li> <li>▪ Will it contribute towards a</li> </ul>

		cohesive community?
<p>Inclusive communities</p> <p><i>Population and human health</i></p>	<p>14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of local services and facilities including education, health, training and leisure opportunities)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it improve the availability of key local services and facilities, including health, education and leisure (shops, post offices, pubs etc.)?</li> <li>▪ Will it encourage engagement with community activities and increase the ability of people to influence decisions?</li> <li>▪ Will it improve accessibility by means other than the car?</li> <li>▪ Will it support and improve community and public transport?</li> </ul>
	<p>15. Redress inequalities related to gender, age, disability, race, faith, sexuality, location and income</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it improve relations between people from different backgrounds or social groups?</li> <li>▪ Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion for those areas and groups most affected?</li> <li>▪ Will it promote accessibility for all members of society, including the elderly and disabled?</li> </ul>
	<p>16. Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it support the provision of a range of house types and sizes, including affordable and key worker housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community?</li> <li>▪ Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?</li> <li>▪ Will it address the particular needs of the travelling community?</li> </ul>
<p>Economic activity</p> <p><i>Economic development</i></p>	<p>17. Improve access to satisfying work, appropriate to skills, potential and place of residence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it encourage businesses development?</li> <li>▪ Will it support the growth of sectors that offer scope to reduce out-commuting?</li> <li>▪ Will it improve access to employment, particularly by means other than the private car?</li> <li>▪ Will it encourage the rural economy and support farm diversification?</li> </ul>

	<p>18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Will it facilitate business development and enhance competitiveness?</li> <li>▪ Will it enable tourism opportunities to be exploited?</li> <li>▪ Will it support the vitality and viability of market town centres?</li> </ul>
--	--	---

## 4. Plan issues and options

### **Main strategic options and policies considered and how they were identified**

4.1 The range of options and alternative approaches was determined by the Council during plan development. The Council identified options considered relevant and appropriate, however the detailed content of the plan and its position in the wider plan structure limited the number of alternatives that were proposed. Specific constraints were:

- Strategic policy in the emerging East of England Plan eg housing targets
- National planning guidance (PPSs, PPGs and Circulars) – it was considered inappropriate to propose options that deviated from current practice
- Other plans and strategies which influenced the production of the Core Strategy (eg Sustainable Community Strategy – a full list of the review of relevant plans and policies can be found in Appendix 1).

4.2 The Council considered that these conditions therefore limited the number of policy areas for which it was possible to define relevant and appropriate alternative options. The development of policies (including alternative options considered and the results of public participation) is recorded in Volume Two of the Preferred Options report and should be read alongside this SA. The Initial SA of the Issues and Options paper assessed the reasonable alternatives considered appropriate at that stage of plan development and included in Appendix 4 is a summary of these assessments. The assessments of additional options from the Initial SA considered in *Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire* are included in Appendix 5. How the ISA informed the Preferred Options is included in Table 6 of this draft Final Sustainability Report.

### **Spatial Strategy Options**

4.3 Following analysis of the responses made during the Core Strategy Issues and Options consultation, it was decided that further engagement with key stakeholders was required in light of specific issues that were identified from the consultation responses – namely the vision, spatial strategy and the inclusion of an option for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show people. Subsequently, another consultation document entitled *Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire* was produced and consulted on with key stakeholders during

September 2007 in order to help the Council develop and refine its Preferred Spatial Strategy.

4.4 *Towards a Spatial Strategy For Huntingdonshire* set out a revised, more locally specific, Spatial Vision (including Spatial Principles) and Spatial Objectives (set out in Section 2 above) and outlined four spatial options based on the growth requirements set out in the draft East of England Proposed Changes and the requirements of PPS3<sup>12</sup>:

- Option A: Cambridge Sub Region focus
- Option B: Huntingdon area focus
- Option C: St Neots area focus
- Option D: Dispersed

4.5 Three additional options for growth were set out based on achieving a higher level of growth than the minimum allocation in the Proposed Changes draft East of England Plan

- Option 1: Enhanced Growth in the St Neots area
- Option 2: Enhanced Growth for the Cambridge Sub Region
- Option 3: A New Eco Town

4.6 These Additional Options were proposed on the basis of government guidance encouraging Local Authorities to “consider the case for higher growth in their areas.”<sup>13</sup> In identifying these additional options, the Council is demonstrating its commitment to tackle affordability problems for the benefit of existing and future residents of Huntingdonshire.

4.7 The Spatial Options presented in the document were worked out according to the District’s available land supply as set out in the Housing Land Availability Study (2007).

4.8 An option for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show people was also included in the document and will be included as a policy in future stages of the Core Strategy 2007 development as recommended in Circular 01/06.

4.9 The spatial options were the culmination of evidence gathering, continued stakeholder engagement and the results of the Initial SA. All of the options have been subject to an Initial SA.

<sup>12</sup> Proposed Changes to the draft East of England Plan (policy H1, GO- East 2006) sets, for Huntingdonshire, a minimum allocation of 11,200 homes to be built in the period 2001-2021 (of which 8,500 have already been built or committed). This equates to 560 homes per year. PPS 3 (para 53, DCLG, 2006) sets a requirement for Local Authorities to provide a housing supply for at least 15 years from the date of DPD adoption (which the Council anticipate to be 2009). The Proposed Changes advises that the annual housing requirement be used for the early years after 2021. The four Spatial Options (A-D) are therefore based on the requirement of 5450 homes to be built before 2026.

<sup>13</sup> Paragraph 30, Eco Town Prospectus, DCLG 2007

### **Preferred Spatial Strategy Option**

- 4.10 On the basis of the ISA and following analysis of consultation responses for *Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire* the Preferred Option for the Spatial Strategy forms a hybrid of two options – Huntingdon area focus and St Neots focus. This option has been taken forward into the Preferred Options report. It ensures a continual housing supply and maximises all available brownfield land around the Huntingdon area. Housing growth directed towards St Neots – the large scale Greenfield extension – will be of a sufficient scale to generate substantial benefits for the communities of St Neots, not just the development area. Although this relies on Greenfield development, it is in a highly sustainable location, adjacent to the railway line and near to the proposed High Quality Public Transport Corridor along the A428. It also makes best use of all available brownfield land within the built up framework of St Neots. Growth in Key Service Centres is limited to that which is considered the most sustainable and accessible, with the most development being directed towards Fenstanton.
- 4.11 The Preferred Option identifies four spatial planning areas which are made up of market towns and nearby settlements with which they have a close functional relationship:
- Huntingdon Spatial Planning area – Huntingdon, Brampton and Godmanchester
  - St Neots Spatial Planning area – St Neots and Little Paxton
  - St Ives Spatial Planning area – the town of St Ives and development south of London Road, St Ives
  - Ramsey and Bury Spatial Planning area – Ramsey, Bury and RAF Upwood
  - Key service centres capable of accommodating a proportion of strategic growth are also identified including Fenstanton, Sawtry and Yaxley
  - In other key service centres, outside of Spatial Planning areas – namely Buckden, Kimbolton, Little Paxton, Somersham and Warboys - moderate development will be acceptable on appropriate sites within built up areas.
- 4.12 The Preferred Spatial Strategy, in terms of identifying spatial priorities for employment and retail development, has largely been dictated by the Employment Land Review and Retail Assessment Study. These studies both contain rational evidence based on assessments of market demand and spare capacity. The Preferred Option concentrates the majority of employment growth towards:
- Huntingdon spatial planning area – primarily accommodated through mixed use development in brownfield locations, some Greenfield development is directed towards Godmanchester.
  - St Neots spatial planning area – Greenfield development as part of large scale, mixed use development to the east of the town.
  - St Ives spatial planning area – no strategic growth identified. Instead there will be a reliance on existing commitments and windfalls.

- Ramsey and Bury spatial planning area – primarily provided through mixed use developments on brownfield land.
- Key service centres outside spatial planning areas – growth proposed for Yaxley on brownfield land.

The majority of retail development (comparison floorspace) is distributed evenly between Huntingdon and St Neots, to be accommodated within the town centres and as mixed use Greenfield development for St Neots. A lesser degree of comparison floorspace is directed towards St Ives, to be accommodated within the town centre and some convenience floorspace to be accommodated in town centres across the District.

#### **Rejection of spatial options**

- 4.13 The appraisal process can only give an indication of likely effects and therefore can only present a limited judgement on the sustainability of each option. However, from the appraisal process of *Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire*, Options B (Huntingdon area focus) and Option C (St Neots focus) scored consistently well throughout the appraisal compared to Option A and Option D both of which scored less well; the latter of these was considered to be the least sustainable option.
- 4.14 Each option makes the best use of brownfield land available in the District, as identified in the Housing Land Availability Study (2007). It is recognised that in all options there is a reliance on Greenfield sites to some degree, with this being most prevalent in Option C. Nevertheless, only the most sustainable Greenfield sites are proposed and, in the case of Option C, Greenfield development may bring significant benefits in terms of providing opportunities to improve green infrastructure and biodiversity as well as community benefits.
- 4.15 Options B and C are the options which set out growth that minimises flood risk. Other options are very reliant on a high proportion of growth in high flood risk areas, particularly St Ives.
- 4.16 Growth in the District will help facilitate provision of affordable housing – the large scale of growth proposed in Option C will be important to ensuring affordable housing provision as well as community benefits as well for the people of St Neots. Despite other options being reliant on smaller sites coming forward, it is considered that the thresholds for affordable housing provision will be such that all options could contribute to the provision of affordable housing.
- 4.17 The options presented in *Towards A Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire* all included diagrams which were intended to indicate the scale and distribution of housing, employment and retail growth. The scale and distribution of employment and retail development were based on the results of the Employment Land Review (ELR) (2007) and Retail Assessment Study 2005 and Update 2007. Both documents carried out very thorough and rational assessments of the employment and retail markets in the District.
- 4.18 For the reasons outlined above, the Preferred Spatial Strategy comprises a hybrid of Option B (Huntingdon area focus) and Option C (St Neots area focus) and ensures growth will be accommodated in the most sustainable way for the District.



**How the SA process influenced the Preferred Options DPD**

4.19 The SA process has had an ongoing input to the development of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report since the SA Scoping consultation. The following table sets out how the mitigation measures that were proposed in the Initial SA of the Core Strategy Issues and Options have been taken into account in the Preferred Options Report.

**Table 6: How the ISA influenced development of the Preferred Options DPD**

Findings of ISA			
Policy Area	Proposed Mitigation Measure	Incorporated into Preferred Options Y/N? (Where in Preferred Options?)	Commentary
Spatial Vision	Suggests additional wording to including minimising flood risk, promoting renewable energy use and the need to improve cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways.	Y (Spatial Vision)	The Spatial Vision included in <i>Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire</i> has been taken forward into the Preferred Options report. The vision was revisited in light of consultation response to Issues and Options. The vision proposed is more locally distinctive. The suggestions made in the ISA for <i>Towards a Spatial Strategy</i> have not been included in the preferred approach as they are too specific to be incorporated into a high level, strategic spatial vision.
Spatial Principles	These were not included in the Issues and Options paper but were included in <i>Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire</i> . The ISA suggests that reference should be given to minimising flood risk, maximising renewable energy	Y (Spatial Principles)	The Spatial Principles indicate the direction that more detailed policies of the Core Strategy will take. They were included in <i>Towards a Spatial Strategy</i> in light of responses received from

	sources and improving cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways.		Issues and Options consultation. The principles should be read alongside the vision as they provide spatial detail. To clarify the relationship between the vision and principles the document was reordered so that they followed on from each other.
Spatial Objectives	The ISA of <i>Towards a Spatial Strategy</i> suggested that there may be possible compatibility issues raised between some of the Plan Objectives and some of the SA Objectives. Overall the assessment was largely positive.	Y (Spatial Objectives)	The Spatial Objectives have been carried forward into the Preferred Options report. The order of the objectives presented in the Issues and Options paper has been changed to reflect local conditions and additional objectives added than those included in <i>Towards a Spatial Strategy</i> .
Sustainable development	Suggests the careful wording of policy will be required in order to maximise benefits.	Y (P1)	The policy wording has been made substantially more detailed and clearly sets out how development proposals will be expected to achieve sustainable development – it covers the three pillars of sustainable development – social, environmental and economic issues.
<b>Distribution and scale of unallocated housing growth</b>			
Settlement hierarchy	The appraisal implied that the preferred policy should be taken from either option 9 (outlines a settlement hierarchy based on current size and accessibility to services) or contain additional layers in which development could be focused. It identified the	Y (P2)	Although no specific mitigation measure was referred to, the appraisal intimated that the settlement hierarchy should be based on current size and accessibility as it

	reasonable alternative based on the physical capacity of settlements to accommodate growth as being the least sustainable.		presents the most sustainable option. This has been taken forward into the preferred option and the hierarchy is clearly set out identifying market towns, key service centres and smaller settlements as well as the scale of growth that will be permitted in each category of the hierarchy
Scale of housing growth	Suggests that the favoured approach should define the scale of unallocated housing growth in terms of major, moderate, minor or infill	Y (P2)	Taken forward into the Preferred Options. Policy clearly sets out definitions for each category. The reasonable alternative presented in the ISA proposed more restrictive categories of growth which would result in less flexibility in relating the scale of growth to the settlement hierarchy.
<b>Distribution of allocated housing growth</b>			
Spatial planning areas	Identification of spatial planning areas for allocated growth	Y (P3)	The use of spatial planning areas was favoured over allocations focused only in market towns. The spatial planning areas are clearly described and scale of growth anticipated for each area clearly set out
Key service centres	Suggests that development should be distributed across all key service centres opposed to limiting development to settlements which have recently received high levels of growth	Y (P3)	Distributing growth across key service centres in proportion to their size and facilities is the most sustainable policy approach as it reduces the need for people to travel

<b>Affordable housing provision</b>			
Targets	Identifies the 40% target for affordable housing provision across the District as being a realistic target that could contribute significantly to the provision of affordable housing.	Y (P4)	Taken forward as the Preferred Option in combination as well as identifying thresholds on which affordable housing provision will be sought
Thresholds	Doesn't identify any one threshold above another but suggests that there are a number of viability issues with having a threshold of 3 in areas outside Market Towns and Key Service Centres.	Y (P4)	Threshold of 15 dwellings taken forward into Preferred Option. Preferred approach combines the affordable housing target and thresholds which includes provision for affordable housing on sites of 3 or more dwellings in areas outside of the market towns and key service centres in order to reflect the need and type of development likely to take place in rural areas.
Rural exceptions housing	Identifies that such a policy offers flexibility in affordable housing provision and benefits to offering opportunities for local people to remain in their local communities rather than having to move away as they can't afford to live in their local community.	Y(P5)	Policy has been taken forward into the Preferred Options. Policy approach clearly sets out the exceptional circumstances in which rural exceptions housing will be permitted.
<b>Employment growth</b>			
Overall scale and distribution of employment growth	Identifies the favoured policy approach as planning for a lower scale of employment land provision which acknowledges the constraints of climate change and availability of local labour	Y (P7)	The policy approach taken forward into the Preferred Options report is the result of evidence provided from the Employment Land Review. This indicates that Huntingdonshire should plan for 82ha of employment land before 2026. The policy clearly sets out where this

			development will take place using the spatial planning areas identified in P3. It is consistent with both the settlement hierarchy and housing distribution policies (P2 and P3).
<b>Retail development</b>			
Retail Scale	Suggests that there may not be the market demand for a higher target than that identified in the Study and, although a lower target would place less development pressure on open space, it would not sustain a buoyant, competitive economy. The targets for floorspace provided in the Retail Assessment Study are considered the most accurate on which to plan for.	Y (P8)	The target of 20,000sqm <sup>2</sup> comparison and 4,000sqm <sup>2</sup> convenience is taken forward into the Preferred Options.
Retail Distribution	No real indication given. Suggests that distributing the majority of growth towards Huntingdon (option 24) will meet market preference and enhance its competitiveness against higher order centres, yet distributing growth more evenly between Huntingdon, St Neots and St Ives (option 25) the resulting benefits will be distributed more evenly.	Y (P8)	A permutation of Option 25 was taken forward into the Preferred Options. Comparison floorspace is distributed evenly between Huntingdon and St Neots with a lesser scale towards St Ives and convenience to be distributed towards town centres across the District. The policy clearly sets out where growth will be concentrated and directs it in most instances towards town centres.
<b>Other strategic areas</b>			
Areas of Strategic Greenspace Enhancement	Identifies the option as being sustainable.	Y (P9)	Taken forward into Preferred Options. Policy defines specific areas and action to promote biodiversity and

*Sustainability Appraisal: Core Strategy Preferred Options*

			landscape and recreational value. Reinforced by the inclusion of a diagram illustrating the main green infrastructure areas and corridors across the District.
Infrastructure requirements	Indicates that the option is sustainable and socially just. However, suggests that the policy will need to be carefully worded to ensure it is clear what contributions will be required and to ensure these maximise the impact in SA objectives.	Y (P10)	Taken forward into Preferred Options. The policy approach clearly identifies types of infrastructure on which contributions may be sought. To be supported by a Planning Contributions SPD.
Energy use	Suggests that the viability of measures will need to be carefully considered	N	Not considered to be a strategic level policy consistent with other Core Strategy policies. Refinement of this policy and its future development will occur within the Development Control policies DPD.
Re-using military sites	Proposals for the re-use of military sites will need to take into account how accessible these are and the impact development would have on features within the site and on the surrounding area	N	The re-use of military sites as potential eco-towns was taken forward into <i>Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire</i> . This option has been deferred until the review of the East of England Plan is underway
Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show people	Following an analysis of consultation responses and government guidance this policy has been transferred from the Development Control Policies DPD into the Core Strategy.	N/A	Including a policy for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the Core Strategy is consistent with government guidance. Further guidance will be given in a Gypsy and Traveller Sites DPD.

**Comparison of the social, environmental and economic effects of the Preferred Policies:**

- 4.20 Each policy carries with it social, environmental and economic effects, some of which may be similar and overlap, and others may differ considerably. Appendix 2 provides a detailed matrix which appraises the social, environmental and economic effects of each policy. Each effect has been assessed using the SA Framework, in particular the decision aiding questions. The following section provides a summary of the main social, environmental and economic effects and how they compare.
- 4.21 In summary the assessments of each policy are overwhelmingly positive and no draft policy is considered unsustainable. It is recognised that in absolute terms any form of development will have impacts upon some of the SA Objectives – primarily minimising the use of water and reducing waste generation, throughout the assessments these have been assessed as having a largely neutral effect as to some degree they can be mitigated and addressed by implementation of emerging Development Control Policies DPD and other Council initiatives.
- 4.22 The Preferred policies have been formulated from extensive consultation and assessment. The mitigation measures proposed in the ISA of the Issues and Options have largely been taken forward into each policy through re-wording. The detailed assessments of the Preferred Policies (Appendix 2) in some cases require only minor policy wording changes. There is a section in volume one of the Preferred Options report which details the proposed Implementation and Monitoring Framework.
- 4.23 The following table summaries the main social, environmental and economic effects identified through detailed assessment of each policy.

**Table 7: Main social, economic and environmental effects of draft policies**

Policy approach	Effects		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<i>Spatial Vision</i> Provides the overarching goals that the Core Strategy policies will contribute to and sets out how the District will change till 2026	Seeks to improve the quality of life for residents and improve access to jobs and housing	Sets out a commitment to retain the predominantly rural identity of the District and improve green infrastructure	Looks to take advantage of the economic vitality of the Cambridge Sub Region
<i>Spatial Principles</i> Indicate the direction more detailed policy will take – are locally distinct	Sets spatial priorities for concentrating the majority of growth in the most sustainable market towns of St Neots, Huntingdon and St Ives and ensuring any growth	Concentrates growth towards brownfield locations  Where Greenfield development is necessary, directs	Identifies opportunities for maximising retail development in the market towns and key service centres to strengthen the economy

	<p>in key service centres is sustainable and proportionate to size and facilities available</p> <p>Identifies opportunities for regeneration on St, Neots, Ramsey and Huntingdon</p>	<p>growth towards the most sustainable locations</p> <p>Emphasises the commitment to protecting and enhancing the countryside of the District and identifies specific areas for enhancement</p>	<p>Sets out priorities for employment development</p>
<p><b>Spatial Objectives</b></p> <p>Summarise key policy directions and provides the basis for monitoring framework</p>	<p>Emphasises the need to provide housing to meet local needs including affordable housing</p> <p>Emphasises the need to encourage healthy lifestyles through providing improved recreation opportunities and improvements to cycle routes and footpaths</p> <p>Emphasises the need for development to integrate with its setting and promotes local distinctiveness</p>	<p>Sets out objectives relating to conservation and enhancement of landscapes, habitats and species; conserving natural resources and reducing waste</p> <p>Emphasises the need to minimise flood risk and the effects caused by climate change</p>	<p>Includes objectives which emphasise the vitality and viability of the District's town centres</p> <p>Promotes rural development to provide local jobs</p> <p>Emphasises the need to facilitate local job creation to limit out commuting</p>
<p><b>Sustainable development</b></p> <p>Sets out criteria, against which proposals will be assessed, to promote achievement of sustainable development</p>	<p>Promotes social cohesion and the creation of attractive places that are accessible and safe</p> <p>Emphasises the need to limit travel and increase opportunities for sustainable modes of transport as part of promoting healthy lifestyles</p>	<p>Promotes the need to protect and enhance the natural and built environment to reflect local distinctiveness</p> <p>Seeks to reduce green - house gas emissions; make efficient use of land; preserve diversity of the District's towns and villages and promote the vitality of habitats and species</p>	<p>Reflects economic priorities set out in the spatial vision, principles and those in the SA Framework</p>
<p><b>Settlement Hierarchy:</b></p> <p>Sets out a framework to manage the scale of unallocated growth which</p>	<p>Concentrates development in larger settlements offering the best levels of services – this will help reduce the</p>	<p>Seeks to maximise brownfield development as far as possible by directed growth towards larger settlements</p>	<p>Enhances the vitality and viability of sustainable centres across the District</p> <p>Encourages employment</p>



	need to travel and ensure development is accessible		development in the most sustainable and accessible locations to help minimise out commuting
<p><i>Housing growth: distribution</i></p> <p>Defines spatial planning areas and where strategic growth will be accommodated across the District</p>	<p>Identifies spatial planning areas on the basis of relationships between settlements. This areas are the most sustainable locations in which to accommodate growth and have the best level of services and facilities which will help reduce the need to travel</p> <p>Strategic growth in each of the spatial planning areas will contribute to the provision of affordable housing, with development in the St Neots spatial planning area likely to facilitate provision of the highest level of affordable housing. Similarly, development in this spatial planning area will also create significant opportunities for contributions towards provision of infrastructure, although development in all the areas identified will facilitate contributions</p>	<p>In each of the spatial planning areas identified there are brownfield opportunities. Proposed growth in the St Neots spatial planning area has a high reliance on Greenfield development but also uses all available brownfield opportunities within St Neots</p> <p>Huntingdon spatial planning area makes the best use of land and uses all available brownfield opportunities within this area although does rely on a level of Greenfield development</p>	<p>The spatial planning areas facilitate the provision of retail and employment development in the most sustainable and accessible locations</p>
<p><i>Affordable housing</i></p> <p>Defines affordable housing, sets the target to be achieved across the District and the categories where it will be required</p>	<p>Primary objective – promotes the creation of diverse and mixed communities</p>	N/A	<p>Enables more people to live in the District which will help to sustain the economy (eg through Council Tax paid, monies spent)</p>
<p><i>Rural exceptions</i></p>	<p>Enables local people to</p>	<p>Scale of development is</p>	<p>Promotes the rural</p>

<p><i>housing</i></p> <p>Provides for affordable housing development in small rural communities subject to criteria</p>	<p>remain in their community</p> <p>Generates critical mass to sustain local services</p>	<p>likely to be small therefore environmental impacts are reduced</p>	<p>economy as it enables local people to work and live in their local community</p> <p>Helps to sustain local services</p>
<p><i>Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling showpeople</i></p> <p>Defines criteria to guide the provision of sites for this community</p>	<p>Prevents social exclusion of Gypsies and Travellers by providing pitches in appropriate locations</p> <p>Recognises the need to promote good relationships between settled communities and Traveller community</p> <p>Ensures provision of pitches in sustainable locations with good access by foot, cycle or public transport to services</p>	<p>Protects against inappropriate provision of pitches in areas of flood risk and on adjoining land uses/landscape value</p>	<p>Promotes opportunities for the traveller community to contribute to the economy</p>
<p><i>Employment growth</i></p> <p>Identifies the scale of employment growth to be achieved and defines spatial priorities for its provision</p>	<p>Directs employment provision to the most sustainable and accessible locations in the District (concentrating growth in St Neots and Huntingdon spatial planning areas) thereby limiting out commuting</p> <p>Encourages creation of sustainable, mixed communities – majority of growth is to be provided as part of mixed use development within St Neots and Huntingdon spatial planning areas</p> <p>Provides opportunities</p>	<p>Promotes brownfield employment development . Where Greenfield development is necessary it's directed towards the most sustainable and accessible locations</p>	<p>Primary objective – provision of local employment opportunities strengthens the District's economy and helps limit out-commuting</p>

	for regeneration		
<i>Retail growth</i> Identifies the scale of comparison and convenience floorspace and determines spatial priorities for distribution	Directs development towards town centres which will enhance the diversity of uses and contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities	Minimises Greenfield development as growth is directed towards town centres – where Greenfield development will occur it is in the most sustainable and accessible locations	Enhances the vitality and viability of town centres and increases competitiveness (of Huntingdon) against other higher order centres eg Cambridge
<i>Areas of Strategic Greenspace Enhancement</i> Identifies areas for enhancement and determines the action to promote landscape, ecological and recreational value in these areas	Provides recreational opportunities to promote healthy lifestyles  Enhances areas of Greenspace and improves accessibility which contributes to physical and psychological well being	Primary objective – promotes habitat creation, biodiversity and green corridors	Provides opportunities for tourism
<i>Infrastructure Requirements</i> Identifies appropriate forms of infrastructure for which contributions may be sought as part of development	Primary objective	Primary objective	N/A

## 5. Implementation

### Monitoring proposals

- 5.1 Current government guidance requires the draft Sustainability Report to make proposals for monitoring to detect the effects of plan policies. In practice the Council retains responsibility for monitoring the LDF and also the effect of individual DPD policies. Its monitoring plan cannot be finalised until the DPD has been adopted, and therefore our contribution at this stage is to propose an outline monitoring programme (see Appendix 6) based on the indicators listed in the Scoping Report, adapted to reflect any issues identified during the SA.
- 5.2 The initial monitoring framework relates to the Core Strategy only. A separate framework will be developed for the Development Control Policies DPD .

- 5.3 Separately, the Council is responsible for developing an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which monitors the extent to which local development documents are being achieved and targets being met. The SA Framework will be monitored through the AMR, thus the targets and indicators in the SA Framework are largely derived from the AMR.

## **6. Conclusions**

- 6.1 The key tensions revealed from the SA process to date is the need to accommodate growth that is sustainable in economic, social and environmental terms. The SA process has attempted to highlight particular areas where tensions may arise, such as the need to make efficient use of land and minimise Greenfield development against the fact that the District, due to its predominantly agricultural history, has a limited number of sustainable brownfield sites available.
- 6.2 The Preferred Policies have been assessed using the SA Framework and, taking account of the judgements and assumptions that are inherent in such assessments, have been found to be sustainable. The key area – the spatial strategy – has been influenced by consultation and accompanying ISAs. The preferred approach is one that identifies spatial planning areas for accommodating housing, employment and retail growth in the most sustainable locations and concentrates the majority of growth within the St Neots and Huntingdon spatial planning areas.
- 6.3 Throughout the plan there is a tangible commitment to manage growth in a sustainable manner that respects the characteristics of the District and promotes environmental issues. There is a policy which addresses Strategic Greenspace Enhancement as well as a strong commitment to protect and enhance the built and natural environment in the Sustainable Development policy. The Spatial Vision and a number of spatial objectives reflect strong environmental concerns. The environmental concerns are balanced against the economic vitality and opportunities that strategic growth can bring about. The preferred policies seek to manage these competing interests in a sustainable manner and reflect economic strategies at other local levels. Employment growth is directed towards the spatial planning areas of St Neots and Huntingdon which provide accessible locations that reduce the need to travel and can help limit the incidence of out commuting.
- 6.4 Finally, the Plan seeks to promote a high quality of life for residents and visitors to the District. The provision of affordable housing promotes diverse and mixed communities. This is a key priority of the Council identified in the emerging Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The Core Strategy, once adopted, will implement the spatial elements of the SCS. Concentrating strategic growth in sustainable settlements will facilitate the provision of affordable housing and also ensure that the need to travel is limited. The provision of affordable housing in rural areas is a key issue for the District and is promoted through the Rural Exceptions Policy.

Appendix 1: SA Framework

SEA/SA Topic	Sustainability Objectives	Indicators	Target
Land, water and resources	1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	% dwellings completed on previously developed land	↑
		Net density of dwellings completed on major sites	↑
	2. Minimise the use of water	Water use per household	No data available at present therefore no target can be set
Biodiversity	3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure	% SSSIs in favourable or unfavourable recovering condition	↑
		Progress in achieving priority BAP targets	No data available at present therefore no targets can be set
Landscape, townscape and archaeology	4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	a) % listed buildings at risk all grades	↓
		b) % grade I and II* listed buildings and scheduled monuments at risk	
	5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	% of major housing sites meeting local 'Building for Life' standards	No data at present therefore targets cannot be set
Climate change and pollution	6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	Number of planning permissions granted contrary to advice of EA on either defence grounds or water quality	↓
	7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (for example air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	Air Quality a) Annual average concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide (ug/m3) b) Days when fine particle concentration found to be in bandings 'moderate' or higher (days)	↓

	8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	% household waste collected which is recycled	↑
		Household waste collected per person per year (kg)	
Climate change and pollution (cont)	9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways)	Vehicle flows across urban boundaries	↓
	10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies	% of predicted energy requirement from on site renewable energy technology on major developments	Data not currently available therefore targets cannot be set at present
Healthy communities	11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	% of residents with limiting long term illness	↓
	12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	Ha of strategic open space per 1,000 people	↑
	13. Reduce and prevent crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	% crime per 1000 population	↓
		% of residents feeling safe or fairly safe outside in local area after dark	↑
Inclusive communities	14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including, education, health, transport and leisure opportunities)	% parishes (or urban wards) with access to: (a) general store; (b) surgery; (c) primary school	↑
		% of rural households within 800 meters of an hourly or better bus service	↑
		% adults who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area	↑
		Pupil teacher ratios	↑

	15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	% residents who feel the local community is somewhere where people from different backgrounds can live harmoniously	↑
		a) % population in wards within most deprived 25% nationally b) Average IMD score 2004	↓
	16. Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing	% dwellings completed that are 'affordable'	↑
Economic activity	17. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	Unemployment rate, % (male & female)	↓
		% residents aged 16-74 in employment working within 5km of home, or at home	↑
	18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	Annual net increase (or decrease) in VAT registered firms, %	↑
		Economic activity rate, % (male & female)	↑

**Appendix 2: Detailed assessment sheets: Draft Policies**

**Key:**

**+** Positive effect

**-** Negative effect

**?** Uncertain effect

~ Neutral

An indication of whether the effect may be short, medium or long term (as defined in section 1) is given in the commentary where appropriate.

**Detailed assessment sheets for Spatial Vision and Spatial Principles**

<b>Policy: Spatial Vision</b>		
<b>Summary of policy approach:</b> Taking account of challenges and opportunities for the District the vision sets out how the District will change up to 2026.		
	<b>Vision Principles and</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Impact</b>	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	<b>+</b>	The spatial vision states that development will be incorporated in a sustainable manner. The spatial principles reinforce this by specifying that the majority of development will be directed towards the market towns and opportunities to maximise use of PDL will be encouraged.
2. Minimise use of water	~	No reference is made to minimising the use of water in either the vision or principles. It is considered that meeting this SA Objective will be dependent upon pursuing a coordinated programme of measures (e.g. changes to the Building Regulations) as well as implementation of emerging Development Control policies.
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure.	<b>+</b>	A commitment to enhance green infrastructure and opportunities to promote biodiversity is made within the Vision and is supported by the Principles which sets out how this may be achieved. The need to improve opportunities for green infrastructure and biodiversity is a key priority of the Core Strategy and will be supported by emerging Development Control policies.



4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including the archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	+	Reference is made to the need to retain the predominantly rural identity of the District in the Vision; this is supported, in part, by the Spatial Principles which identify a need to improve the quality of place in the District and protect separate identities of villages.
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	~	No explicit reference is given to ensuring the use of sustainable construction methods. However, the importance of the public realm and the need to improve quality of place is recognised.
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	~	No reference is made to managing and minimising flood risk in either the Spatial Vision or Spatial Principles. Reference is made to accommodating growth in a sustainable manner and sustainable locations, which would include minimising flood risk. There is a specific Spatial Objective relating to the need to minimise flood risk.
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (eg air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	+	There is an emphasis on reducing the need to travel by locating development in sustainable locations and improving public transport which may help reduce associated air pollution. However, there is no reference to improvements to cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways which also have associated benefits for green infrastructure in tackling habitat fragmentation as well as health benefits by encouraging people to exercise. No mention of other pollutants eg water or soil.
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	~	No reference is made to reducing waste and encouraging re-use and recycling in either the vision or principles.
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	+	Emphasis is placed on the need to reduce the need to travel by locating development in sustainable locations and improving public transport in the Spatial Principles. The extent to which making improvements to public transport is within the remit of planning at District level is questionable. No reference is made to improving cycle routes, footpaths or bridleways.
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~	No reference is made to renewable technologies in either the Spatial Vision or Spatial Principles.
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	+	There is a clear emphasis on improving the quality of life for residents in Huntingdonshire, as well as a commitment to improving opportunities for recreation and green infrastructure/biodiversity which impacts upon health in the Spatial Principles. Additional emphasis on improving cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways will also promote healthy lifestyles and help encourage sustainable

		travel choices.
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	+	There is a clear commitment to improving opportunities for people to access through wildlife, particularly through improving green infrastructure and areas of enhancement. Improving opportunities for recreation (including publicly open space) are also emphasised in the Spatial Principles.
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	~	No reference is made to reducing crime, anti-social behaviour and fear of crime. However, there are limited opportunities to achieve this within the planning system.
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including health and education)	+	There is a clear commitment to improving accessibility to services, and facilities in the Spatial Vision. This is reinforced in the Spatial Principles by promoting growth in the market towns (well serviced by facilities and existing infrastructure) and key service centres with a good level of services.
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	+	By promoting sustainable growth consideration is given to redressing a number of inequalities that are in the remit of the planning system eg provision of affordable housing and ensuring adequate access for all.
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	+	This is a key priority for the Council as emphasised in the Spatial Principles and emerging Sustainable Community Strategy as well as Growing Success the Council's Corporate Plan.
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	+	Key priority for the Council which is reinforced within the Spatial Vision and Spatial Principles.
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	Improving the economic vitality is a key priority and is emphasised in both the Spatial Vision and Spatial Principles.
<p><b>Summary:</b> The spatial vision and spatial principles are sustainable and reflect local context. They set out the key challenges posed to the District and the opportunities that may arise till 2026 and sets out a sustainable way in which to accommodate the growth whilst protecting and enhancing the District's landscape character and ecology. The economic opportunities arising from growth are identified. However, no reference is made to the need to manage flood risk, the need to improve cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways, promote renewable technologies, reduce waste and encourage recycling and reduce crime.</p>		
<p><b>Proposed changes:</b> Include reference to managing flood risk, improving cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways, reducing crime and waste in the Spatial Principles.</p>		

Compatibility matrix SA Objectives and Core Strategy Spatial Objectives

✓ Potentially compatible  
 ✗ Potentially incompatible  
 ? Uncertain – potentially compatible or incompatible  
 ~ No links

<b>SA Objectives</b>	1	?	~	~	~	✓	?	~	✓	✓	✓	~	✓	✓	~	~
	2	?	~	~	?	~	?	~	~	~	~	~	✓	~	~	~
	3	?	~	~	~	~	?	~	✓	✓	~	~	✓	~	✓	~
	4	✓	~	~	~	✓	?	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	~	~	~	~
	5	~	✓	~	~	✓	~	?	✓	~	✓	✓	✓	✓	~	~
	6	?	~	~	~	~	?	~	~	~	~	~	~	✓	~	~
	7	✓	~	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	✓	✓	✓	~
	8	?	~	~	?	~	?	~	~	~	~	~	✓	~	~	~
	9	✓	~	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	✓	~
	10	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	?	~	✓	~	~	~
	11	✓	~	~	~	✓	~	~	~	✓	~	~	~	✓	✓	~
	12	✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	✓	✓	✓	~	~	~	✓	✓
	13	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	✓	~	~
	14	✓	~	~	✓	✓	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	✓
	15	~	✓	✓	✓	~	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	~	✓	~	✓
	16	~	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	✓
	17	~	~	~	✓	✓	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	✓
	18	~	~	~	✓	✓	✓	✓	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
<b>Core Strategy Preferred Options Spatial Objectives</b>																

**Commentary:**  
 The compatibility matrix revealed that, overall, the objectives have a positive relationship or no identified links. However, a number of questions regarding compatibility may arise between certain objectives. These relate primarily to minimising water, reducing waste and energy consumption. Although these aspects will be mitigated against through the emerging Development Control policies, all development will result in an increase for each area.

Other uncertain effects relate to facilitating business development in rural areas against the objective to minimise Greenfield development. Rural development implies use of Greenfield land however, the scale will be small and potential impacts reduced. Uncertain relationships have also been identified between enhancing key services, including communications and protecting the built environment and creating an attractive environment. Balancing this relationship will depend upon the type of services – in particular communications – to be developed.

**SA Objectives**

1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value
2. Minimise use of water
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (inc archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality of design and use of sustainable construction methods
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gasses and other pollutants
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport
10. Maximise the use of renewable technologies
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and fear of crime
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities
15. Redress inequalities, related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to skills, potential and place of residence
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy

**Core Strategy Preferred Options Spatial Objectives**

1. To enable required growth to be accommodated in locations which limit the need to travel, while catering for local needs
2. To ensure that the types of dwellings built are suited to the requirements of the local population, and that an appropriate proportion is 'affordable' to those in need
3. To enable specialist housing needs of particular groups to be met in appropriate locations
4. To facilitate business development in sectors that have potential to meet local employment needs and limit out commuting
5. To strengthen the vitality and viability of Huntingdonshire's town centres as places for shopping and leisure
6. To enable business development in rural areas, in locations and on a scale which helps to provide local jobs, limits commuting and avoids adverse environmental impacts
7. To maintain and enhance the availability of key services and facilities including communications services
8. To maintain, enhance and conserve Huntingdonshire's characteristic landscapes, habitats and species
9. To identify opportunities to increase and enhance major strategic greenspace
10. To conserve and enhance the special character and separate identities of Huntingdonshire's villages and market towns
11. To ensure that design of new development integrates effectively with its setting and promotes local distinctiveness
12. To promote developments that conserve natural resources, minimise greenhouse gas emissions and help to reduce waste
13. To secure developments which are accessible to all potential users, and which minimise risks to health as a result of crime (or fear of crime), flooding or pollution and climate change
14. To increase opportunities for pursuing a healthy lifestyle, by maintaining and enhancing recreation opportunities and encouraging walking and cycling
15. To provide a framework for securing adequate land and infrastructure to support business and community needs

<b>Policy 1: Sustainable Development</b>		
<b>Summary of Option:</b> Plan policies will conform to a set of stated sustainable development policies.		
	<b>P1: Sustainable development</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<b>SA Objective</b>	Impact	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	+	
2. Minimise use of water	+	
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure.	+	Green infrastructure or biodiversity not explicitly mentioned but assumed to be supportive as enhancing the range of characteristic habitats and species is linked.
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including the archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	+	
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	+	
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	+	
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (eg air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	+	
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	+	
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	+	

10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	?	Not specifically mentioned, assumed to be implicitly supportive as minimising the use of non-renewable energy sources and curtailing greenhouse gas emissions are key priorities.
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	?	Not specifically mentioned however, increasing opportunities to make journeys by foot or cycle is a key priority which would also help encourage healthy lifestyles.
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	?	Not specifically mentioned but 'creating places that are attractive' is implicitly assumed to include open and green spaces as well. Open space is an important element in maintaining health and wellbeing so contributes directly to the social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	+	Ensuring places are safe and accessible for all is linked to the need to reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and fear of crime.
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including health and education)	+	Increasing the diversity of towns and villages will ensure a range of services and facilities.
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	?	Not mentioned explicitly but delivered through support for social cohesion.
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	?	Not mentioned specifically but assumed to be delivered through support for social cohesion.
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	?	No specific mention of sustainable economic growth including access to work or improving the competitiveness and vitality of the economy.
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	?	As above.
<p><b>Summary:</b> The policy is strongly sustainable in areas of protection of the natural and built environment and these will contribute to other objectives of creating more sustainable communities. However, social cohesion is mentioned only in brief without any support statement as to how this should be achieved and no mention is given to promoting economic growth. The difference in assessment relates to the extent the policy directly quotes or is linked to the objective. The policy is therefore explicitly sustainable in the majority of areas – specifically those relating to environmental objectives however, is less so in terms of social or economic objectives, some of which are not explicitly referenced.</p>		
<p><b>Proposed changes:</b> Consideration should be given to ensuring criteria relating to social and economic objectives are more explicit, reflecting the wording of the SA objectives to ensure that there is more consistency which better reflect the three areas of sustainable development.</p>		

<b>Policy 2: Settlement Hierarchy</b>		
<b>Summary of option:</b> Proposes a hierarchy of settlements based on current size and ease of access to existing services and amenities, and establishes priorities for the expansion of unallocated housing and employment within the District.		
	<b>Policy 2: Settlement Hierarchy</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<b>SA Objective</b>	Impact	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	+	In supporting text it is recognised that concentrating development in larger settlements will help minimise Greenfield development in unsustainable locations. Specific mention is made of other areas classified as countryside which will be severely restricted in terms of development and which is deemed essential only.
2. Minimise use of water	~	
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure.	~	Not a primary aim of this objective.
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including the archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	?	Impact depends on design and location of development with respect to protecting and enhancing the distinctiveness of the built environment.
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	~	Not a primary aim of this objective. However, this policy will direct development to create a critical mass of services making communities more self sustaining. Meeting this SA Objective will also be dependent upon policy relating to sustainable development and emerging development control policy relating to design. Effects should build in the long term as communities become established although the supply of brownfield land (already limited) will decrease over time.
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	~	Managing and minimising flood risk will be dependent upon implementation of emerging Development Control policy on flood risk and having regard to national and regional policy.

7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (eg air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	+	Cumulative benefit if amenities and services are available centrally and in easy reach of more of the population, reducing trips between towns in the district, and to Peterborough and Cambridge. Effect will improve over time as improvements are made to the District's town centres (particularly Huntingdon as the principal centre) which may help obviate the need to travel to higher order centres eg Bedford.
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	~	(Development will increase waste though this policy primarily defines location.)
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	+	As for SA Objective 7.
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~	
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	~	
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	?	Directing development into existing towns may create pressure to meet open space targets while also achieving (for example) housing densities. Needs to be addressed in negotiations over infrastructure requirements and design detail.
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	~	
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including health and education)	+	
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	+	Aims to improve local access to services and amenities for those without a car by concentrating development in settlements with a good range of services.
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	+	Housing type and price not addressed directly but in conjunction with emerging policies on thresholds, it is likely that a proportion of affordable housing can be achieved as development is concentrated in settlements where large and moderate schemes will be permitted.
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	+	Supports sustainability of market towns which should help to attract new employment while also reducing commuting journeys. Smaller centres probably will not benefit in the same way due to their size, though new employment in nearby market towns could reduce out-



		of-district commuting.
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	Aims to support vitality of market towns and also other settlements on a smaller scale.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy approach aims to steer development towards those locations where it will improve the sustainability and vitality of communities in proportion to their size and accessibility. Implicitly it aims to improve the attractiveness of the largest centres to reduce the loss of services and employment to Peterborough and Cambridge.		
<b>Proposed changes:</b> None – the negative effects can be addressed in planning controls particularly by the emerging development control policies.		

<b>Policy 3: Housing growth: distribution</b>										
<b>Summary of option:</b> defines spatial planning areas and where allocated growth will be accommodated across the District.										
	Huntingdon Spatial Planning Area	Commentary	St Neots Spatial Planning Area	Commentary	St Ives Spatial Planning Area	Commentary	Ramsey and Bury Spatial planning area	Commentary	Key Service centres	Commentary
<b>SA Objective</b>	Impact		Impact		Impact		Impact		Impact	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental /amenity value	+	Brownfield development is maximised within the Huntingdon are. The reliance on brownfield sites may mean development is more complex and delivery difficult due to constraints associated with brownfield development. There remains a reliance on Greenfield	+	High reliance on Greenfield development. However, this Greenfield development is considered to be highly sustainable and this option Provides suitable land for long term development which covers the plan period and beyond. Makes best use of all available brownfield opportunities in St	+	Fewer opportunities for brownfield development due to physical (smaller settlement) and environmental constraints (flooding) on St Ives. Makes best use of available brownfield land in sustainable locations. Greenfield development is directed towards very sustainable	+	Makes best use of available brownfield land in the most sustainable locations possible.	+	Makes the best use of brownfield land available in Key Service Centres. Greenfield development is limited to that which is considered to be in sustainable locations.

		development in order to achieve the RSS requirements and all known capacity is used in Huntingdon.		Neots.		locations – being on the route of the Guided Bus and close to the town centre.				
2. Minimise use of water	~		~		~		~		~	
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure.	?	Levels of growth proposed for Brampton may affect County Wildlife Sites particularly Grafham Water and/or Brampton Woods. Growth may impact upon a number of green infrastructure initiatives eg Godmanchester to Cambourne corridor as well Grafham Water to Abbots Ripton Corridor. Development may present opportunities to improve biodiversity value and green infrastructure (as cycle routes and footpaths are created alongside development all of which are important aspects of green infrastructure	?	The majority of growth is directed towards an area of low agricultural, ecological and landscape value. It is therefore unlikely that development would impact greatly upon areas of biodiversity. Nevertheless, the large scale development proposed to the east of the town is near to an existing Green corridor initiative (no 22) as well as the Ouse Valley to Cambourne Corridor and mitigation measures would need to be implemented to limit the impact upon these corridors. In this option there is still a fairly high proportion of growth proposed for the Huntingdon	?	Development in St Ives may have implications for the Ouse Valley area, as well as Fen Edge Project. However, growth in St Ives is limited due to environmental constraints on the settlement, therefore the impacts on green infrastructure will be reduced. Opportunities presented by development result in an improvement in biodiversity value and green infrastructure (as cycle routes and footpaths are created alongside development). These could be integrated into existing green infrastructure areas.	?	Growth proposed for Ramsey and Bury is limited; therefore effects on surrounding green infrastructure will be reduced. Important green infrastructure initiatives near to Ramsey and Bury include the Great Fen Project and the Fen Edge Project. Development does impact upon biodiversity and it is important that appropriate measures are taken to ensure any negative effects are limited and, where possible, benefits can be achieved through design and management of the area.	?	Effects are assumed to be reduced due to the limited levels of growth proposed. Development is also more dispersed which will reduce the effects on one particular area. Areas of green infrastructure that may be most impacted upon is the Ouse Valley and the Great Fen Project. However, there may be opportunities to enhance green infrastructure and biodiversity through development by, for example, creating cycle routes and

		and can help reduce habitat fragmentation).		area, particularly for Brampton, which may affect County Wildlife Sites in this area. The opportunities presented by development may in fact result in an improvement in biodiversity value and green infrastructure (as cycle routes and footpaths are created alongside development all of which are important aspects of green infrastructure and can help reduce habitat fragmentation).						footpaths as part of new development which is important to help reduce habitat fragmentation.
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including the archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high		Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon		Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the		Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the		Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the		Achievement of this SA objective is more

quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	~	the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.	~	implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.	~	implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.	~	implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.	~	dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	+	Development is directed away from areas of high flood risk.	+	Development is directed away from areas of high flood risk.	+	Although very constrained by flood risk, which limited the levels of growth that can occur in St Ives, development is directed away from areas of high flood risk.	+	Development is directed away from areas of high flood risk.	+	Development is directed away from areas of high flood risk.
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (eg air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	+	Development is centrally located, in highly sustainable locations well served by transport infrastructure. Most development is located on or near to the long term the Guided Busway which may help reduce congestion, encourage sustainable travel modes and reduce associated air pollution. Consideration will need to be	+	The majority of development is directed towards a sustainable location adjacent the railway line and near to the proposed A428 High Quality Public Transport Corridor. In the long term this may help encourage use of public transport and reduce congestion and air pollution. Consideration will need to be given to potential effects of development on the Air Quality Management	+	Development is located in sustainable locations on the route of the Guided Busway. In the medium and long term, once complete including on road priority measures to Huntingdon, this may help reduce traffic generation and air pollution.	?	Although development is directed towards the most sustainable locations in Ramsey and Bury, the town is relatively remote compared to other market towns in the District which may increase trip generation and associated air pollution.	?	Development is directed towards the most sustainable key service centres in terms of size and facilities. All the key service centres with growth allocated are served by transport links, albeit not as well serviced compared to market towns. Due to the limited transport infrastructure development

		given to potential effects of development on the Air Quality Management Areas in Huntingdon and Brampton.		Areas in St Neots.						may serve to increase dependency on the car and result in a potential increase in air pollution, although the scale of development proposed is limited. Consideration will need to be given to any potential effects on the Air Quality Management Area in Fenstanton.
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	~		~		~		~		~	
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	+	Development centrally located on or near to the route of the Guided Busway. In the medium term, once complete, this may encourage people to use sustainable modes of travel and reduce car dependency and traffic generation. Improved cycle,	+	Development located adjacent the railway line and, near to the proposed High Quality Public Transport Corridor along the A428. In the long term this may encourage people to use sustainable modes of travel and reduce car dependency and traffic generation. Improved cycle,	+	Development located on or near to the route of the Guided Busway. In the medium term, once complete, this may encourage people to use sustainable modes of travel and reduce car dependency and traffic generation. Improved cycle, footpath and bridleway links will also be	?	Despite development being directed towards the most sustainable locations in Ramsey and Bury, the town is relatively remote and has fairly poor transport infrastructure and services and facilities compared to other market towns.	?	Development is directed towards the most sustainable key service centres in terms of size and facilities. All the key service centres with growth allocated are relatively well served by transport links, particularly

		footpath and bridleway links will also be encouraged through development.		footpath and bridleway links will also be encouraged through development.		encouraged through development.				Fenstanton which is near to the Guided Busway. However, development may serve to increase dependency on the car and result in a potential increase in air pollution, although the scale of development proposed is limited.
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~		~		~		~		~	
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	+	The majority of growth is located near to or on the Guided Busway. In the medium and long term this may help encourage people to make sustainable travel choices and contribute to a reduction in trip generation by private car and air pollution which may reduce congestion and	~	Although located close to the East Coast Mainline railway, accessibility to health services, particular secondary services, is reduced as there are no secondary services, such as a hospital within the town and pressure may be exerted on existing health care services (eg GPs). However,	+	Accessibility to key destinations, such as the hospital will be improved in the long term once the Guided Busway is complete. Development will present opportunities to improve cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways as well as create new ones which may encourage healthier lifestyles.	?	Due to the remoteness of Ramsey and Bury accessibility to key destinations such as hospitals is poor. The scale of development proposed may also place pressure on existing primary care services. Opportunities may be provided through development, to improve cycle routes, footpaths	?	Accessibility to key destinations such as hospitals is reduced due to growth being dispersed. However, the levels of growth proposed for key services are limited. Pressure may be exerted on existing primary care

		improve health for those living close to busy roads. It makes use of existing infrastructure such as cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways and new development will provide opportunities to improve these and create new pedestrian routes. Much of the growth is proposed near to existing health services such as Hinchingbrooke Hospital and new development may offer opportunities to provide additional primary care services and improve existing services.		opportunities to incorporate new primary services will be provided by new development. The majority of growth is located near to the railway station which may encourage people to make sustainable travel choices and, in the longer term, near to the proposed High Quality Public Transport corridor along the A428 to Cambridge which may encourage use of public transport once proposals are confirmed. Development will also bring about opportunities to enhance existing cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways and create new ones.				and bridleways.		services.
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	?	Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for	?	Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for additional and enhanced open	?	Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for additional and enhanced open	?	Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for additional and enhanced open	?	Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions,

		additional and enhanced open space can be brought forward with development		space can be brought forward with development		space can be brought forward with development		space can be brought forward with development		opportunities for additional and enhanced open space can be brought forward with development
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	~		~		~		~		~	
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including health and education)	+	Development is centrally located close to a wide range of services. Development may also bring opportunities to provide additional services.	+	Development is centrally located close to a wide range of services. Development will bring opportunities for additional services to be provided and a district centre is proposed which will improve accessibility to services for residents.	+	Development is centrally located close to a wide range of services. It is also located on the route of the Guided Busway which, in the medium term, will further improve accessibility to higher order centres with a greater range of facilities such as Huntingdon and Cambridge. Development may also bring opportunities to provide additional services.	+	Developed located near to existing services and may also bring opportunities to provide additional services.	+	Developed located near to existing services and may also bring opportunities to provide additional services
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and		Makes use of existing social infrastructure. Long and medium term mitigation measures may involve the		The scale of development proposed and presence of physical barriers (eg railway) may create problems for integrating		Development in St Ives will be located on the route of the Guided Busway. In the medium term this will improve accessibility to key destinations and		Development may provide opportunities to help regenerate areas of Ramsey and Bury which have been a key priority of the		Higher levels of growth in key service centres across the district may help to combat the prevalence of rural



income	+	provision of additional services alongside development (particularly where new development is located adjacent existing areas of inequality). As growth is proposed on or near to Guided Busway this will improve accessibility to key destinations (eg health care) for those without a car.	~	residents of the new development into existing communities. This could be mitigated ensuring there are good physical access routes (eg cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways) over the railway as well as providing community benefits for the existing communities through developer contributions. There may be further issues arising from the proximity of the Gypsy and Traveller site to areas where development may be proposed.	+	employment for those without a car.	+	Ramsey Area Partnership.	+	inequalities by providing opportunities to improve range of services and accessibility to services
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	+	Key priority	+	Key priority	+	Key priority	+	Key priority	+	Key priority
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of	~		~		~		~		~	

residence										
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~		~		~		~		~	
<p><b>Summary:</b> All spatial planning areas are considered sustainable with the majority of the SA Objectives being met in a positive way. Growth is directed towards the most sustainable locations, with all available brownfield land used and where Greenfield development is necessary, it is achieved in the most sustainable locations in the District. Strategic growth in any of the spatial planning areas will impact upon biodiversity and green infrastructure. Any form of development will have an impact on biodiversity – even in brownfield locations which often sustain high levels of biodiversity. It will be important to ensure that any potential negative impacts are minimised and mitigated against. However, development will also provide opportunities to enhance biodiversity through, for example, design and landscaping. Similarly, the provision of cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways is an important part of Green infrastructure and provides ways to mitigate against habitat fragmentation. Accessibility to key destinations such as a hospital is slightly reduced in the St Neots Spatial Planning area as the town does not have its own hospital, similarly, St Ives does not have a hospital although in the medium term, once the Guided Busway is complete, accessibility to Hinchingsbrooke Hospital will be improved. Pressure may be placed on existing primary services, in all scenarios, although if development is of a sufficient scale it will generate the provision of additional services.</p> <p><b>Proposed changes:</b> None – the issues raised can be addressed by emerging development control policies relating to design and biodiversity and emerging Core Strategy policies relating to Greenspace enhancement which will help protect the green infrastructure areas that may be affected by development.</p>										

Policy 4: Affordable Housing		
<p><b>Summary of policy approach:</b> defines affordable housing and the categories where affordable housing provision will be appropriate. The policy also sets the affordable housing target for the District.</p>		
		<b>Commentary</b>
<b>SA Objective</b>	Impact	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	~	
2. Minimise use of water	~	

3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure.	~	
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including the archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	~	
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	+	By providing opportunities for diverse, mixed communities the vibrancy and vitality of an area will be enhanced. Protecting against segregation or clustering of affordable housing will be important to ensuring the creation of a high quality attractive environment.
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	~	
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (eg air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	~	Incorporation of energy saving and efficient devices may raise build costs, which may impact on provision of affordable housing. However, it is assumed that in the long term the cost of technologies will decrease and, coupled with increased incentives as the house building industry moves towards provision of carbon neutral homes by 2016, should not affect affordable housing provision.
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	~	
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	~	
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~	As for SA Objective 7.
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	+	Provision of a mix of housing, affordable to those on low incomes will improve living conditions and corollary health benefits for this sector of the population.
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	~	Neutral provided development conditions require provision of affordable housing and open space.
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	~	
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including health and education)	~	

15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	+	Primary objective.
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	+	Primary objective.
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	~	
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	
<b>Summary:</b> Addresses one of the key component of the government's policy on sustainable communities whilst reflecting local conditions. Further guidance is available in the SPD Developer Contributions Towards Affordable Housing.		
<b>Proposed changes:</b> None.		

Policy 5: Rural Exceptions Housing		
Summary of policy approach: provides for affordable housing development in small rural communities subject to strict criteria including sustainability and need.		
		Commentary
SA Objective	Impact	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	~	Suggests development may be permitted in Greenfield locations, although the scale is anticipated to be small and effects limited.
2. Minimise use of water	~	
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure.	~	
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including the archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	~	Effect assumed to be neutral as scale of development anticipated to be small and other control policies will promote high design, to ensure development is sympathetic to its surroundings.

5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	~	As above.
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	~	
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (eg air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	?	Small scale benefit if helps to ensure local people can work in the local area. However, it may have a very slight effect on increasing trip generation by private car if residents work outside of the local community. Scale of development is likely to be very small so this effect will be limited.
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	~	
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	?	See SA Objective 7.
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~	Cost of providing affordable housing and the small size of developments expected may impact upon the viability of developers using renewable energy sources and technologies. This issue is likely to decrease in the long term as the cost of technologies reduces.
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	~	
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	~	
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	~	
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including health and education)	+	Potentially positive effect as development may provide the critical mass required to sustain and maintain provision of local services.
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	+	Key objective of this policy is to reduce rural inequalities.
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	+	Primary objective.

17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	~	May have a slightly positive effect if local residents are able to access local employment opportunities within or very near to their local community.
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	As above – also development may generate the critical mass needed to improve and sustain local services thereby improving vitality and viability of small rural village services.
<b>Summary:</b> This policy approach is sustainable and reflects local conditions. By providing opportunities for local people to live in affordable houses and work in rural communities it will reduce the need for people to live in larger settlements away from their family and employment opportunities. Provision of affordable housing based on need may also help generate the critical mass needed to sustain local services thereby improving the vitality of the rural economy.		
<b>Proposed changes:</b> None.		

<b>Policy 6: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</b>		
<b>Summary of policy approach:</b> Defines criteria to guide the provision sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople		
		<b>Commentary</b>
<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Impact</b>	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	~	The accommodation of Gypsies and Travellers in sustainable locations and protecting the environment is a priority. However, it is recognised that Gypsies and Travellers often prefer rural locations which may reduce capacity for maximising use of brownfield sites to accommodate the community.
2. Minimise use of water	~	
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure	~	
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including archaeological heritage) and historical landscape character	~	
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	~	

*Sustainability Appraisal: Core Strategy Preferred Options*

6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	+	The approach proposes that pitches will not be allowed in areas where there is unacceptable flood risk.
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gasses and other pollutants (for example air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	~	
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling.	-	No mention is made of the need to ensure access to recycle or waste facilities.
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	+	One of the primary objectives.
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~	
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles.	~	
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife.	~	
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime.		
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including education and health).	+	Approach emphasises the need to accommodate pitches in sustainable locations with good access by foot, cycle and public transport to services eg health and education.
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	+	Approach recognises the importance of preventing social exclusion of Gypsy and Travellers by providing pitches in appropriate locations.
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	+	Key priority of this option.
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	~	
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	
Summary: Approach is sustainable and consistent with government guidance. Although no reference to the provision of waste or recycling this is considered to be too specific		

for a strategic policy. Due to the relatively small number of pitches the District needs to accommodate may effects are assumed to be neutral. This approach meets a significant proportion of the social objectives, for example, reducing inequalities. Further guidance will be provided in the forthcoming Gypsies& Traveller Sites DPD.

Proposed mitigation measures: None.

**Policy 7: Employment growth: scale & distribution**

**Summary of policy approach:** identifies the scale of employment growth to be achieved during the plan period and defines spatial priorities for its provision

	Huntingdon Spatial Planning Area	Commentary	St Neots Spatial Planning area	Commentary	St Ives Spatial Planning area	Commentary	Ramsey and Bury Spatial planning area	Commentary	Key Service centres	Commentary
<b>SA Objective</b>	Impact		Impact		Impact		Impact		Impact	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental /amenity value	+	Brownfield employment development is maximised within the Huntingdon area including a proportion to be provided west of town centre as mixed use redevelopment and at the RAF base in Brampton as mixed use development. In the longer term Greenfield employment development is proposed for Godmanchester.	+	High reliance on Greenfield employment development. However, this Greenfield development is considered to be highly sustainable and provides suitable land for long term development which covers the plan period and beyond.	~	No employment growth proposed beyond existing commitments and windfalls.	+	Proposed employment development is on brownfield land.	~	Employment growth is limited in Key Service Centres with Yaxley providing the only sustainable brownfield employment opportunity.



2. Minimise use of water	~		~		~		~		~	
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure.	?	Growth proposed is limited in the short term to brownfield locations as part of mixed use developments where housing is already proposed. Appropriate mitigation measures will need to be considered in sensitive areas – particularly around Brampton and north of Huntingdon. Development may also bring forward opportunities to improve biodiversity and enhance existing green corridors through providing cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways.	?	Greenfield employment development will occur as part of a mixed use scheme alongside housing development. The majority of development is directed towards areas of low ecological, landscape or agricultural value. However, appropriate mitigation measures will need to be considered as development is proposed close to a number of green infrastructure initiatives. Development may also bring forward opportunities to improve biodiversity and enhance existing green corridors through providing cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways.	~		?	All employment development is to be directed towards brownfield sites, the majority of which will be part of a mixed use scheme at RAF Upwood. However, appropriate mitigation measures will need to be considered as development is proposed close to a number of green infrastructure initiatives. Development may also bring forward opportunities to improve biodiversity and enhance existing green corridors through providing cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways.	?	Minimal employment development is proposed for key service centres. 2ha will be directed towards brownfield locations within Yaxley. Potential effects on biodiversity are assumed to be minimal. Development may also bring forward opportunities to improve biodiversity and enhance existing green corridors through providing cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways.
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment		Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging		Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development				Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development		Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development

(including the archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	~	Development Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.	~	Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.	~		~	Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.	~	n of emerging Development Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.	~		~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	+	Development is directed away from areas of high flood risk.	+	Development is directed away from areas of high flood risk.	~		+	Development is directed away from areas of high flood risk.	+	Development is directed away from areas of high flood risk.
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (eg air, water, soil, noise, vibration and	+	Development is centrally located, in highly sustainable locations well served by transport infrastructure. Most development is located on or	+	The majority of development is directed towards a sustainable location adjacent the railway line and near to the proposed A428 High Quality Public Transport Corridor. In the	~		?	Although development is directed towards the most sustainable locations in Ramsey and Bury, the town is relatively remote compared to other market towns in	?	Development is directed towards the most sustainable location in Yaxley. However, development may serve to increase

light)		near to the long term the Guided Busway which may help reduce congestion, encourage sustainable travel modes and reduce associated air pollution. Consideration will need to be given to potential effects of development on the Air Quality Management Areas in Huntingdon and Brampton.		long term this may help encourage use of public transport and reduce congestion and air pollution. Consideration will need to be given to potential effects of development on the Air Quality Management Areas in St Neots.				the District which may increase trip generation and associated air pollution.		dependency on the car and result in a potential increase in air pollution, although the scale of development proposed is limited.
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	~	All development will increase waste generation, particularly employment development.	~	All development will increase waste generation, particularly employment development.	~		~	All development will increase waste generation, particularly employment development.	~	All development will increase waste generation, particularly employment development.
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	+	Development centrally located on or near to the route of the Guided Busway. In the medium term, once complete, this may encourage people to use sustainable modes of travel and reduce car dependency and traffic	+	Development located adjacent the railway line and, near to the proposed High Quality Public Transport Corridor along the A428. In the long term this may encourage people to use sustainable modes of travel and reduce car dependency and	~		?	Despite development being directed towards brownfield locations the town is relatively remote and has fairly poor transport infrastructure and services and facilities compared to other market towns. However, the provision of employment	?	As for SA Objective 7.

		generation. Improved cycle, footpath and bridleway links will also be encouraged through development.		traffic generation. Improved cycle, footpath and bridleway links will also be encouraged through development.				opportunities may help reduce the level of out commuting from Ramsey and Bury, thereby reducing air pollution and may help regenerate the area and facilitate the provision of improved transport infrastructure.		
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~		~		~		~		~	
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	+	The majority of growth is located near to or on the Guided Busway. In the medium and long term this may help encourage people to make sustainable travel choices. Makes use of existing infrastructure such as cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways and new development will provide opportunities to improve these and create new pedestrian	+	Development is located near to the railway station which may encourage people to make sustainable travel choices and, in the longer term, near to the proposed High Quality Public Transport corridor along the A428 to Cambridge which may encourage use of public transport once proposals are confirmed. Development will also bring about opportunities to enhance existing cycle routes,	~		?	There are limited opportunities to promote sustainable travel choices as Ramsey and Bury is relatively remote and served by poor transport infrastructure. However, by providing employment opportunities within the town it may reduce the need for residents to travel to work elsewhere in the District or outside of the District. Development may also present opportunities to improve existing	?	By providing additional employment opportunities in Yaxley it may reduce the need for residents to travel to work elsewhere in the District or outside of the District. Development may also present opportunities to improve existing cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways which may encourage sustainable

		routes.		footpaths and bridleways and create new ones.				cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways which may encourage sustainable travel choices through, for example, Green Travel Plans.		travel choices, through, for example, Green Travel Plans.
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	?	Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for additional and enhanced open space can be brought forward with development.	?	Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for additional and enhanced open space can be brought forward with development.	~		?	Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for additional and enhanced open space can be brought forward with development.	?	Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for additional and enhanced open space can be brought forward with development.
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	~		~		~		~		~	
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including	+	Provision of employment opportunities will increase the range of services. Development is directed towards	+	Provision of employment opportunities will increase the range of services. Development is directed towards accessible,	~		+	Provision of employment opportunities will increase the range of services.	+	Provision of employment opportunities will increase the range of services.

health and education)		accessible, sustainable locations.		sustainable locations.						
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	+	Employment development is directed towards central and accessible locations.	?	Employment development is directed towards a sustainable location however, the railway may create a barrier and cause accessibility issues. Mitigation measures, such as cycle routes and footpaths will reduce this.	~		+	Employment development may provide opportunities to help regenerate areas of Ramsey and Bury which have been a key priority of the Ramsey Area Partnership.	~	Employment development is minimal in Yaxley and unlikely to have significant effects on reducing inequalities.
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	~		~		~		~		~	
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	+	Primary objective of this approach.	+	Primary objective of this approach.	~		+	Primary objective of this approach.	+	Primary objective of this approach.
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local	+	Primary objective of this approach.	+	Primary objective of this approach.	~		+	Primary objective of this approach.	+	Primary objective of this approach.

economy							
<p><b>Summary:</b> All spatial planning areas for employment development are considered sustainable with the majority of the SA Objectives being met in a positive way. Employment growth is directed towards the most sustainable locations, with all available brownfield land used and where Greenfield development is necessary, it is achieved in the most sustainable locations in the District. All spatial planning areas have potential uncertain effects on biodiversity and green infrastructure. Any form of development will have an impact on biodiversity – even in brownfield locations which are known to potentially sustain a high level of biodiversity. It will be important to ensure that any potential negative impacts are minimised and mitigated. However, development will also provide opportunities to enhance biodiversity through, for example, design and landscaping. Similarly, the provision of cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways is an important part of Green infrastructure and provides ways to mitigate against habitat fragmentation. Providing local employment opportunities throughout the District will be important to help reduce levels of out commuting and will also be beneficial for the District’s economy in terms of its viability and vitality.</p>							
<p><b>Proposed changes:</b> None – the issues raised can be addressed by emerging development control policies relating to design and biodiversity.</p>							

Policy 8: Retail growth: scale & distribution		
Summary of policy approach: identifies the scale of comparison and convenience floorspace and determines spatial priorities for distribution across the District.		
SA Objective	Impact	Commentary
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	+	Retail development is directed towards the town centres Huntingdon and St Ives which helps to minimise Greenfield development. Despite retail development in St Neots being directed towards in a Greenfield sites it is considered to be a sustainable location.
2. Minimise use of water	~	
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure.	~	Generally considered to be supportive as it limited out of town retail development. Consideration will have to be given to potential biodiversity on brownfield land. Development may provide opportunities to enhance biodiversity.
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including the archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	+	Supportive by the need to ensure development is sympathetic to its setting and surroundings. Enhancing local character can be better achieved when concentrated development towards town centres rather than locating it in out of town retail centres.

5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	+	As above.
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	~	
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (eg air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	+	Supportive as concentrating development in town centres will increase accessibility by public transport thereby reducing air pollution. Additional retail development may also facilitate improvements to cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways.
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	~	
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	+	As for SA Objective 7.
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~	
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	+	Development may facilitate improvements to existing and provision of additional cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways which may encourage sustainable and travel choices and active lifestyles.
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	+	Directing development towards town centres may reduce pressure for development on existing open space.
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	~	
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including health and education)	+	Primary objective.
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	~	
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	~	
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	~	



18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	+	Primary objective. Distribution recognises the strength of the market in Huntingdon and will enhance its status as principal centre for the District and competitiveness against higher order centres. Retail development in St Neots will increase accessibility to services and strengthen its economy
<b>Summary:</b> Consistent with settlement and housing hierarchies established by other policies. Provides sustainable spatial priorities which direct the majority of retail development towards town centres which have strong market demand as identified in the Retail Assessment Study 2005 and Update 2007.		
<b>Proposed changes:</b> None.		

Policy 9: Areas of Strategic Greenspace Enhancement		
<b>Summary of policy approach:</b> determines action to promote biodiversity, landscape and recreational value through habitat creation and landscape management in areas of Strategic Greenspace Enhancement.		
		Commentary
SA Objective	Impact	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	~	
2. Minimise use of water	~	
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure.	+	Primary objective.
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including the archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	+	Assumed to be supportive as areas are likely to have historical and cultural associations which can similarly be improved by action to promote enhancement of strategic greenspace.
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	~	
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	~	

7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (eg air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	~	
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	~	
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	~	
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~	
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	+	The provision of attractive green space is beneficial to health including physical health, and psychiatric well being.
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	+	Primary objective.
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	~	
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including health and education)	~	
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	~	
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	~	
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	~	
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	
<b>Summary:</b> This policy approach is clearly sustainable and will work towards promoting areas of habitat creation as identified in the Biodiversity Partnership for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough 50 year Wildlife Vision.		
<b>Proposed changes:</b> None.		

<b>Policy 10: Infrastructure Requirements</b>		
<b>Summary of policy approach:</b> Identifies appropriate infrastructure for which contributions may be sought.		
		<b>Commentary</b>
<b>SA Objective</b>	Impact	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	~	
2. Minimise use of water	~	
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure.	+	Environmental improvements is mentioned as infrastructure that may require contributions.
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including the archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	~	
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	~	
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	+	Flood prevention and protection measures are identified as being appropriate infrastructure for which contributions may be sought.
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants (eg air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	+	Contributions towards provision of public transport and cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways may be sought.
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	+	Primary aim
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).	+	Primary aim

10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~	
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	+	Primary aim
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife		
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	~	
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including health and education)	~	
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	+	Primary aim.
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing	+	Primary aim.
17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	~	
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	~	
<b>Summary:</b> Although many of the effects of this policy are judged to be positive and it meets many of the social and environmental objectives however there are many variables involved in the implementation of this policy. Further guidance on this policy will be set out in a separate Planning Contributions SPD.		
<b>Proposed changes:</b> None.		

Appendix 3: Indicators and baseline data

Objective	Indicator	Current Situation		Assessment	Data Sources
		Huntingdonshire	Comparator		
<b>Land, water and resources</b>					
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	% dwellings completed on previously-developed land	Ave 55.3% (05/06)	East of Eng: 71% 2005/06	Favourable situation. Lower than for the region but improving significantly.	District monitoring; EERA (1), (2), (4)
	Net density of dwellings completed on major sites	36.3 dwellings per hectare (05/06)	East of Eng: 48 dwellings per hectare (05/06)	Mixed Situation. Lower than for the region but improving	District monitoring; EERA (3)
2. Minimise use of water	Water use per household	No data available at present.	No data available at present.	No data available at present.	Water consumption data available by water company regions. A method of estimating water consumption at the County level is being investigated.
<b>Biodiversity</b>					
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure	% SSSIs in favourable or unfavourable recovering condition	86.2% (05/06)	Cambridgeshire: 71.5% (2005) East of Eng: 77% (2004)	Mixed situation, Decrease in condition but higher than for the county and region.	District and County monitoring and English Nature. The first complete survey of SSSI condition completed in 2004 (3)
	Total area designated as SSSIs (ha)	2,373.8 ha (2005)	East of Eng: 129100 ha (2003)	Unable to make an assessment at present.	County or district GIS; English Nature (3)
	Progress in achieving priority BAP targets	No data available at present.	Cambridgeshire (2000) Progress towards targets: 3% completed, 16% much progress, 52% some progress and 29% no progress.	Unable to make assessment at present.	County & district monitoring. BAP Monitoring and Reporting 2000. Awaiting implementation of monitoring software for County data. Expected to begin late 2004. (3)

Objective	Indicator	Current Situation		Assessment	Data Sources
		Huntingdonshire	Comparator		
<b>Landscape, townscape and archaeology</b>					
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including archaeological heritage) and historic landscape character	a) % listed buildings 'at risk' all grade	a) 13.1% (2006)	No data available at present.	Unfavourable Situation. Figure has increased, although this is partly due to an audit at Hinchingsbrooke School	District monitoring; English Heritage (3)
	b) % grade I & II* listed buildings and scheduled monuments at risk.	b) 8.7% (2005)	b) East of Eng: 1.8% (2004)		
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	% residents who are satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live	81% (2006)	Cambridgeshire: 80% (2006)	Unfavourable situation. Higher than for the county but decreasing	Quality of life survey (no regional comparator) QoL18/LIB133, QoL 19. (3) Data in 'current situation' and 'trend' columns are not directly comparable.
	% major housing sites meeting local 'Building for Life' standard	No data available at present.	No data available at present.	No data available at present.	Monitoring framework needs to be developed
<b>Climate change and pollution</b>					
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	Number of planning permissions granted contrary to advice of Environment Agency on either flood defence grounds or water quality	2 (2004/05)	Cambridgeshire: (2004-2005) 8	Favourable situation. A third fewer permissions are granted than compared to Cambridgeshire.	District monitoring, County monitoring
7. Reduce emissions of green house gases and other pollutants (for example	% improvement in energy efficiency achieved in housing stock	4.08% (2005/06)	No data available at present.	Unable to complete assessment.	District monitoring

Objective	Indicator	Current Situation		Assessment	Data Sources
		Huntingdonshire	Comparator		
air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	Air Quality a) Annual average concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide (ug/m3) b) Days when fine particle concentration found to be in bandings 'moderate' or higher (days)	a) Huntingdon ring road: 55.2 Godmanchester: 50.6 St Neots (urban background): 23.1 St Neots (roadside): 39.5 b) Ring road: 11	National Air Quality Objectives a) 40 ug/m3 (To be achieved by end 2005) b) 35 days (to be achieved by end 2004)	a) The concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide in St Neots are favourable and meet national targets but concentrations on Huntingdon Ring Road and Godmanchester are unfavourable. b) Favourable Situation	Air Quality Review and Assessment progress report 2004.
	% main rivers of good or fair quality (chemical & biological)	Chemical 88% (00/02) Biological 100% (2002)	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Chemical 90% (00/02) Biological 100% (2002)	Favourable situation. Although the chemical quality is lower than county level it has improved significantly.	Environment Agency (1), (2), (3)
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling	% of household waste collected which is recycled	32.5% (2004/05)	Cambridgeshire: 18.74% (2004/05)	Favourable situation. The percentage of household waste recycled for Huntingdonshire is 13.8% higher than that of the county	District monitoring (AMR) and County monitoring
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways)	% of rural households within 13 minutes walk of an hourly or better public/community bus service	No data available at present	Cambridgeshire: 34.9% (2005/06)	Unable to complete assessment.	County Council monitoring
	% of people travelling to work by car	64.7 (2001)	Cambridgeshire: 59.5% (2001)	Unfavourable situation. Huntingdonshire has a 5% increase in people travelling to work by car compared to the county as a whole	State of the Environment report CCC

Objective	Indicator	Current Situation		Assessment	Data Sources
		Huntingdonshire	Comparator		
	Vehicle flows across urban boundaries	2006 Huntingdon 82,500 St Neots 51,600 St Ives 47,500	2006 Cambridge 170,000	Mixed situation. Increase in one market town but slight decrease in others	County monitoring (no regional comparator) Annual LTP monitoring report
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies	<i>Renewable energy capacity installed by type (GW/h)</i>	Onshore wind: 1.79 Water: 0.095 Methane from landfill: 18.33	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough: Onshore wind: 7.571 Water: 0.095 Methane from landfill: 61.29	All the water power for the county is located in Huntingdonshire.	District and county council monitoring
<b>Healthy communities</b>					
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles	<i>% of residents with limiting long term illness</i>	13.5% (2001)	East of England: 16.2% (2001)	Favourable situation. Lower than the region as a whole.	Census of Population
12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife	<i>Ha of strategic open space per 1,000 people</i>	9.8 ha/ 1000 people	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough: 4.8 ha/ 1000 people	Favourable situation. Almost twice as much as for Cambridgeshire.	Strategic Open Space study (no regional comparator)
	<i>Number of sports pitches available for public use per 1,000 people</i>	1.60 ha/ 1000 people	No data available at present.	Unable to make assessment at present	District monitoring (no regional comparator)
13. Reduce and prevent crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime	<i>% crime per 1000 population</i>	14.7 violent crimes per 1000 population (2003/04)	East of England: 17 per 1000 population (2003/04)	Favourable situation. Lower than the region as a whole	State of Environment Report CCC
	<i>% of residents feeling 'safe' or 'fairly safe' outside in the local area after dark</i>	56% (2006)	Cambridgeshire: 54% (2006)	Favourable situation. Marginally higher than for Cambridgeshire	Quality of Life Survey



Objective	Indicator	Current Situation		Assessment	Data Sources
		Huntingdonshire	Comparator		
<b>Inclusive Communities</b>					
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including education, health, transport, training and leisure opportunities)	% parishes (or urban wards) with access to: (a) general store; (b) surgery; (c) primary school	(a) 44.8% (2006) (b) 20.7% (2006) (c) 41.4% (2006)	No data available at present	Mixed situation. Increase in access to general store but decrease in access to primary school	Village Facilities Survey
	% of rural households within 800 meters of an hourly or better bus service	No data available at present.	Cambridgeshire: 40.7% 02/03	Favourable Situation. At county level there has been an increase.	Local Transport Plan Monitoring Report
	% adults who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area	15% (05/06)	Cambridgeshire 17% (05/06)	Unfavourable situation. Lower than for Cambridgeshire and decreasing	Quality of life survey (no regional comparator) (2) QoL23/LIB137
	Pupil Teacher Ratios	Primary 23.6 (2004) Secondary 18.9 (2004)	Cambs: Primary 23.6 (2004) Secondary 18.7 (2004)	Favourable situation.	Cambridgeshire Research Group
15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income	% residents who feel the local community is somewhere where people from different backgrounds can live harmoniously	50% (05/06)	Cambridgeshire: 52% (05/06)	Unfavourable Situation. Lower than for Cambridgeshire and decreasing.	Quality of life survey (no regional comparator) (3) QoL25/LIB139
	a) % population in wards within most deprived 25% nationally b) Average IMD score 2004	a) 0 (2000) b) Average IMD score: 11.73 (2004)	a) East of Eng: 17.4% (2000) b) Cambridgeshire average IMD score: 12.34 (2004)	Favourable situation. Less deprived than the region	Indices of deprivation (3) b) greater score = greater measure of deprivation
16. Ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable	House price / earnings ratio	5.8 (2003)	East of England: 6.6 (2003)	Unfavourable situation. Lower than for the region but increasing.	Land Registry & New Earnings Survey (3)

Objective	Indicator	Current Situation		Assessment	Data Sources
		Huntingdonshire	Comparator		
housing	% dwellings completed that are 'affordable'	24.3% (00/03)	Cambridgeshire: 12% (2003)	Favourable situation. Higher than for Cambridgeshire.	District monitoring (3)
<b>Economic activity</b>					
17. Help people gain access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence	Unemployment rate, % (male & female)	1.5% (2004)	Eastern: 2.3% (2004)	Favourable situation. Lower than for the region and remaining the same.	Nomis / CCC Research Group (1), (2)
	% residents aged 16-74 in employment working within 5km of home, or at home	39.9% (2001)	East of Eng: 46.46% (2001)	Unfavourable situation.	Census of Population
18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy	Annual net increase (or decrease) in VAT registered firms, %	+1.3% (2002) NOMIS	Eastern: +0.2% (2002) NOMIS	Favourable Situation. The number of firms has continued to rise.	NOMIS / CCC Research Group
	Economic activity rate, % (male & female)	85.6% (Mar 02 – Feb 03)	Eastern: 81.5 (Mar 02 – Feb 03)	Favourable Situation. Higher than for the Eastern Region and increasing.	Census of Pop / NOMIS / CCC Research Group

(1) Local Quality of Life Counts

(2) Quality of Life Counts

(3) Audit Commission Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators

Best Value Performance Indicator

**Appendix 4: Assessments of Reasonable Alternatives (taken from the ISA of Core Strategy Issues and Options paper)**

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Sustainable development</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Criteria based methodology setting out how proposals should contribute towards sustainable development.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> This option is clearly sustainable.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> The policy will need to be carefully worded to ensure benefits are maximised and address all aspects of sustainable development thoroughly.	

**Spatial strategy**

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Spatial planning areas – Option 8</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Identifies spatial planning areas which could be used when identifying strategic directions of growth.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Option 8 is sustainable in terms of focusing development in locations which will reduce the need to travel. However, it is more sustainable in terms of re-using previously developed land as allowing development in settlements closely related to the market towns will increase the amount of brownfield land which can be utilised. If development is focused solely in the four market towns then a higher proportion of development will need to take place on Greenfield land.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Option 8 is favoured over the reasonable alternative.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Spatial planning areas – Reasonable alternative</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Focuses development within the four market towns only.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> This reasonable alternative is also sustainable in terms of focusing development in locations which will reduce the need to travel. However, limiting strategic growth allocations to only within the four largest towns in the district, limits the opportunity to maximise the re-use of brownfield land located within the spatial planning areas, but outside of the market towns.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Option 8 is favoured over the reasonable alternative.	

**Settlement hierarchy**

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Settlement Hierarchy – Option 9</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Option 9 outlines a hierarchy of settlements based on current size and ease of access to existing services and amenities.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Option 9 ensures that growth is located in the most sustainable locations and is consistent with national and regional guidance to reduce the need to travel. This option directs development to urban areas which will help to promote vitality and viability of town centres and improve accessibility to services by generating a critical mass of services.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None	
<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Settlement Hierarchy – Reasonable alternative 1</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Settlement hierarchy could contain additional layers in which some development could be focused.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Reasonable alternative 1 proposes additional development in rural areas by designating more growth centres. This may have potential benefits in terms of providing affordable housing where there is a need and generating local employment opportunities in rural areas. However, it could lead to growth being spread out too thinly which may affect settlement character. Also, more dispersed development may lead to an increase in trips and therefore increased emissions.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None	
<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Settlement Hierarchy – Reasonable alternative 2</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Settlement hierarchy could be based on the physical capacity of settlements to accommodate growth, rather than access to services and facilities.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Reasonable alternative 2 is the least sustainable in terms of reducing the need to travel as it does not take into account access to services and facilities; it looks at the physical capacity of settlements to accommodate growth. This alternative implies a greater dispersal of growth compared to Option 9 and potentially an increase in the number of trips generated and subsequent increased emissions.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None	

Housing options for growth

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Huntingdon and St Neots areas - Option 10</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Proposes that the Huntingdon area should get the most growth	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> All three options (10, 11 and 12) are sustainable, as they focus development in market towns where the majority of services and facilities are located. Option 10 allows for greatest opportunity of developing brownfield land as the Housing Land Availability Assessment (HDC, 2007) identified a significant percentage of brownfield land in this area. However, by concentrating growth in one settlement, it may exert additional pressure on this particular locality.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Huntingdon and St Neots areas - Option 11</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Proposes that the St Neots area should get the most growth	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> All three options (10, 11 and 12) are sustainable, as they focus development in market towns where the majority of services and facilities are located. However, as identified in the HLAA, Option 11 would increase development on Greenfield sites and, as such, is not consistent with national and regional guidance. Concentrating growth in one settlement may also cause additional pressure for this particular locality. Overall, Option 11 is less sustainable than Option 10 as growth may be slightly more dispersed.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Huntingdon and St Neots areas - Option 12</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Proposes that both areas should grow at a similar rate	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> All three options (10, 11 and 12) are sustainable, as they focus development in market towns where the majority of services and facilities are located. Option 12 allows for the development of brownfield land in the Huntingdon area, but will direct growth towards Greenfield land in St Neots. It will also enable growth to be more evenly spread between the two towns, which will reduce pressure on individual settlements.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>St Ives and Ramsey - Option 13</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Proposes that growth will only occur within the built-up framework of St Ives and Ramsey	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Both options are sustainable as they focus development in market towns where the majority of services and facilities are located. As Option 13 restricts development to within the built up framework, it is more successful in minimising the loss of undeveloped land. However, as a result of this restriction development may be redirected to less sustainable locations.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>St Ives and Ramsey - Option 14</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Proposes that small-scale extensions to St Ives and Ramsey will be allowed	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Both options are sustainable as they focus development in market towns where the majority of services and facilities are located. However, Option 14 may reduce the need to direct further growth to less accessible settlements and improve accessibility to services and facilities.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Key Service Centres (not closely linked to a Market Town) - Option 15</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Proposes that development is distributed across all Key Service Centres in proportion to their size and level of facilities	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Directs development in proportion to settlement size and the availability of services. In doing so, this helps to ensure that new development is located in areas where services and facilities available and should help reduce the need to travel. This option is more sustainable than Option 16 as it helps reduce the need to travel and maximises use of brownfield land.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Option 15 is favoured over Option 16.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Key Service Centres (not closely linked to a Market Town) - Option 16</b>
--------------------	--

<b>Summary of option:</b> Proposes that development could be limited in settlements which have recently received high levels of growth
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Limits development in settlements which have received large amounts of growth recently which helps to protect the character and townscape of these settlements. It is not clear under this option whether the level of growth taking place would be distributed according to size and availability of services.
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Option 15 is favoured over option 16.

#### Employment options for growth

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Overall Scale – Option 17</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Land requirement based on projection of trends since 2002	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Provides a much higher target for employment land than Option 18. Option 17 allows a much higher take up of land and therefore would, compared to Option 18, result in the loss of a higher amount of undeveloped land. The higher target would also put more pressure on open space within settlements.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Option 18 is favoured over Option 17	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Overall Scale – Option 18</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Land requirement acknowledges constraints on availability of labour and impacts of climate change	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Makes a more positive contribution to the achievement of the sustainability appraisal objectives than Option 17 and takes into account climate change and the need to replace old building stock with zero carbon development. It has a lower land requirement as it takes into consideration constraints on availability of labour and impacts on climate change and therefore places less pressure on undeveloped land.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Option 18 is favoured over Option 17.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Overall Distribution – Option 19</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Development should follow population growth.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> It is difficult to assess the effects of option 19 until the distribution of population growth is determined.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Overall Distribution – Option 20</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Development should follow market preference for the Huntingdon area, the St Neots area and to a lesser extent St Ives	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Limiting development to the market preference of Huntingdon, St Neots and, to a limited extent St Ives, would potentially result in population growth without employment growth (depending on where future population is located). Population growth without commensurate employment growth may increase the need to travel from some locations. However, these locations are accessible so this impact may be limited.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.	

**Retail options for growth**

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Overall Scale – Option 21</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Use floorspace targets included in the retail assessment.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> It is difficult to assess the impact of this option without knowing the precise location of development; however, the option assumes that development would be focused in existing town centres and therefore reduces pressure on undeveloped land. It would also allow for a slow, steady increase in the proportion of expenditure being retained locally. The retail targets from the retail assessment reflect demand in the district and are tailored to local need.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None	



<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Overall Scale – Option 22</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Use a higher target floorspace than proposed in the retail assessment	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Difficult to assess the impact of this option without knowing the precise location of development. A higher target would increase the range of facilities available and would help the market towns compete with higher order centres such as Peterborough and Bedford. However this benefit would be limited to the availability of sites within the town centres. The retail targets in the retail assessment have been identified taking into account retail interests in the area and therefore there may not be a demand for a target floorspace of higher than this.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Overall Scale – Option 23</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Use a lower target than proposed in the retail assessment	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Difficult to assess the impact of this option without knowing the precise location of development. A lower target would reduce the pressure on undeveloped land. However, lower targets may not sustain the vitality and viability of market towns to adequately compete with higher order centres such as Peterborough and Bedford.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Overall distributions – Option 24</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Development should follow market preference	

<p><b>Summary of assessment:</b> Without knowing the precise distribution of development it is difficult to assess the effect. By following market preference, development would be directed towards the higher order centre of Huntingdon where pressure for retail development is greatest. This would increase Huntingdon's competitiveness with other higher order centres outside the district thereby increasing the town's vitality and viability.</p>
<p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.</p>

Policy area	Overall distributions – Option 25
	<p><b>Summary of option:</b> Development is distributed equally between St Neots and Huntingdon and a lesser extent St Ives and Ramsey</p>
	<p><b>Summary of assessment:</b> Without knowing the precise distribution of development it is difficult to assess the effect however, as identified in the HLAA there are a limited number of brownfield sites available in St Neots. This option would therefore place greater pressure on undeveloped land than Option 24, although a slightly broader distribution may allow a higher proportion of people to access a wider range of facilities.</p>
	<p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.</p>

**A clean 'green' attractive place**

Policy area	Areas of strategic greenspace enhancement
	<p><b>Summary of option:</b> Policies will define a network of strategic greenspaces.</p>
	<p><b>Summary of assessment:</b> Option is clearly sustainable and has a positive impact on a number of the sustainability criteria, in particular those relating to open space, nature conservation and enhancement.</p>
	<p><b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.</p>

Housing that meets local needs

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Scale of growth – Option 28</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Defines scale of housing growth in terms of major, moderate, minor or infill development	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> This option allows more flexibility in relating the scale of development to the settlement hierarchy and may facilitate better integration of new development with the existing built form, therefore creating more sustainable communities. Many of the potential benefits are dependent upon the relationship established between scale of development and which levels in the settlement hierarchy such development is permitted.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Option 28 is favoured over the reasonable alternative.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Scale of growth – Reasonable alternative</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Proposes a more limited number of categories	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Although a more limited number of categories may be simpler to interpret, there is less flexibility in relating the scale of development to the settlement hierarchy and creating integrated, sustainable communities.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Option 28 is favoured over the reasonable alternative.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Location of housing growth – Option 29</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Defines the spatial priorities for unallocated housing development	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Option is clearly sustainable as (working in conjunction with the scale of development permitted in different locations) it aspires to ensure a critical mass of development is focused in the largest, most sustainable settlements. In doing so, it facilitates the successful provision of sustainable transport options, services and facilities.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Option 29 is favoured over the reasonable alternative.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Location of housing growth – Reasonable alternative</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Growth could be distributed more widely	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Allows for more development in smaller settlements where access to services is lower and it could be harder to minimise their impact on the character of the settlement. Greater pressure could also be placed on undeveloped land and agricultural land.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Option 29 is favoured over the reasonable alternative.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Affordable housing targets – Option 30</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Sets a target for 40% of housing on eligible sites to be affordable.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Any approach which attempts to tackle housing shortages resulting from recent trends in house prices and incomes is inherently sustainable. A target of 40% could make a significant contribution to meeting the need for affordable housing, as identified in the Housing Needs Survey and is more likely to be deliverable than other Options proposing higher targets.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Whatever target is selected clarification will be required on delivery mechanisms and the Council's priorities for provision.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Affordable housing targets – Reasonable alternative 1</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> A higher target of 50% of housing on eligible sites to be affordable could be set.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Any approach which attempts to tackle housing shortages resulting from recent trends in house prices and incomes is inherently sustainable. A target of 50% could make the biggest contribution to meeting the need for affordable housing however it may be unrealistic to aspire to such a high target as it could have a significant impact on the viability of delivering sites for development.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Whatever target is selected clarification will be required on delivery mechanisms and the Council's priorities for provision.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Affordable housing targets – Reasonable alternative 2</b>
--------------------	--

<b>Summary of option:</b> A lower target of 30% of housing on eligible sites to be affordable could be set.
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Any approach which attempts to tackle housing shortages resulting from recent trends in house prices and incomes is inherently sustainable. A lower target of 30% would be more deliverable but would make a significantly lower contribution towards meeting the overwhelming need for affordable housing in the district.
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Whatever target is selected clarification will be required on delivery mechanisms and the Council's priorities for provision.

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Affordable housing thresholds – Option 31</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Sets a threshold of 15 or more houses	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Adheres closely to national guidance which gives a notional minimum site size of 15 dwellings.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Whatever threshold is chosen it would be useful if clarification is provided on how affordable housing is to be delivered.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Affordable housing thresholds – Option 32</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Threshold could be major and moderate development.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Allows for greater responsiveness to local circumstances and could result in greater provision of affordable housing in Key Service Centres depending on the settlement hierarchy agreed.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Whatever threshold is chosen it would be useful if clarification is provided on how affordable housing is to be delivered.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Affordable housing thresholds – Option 33</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> A threshold of less than 15 homes could be applied in smaller settlements.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Could be integrated with either Option 32 or Option 33 to allow for provision of affordable housing in smaller settlements in conjunction with market housing developments. A major concern with this is the potential for emphasising social divisions between affordable and market housing on the same site.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Whatever threshold is chosen it would be useful if clarification is provided on how affordable housing is to be delivered.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Rural exceptions housing – Option 34</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Sets out criteria for rural exception sites.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Offers flexibility to affordable housing policies and benefits in keeping rural workers close to the land and in the 'home' community rather than transplanting them to an urban area in order to receive affordable housing. This option conforms to policy on sustainable settlements. However, in practical terms some occupants may not be worried about the lack of local services and may value the ability to live where they choose or live nearer to work and family.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Rural exceptions housing – Reasonable alternative</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Exception sites could be allowed in all rural settlements regardless of the level of services and facilities.	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> This option also offers flexibility to affordable housing policies and benefits in keeping rural workers close to the land and 'home' community. However, in policy terms, this alternative does not conform to policy on sustainable settlements, therefore it is difficult to make a distinction between the option 34 and the reasonable alternative other than in policy terms.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.	

**Access to service and transport**

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Infrastructure requirements</b>
--------------------	------------------------------------

<b>Summary of option:</b> Sets out criteria for infrastructure requirements.
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> Difficult to assess the option precisely without knowing the nature and scale of development that is envisaged and would be subject to such contributions. However, the approach is clearly sustainable and socially just, ensuring that developers help to mitigate pressures placed on social, economical and physical infrastructure that arise from their proposals. It is debatable whether the benefits would accumulate over time, although failing to take contributions would make it progressively more difficult for the Council to fund infrastructure costs from public sources.
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> None.

**A strong diverse economy**

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Re-using military sites – Option 36</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Sets out a strategic approach to re-use of military sites and criteria for assessing proposals	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> It is difficult to assess the impact of re-using military sites without knowing what type of development is proposed. However, in principle redeveloping these areas is sustainable in that it re-uses previously developed land and therefore reduces the amount of Greenfield land that is required to meet development targets.	
<b>Proposed mitigation measures:</b> Proposals for re-use of military sites will need to take in to account how accessible these are and the impact development would have on features within the site and on the surrounding area.	

<b>Policy area</b>	<b>Re-using military sites – Option 37</b>
<b>Summary of option:</b> Alconbury Airfield should await a review of the RSS	
<b>Summary of assessment:</b> It is difficult to assess the impact of re-using military sites without knowing what type of development is proposed. However, in principle redeveloping these areas is sustainable in that it re-uses previously developed land and therefore reduces the amount of Greenfield land that is required to meet development targets.	

**Proposed mitigation measures:** Proposals for re-use of military sites will need to take in to account how accessible these are and the impact development would have on features within the site and on the surrounding area.

**Appendix 5: Assessment of additional options set out in *Towards a Spatial Strategy for Huntingdonshire***

	Option 1	Commentary	Option 2	Commentary	Option 3 (inc sub options 3a & 3b)	Commentary
<b>SA Objective</b>	Impact		Impact		Impact	
1. Minimise development on Greenfield land and maximise development on land with the least environmental/amenity value	~	Has a high reliance on large Greenfield sites and would reduce the achievement of national targets relating to use of brownfield land. However, the Greenfield sites proposed to accommodate the majority of growth are in sustainable locations and the use of brownfield land elsewhere is maximised.	~	Uses all available brownfield land within the Sub-region, although there is still a proportionally high reliance on Greenfield sites which may reduce the ability to meet national brownfield targets.	+	Uses significant brownfield sites within the District. In order to ensure a 15 year continuous supply, development in other areas would need to take place and these would also most likely occur on brownfield land, therefore this option would facilitate achievement of national brownfield targets.



<p>Summary: In terms of meeting national brownfield targets, Option 3 appears to facilitate this as well as achieve SA Objective n° 1. However, there may be issues surrounding the sustainability of site location for sub option 3a (Wyton) and 3b (Alconbury) which will be looked at in further detail when progressing through the SA Framework. Options 1 &amp; 2 have similar outcomes to those discussed for Options A and C. Both utilise available brownfield sites to varying degrees, although Option 1 has a higher reliance on large scale Greenfield sites.</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: Option 3 (either sub option 3a or 3b as both comprise significant brownfield sites) is favoured over option 1 or 2.</p>						
2. Minimise use of water	~	Minimising the use of water is not primarily affected by the location of development. Meeting this objective would depend on implementation of other policies to ensure water efficiency.	~	Minimising the use of water is not primarily affected by the location of development. Meeting this objective would depend on implementation of other policies to ensure water efficiency.	~	Minimising the use of water is not primarily affected by the location of development. Meeting this objective would depend on implementation of other policies to ensure water efficiency.
<p>Summary: Minimising the use of water is not, to a large degree, affected by the location of development and is not the primary objective of the spatial options. Thus in all options, meeting this SA objective would be dependent on the implementation of other policies which promote efficient water use.</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: None.</p>						
3. Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure and maximise opportunities for biodiversity and green infrastructure	?	Majority of growth proposed is on land with least environmental and amenity value, biodiversity is less likely to be affected (compared to other options). Proposed development would need to take green infrastructure initiatives (eg green corridor 22) into account to ensure any potential damaging effects are reduced. Development may offer opportunities to enhance existing green infrastructure and promote biodiversity.	+	The substantial growth proposed for the Huntingdon area, particularly Brampton, may affect the many County Wildlife Sites in this area. Consideration would also need to be given to green infrastructure, particularly Green Corridor Initiative 30, major initiatives around St Ives and Ouse Valley and Green Corridor 22 (land east of St Neots).	?	Brownfield sites sometimes sustain high levels of biodiversity as they can add to a mix of land uses and buffer changes in the local climate. It would be important to fully assess the ecological value of both Wyton and Alconbury Airfields in order to ensure appropriate mitigation measures can be implemented where necessary. Consideration would also need to be given to potential impacts on the Grafham Water to Abbots Ripton Corridor

						(n° 8) and potentially the Huntingdon towards Peterborough cycleway (n° 29). Development may offer opportunities to enhance existing green infrastructure and create new infrastructure to help promote biodiversity.
<p>Summary: Due to the sheer scale of development proposed in each of the three options, there are likely to be impacts on biodiversity and green infrastructure. Option 2 may have a greater impact on the County Wildlife Sites around Brampton and also Green Corridor initiatives around St Ives, and St Neots as growth is slightly more dispersed around the Sub Region. Option 1 proposes the majority of growth for St Neots which may impact upon green infrastructure in this area, particularly Green Corridor Initiative 22. Option 3 would require further information on the levels of biodiversity in either of the two airfields as brownfield sites can sustain high levels of biodiversity. There may also be impacts upon Green Corridor initiative 8 due to the proximity of Alconbury Airfield to this Corridor</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: Option 2 is favoured over options 1 or 3.</p>						
4. Maintain, protect and enhance the distinctiveness of the built environment (including archaeological heritage) and historical landscape character	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation.	?	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Landscape Character, Design Quality and Conservation. However, there are known artefacts relating to the Cold War on Alconbury Airfield. This will need to be taken into consideration if development were to take place.
<p>Summary: The achievement of this SA objective is more likely to be affected by the implementation of other emerging Development Control policies than by the location of or scale of development. War features from the Cold War have survived on Alconbury Airfield and would need consideration if development were to take place.</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: Potential impacts on archaeological heritage will require further assessment in all options.</p>						
5. Creation of an attractive environment through high quality design and use of sustainable construction methods	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.	~	Achievement of this SA objective is more dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design and Street Scene.
<p>Summary: The achievement of this SA objective is more likely to be affected by the implementation of other emerging Development Control policies than by the location of or scale of development.</p>						

Proposed mitigation measures: None.						
6. Manage and minimise flood risk taking into account climate change	+	Growth is restricted to areas less constrained by flood risk (for example, less growth is proposed for St Ives). The areas proposed for development are less affected by flooding.	-	The option, although proposing greater levels of growth, recognises the environmental constraints of St Ives. Thus no further growth, beyond that proposed in Option A is proposed for St Ives. Nevertheless, this option is still reliant on significant growth in St Ives which has areas of high flood risk to the south, and areas within the other market towns are also susceptible to flood risk due to the majority of growth being centred around the shallow valley of the River Great Ouse. This option will be reliant on appropriate flood mitigation measures being implemented which may affect development viability.	+	Both Alconbury and Wyton Airfields are outside of flood risk areas.
Summary: Option 2, which proposes enhanced growth for the Cambridge Sub-Region, could raise issues relating to flooding. This is a result of the scale of growth proposed for St Ives which is particularly constrained by flood risk. Options 1 and 3 are less constrained by flood risk and would best achieve this particular SA Objective.						
Proposed mitigation measures: Options 1 and 3 are favoured over option 2.						
7. Reduce emissions of greenhouse gasses and other pollutants (for example air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light)	?	The potential issues raised by option 1 would be akin to those raised by Option C. Thus, in the short term, the majority of development is located near to the railway station which may encourage people to make sustainable travel choices. In the long term, a large proportion of growth is located near to the proposed improvements to the A428 which include proposals to create a High Quality Public Transport corridor between St Neots and Cambridge. When proposals are confirmed the construction of this may encourage people to use public transport and	?	The potential issues raised by option 2 would be akin to those raised by Option A. This option, in terms of having potentially positive medium and long term effects, locates growth near to or on the route of the Guided Busway which, when complete, may contribute to a potential reduction in trip generation and associated air pollution. Similarly, as growth in St Neots is located near to the station this may serve to help people make sustainable travel choices. In the longer term, growth in St Neots is also located near to the proposed High Quality Public Transport Corridor along	?	In terms of sub option 3a (Wyton) the location of the airfield could facilitate an extension to the Guided Busway to serve development which may help encourage sustainable travel choices. However, the relative remoteness of the A14 could be perceived as a constraint.  For sub option 3b (Alconbury) the location of the airfield relative to other settlements could encourage more commuting. The access improvements to the A14 have been costed and prohibitive.

		help contribute to a reduction in car use and associated air pollution. In this option a significant proportion of growth is still proposed for the Huntingdon area in locations which are near to or on the route of the Guided Busway which, in the medium and long term, may encourage sustainable travel choices and a reduction in car use. The potential impact of development to the Air Quality Management Area in St Neots needs to be considered and appropriate mitigation measures implemented where necessary.		the A428 between St Neots and Cambridge. When proposals for this scheme are confirmed, the construction of this may help encourage use of public transport and reduce car use. The potential impact of development to the Air Quality Management Area in the Huntingdon, Brampton and St Neots will need to be considered appropriate mitigation measures implemented where necessary.		There is no prospect of a rail link in the foreseeable future. Further assessment for potential transport implications would be required (eg TA and Accessibility modelling).
<p>Summary: The potential effects of development in relation to meeting this SA objective area largely unknown. In all options a proportion of growth is located near to or on the route of the Guided Busway which in the medium and long term, may encourage sustainable travel choices and a reduction in trip generation. Similarly, in all options a significant proportion of growth is proposed for St Neots in locations near to the station and the proposed High Quality Public Transport corridor linking St Neots to Cambridge. In the short term locating development near to the station may encourage people to make sustainable travel choices and, longer term, once the proposals for the High Quality Public Transport corridor are confirmed, may enable people to travel more sustainably to Cambridge. In all options, consideration of the impact of development on Air Quality Management Areas in Huntingdon, St Neots and Brampton will be required. Due to the location of Wyton, being relatively close to St Ives, may facilitate an extension to serve development if it was required. This may encourage people to make sustainable travel choices. The location of Alconbury however, relative to other settlements could encourage more commuting and there is no prospect of a rail link in the foreseeable future. However, for both options further information relating to potential transport impacts would be required.</p>						
Proposed mitigation measures: None.						
8. Reduce waste and encourage re-use and recycling.	~		~		~	
<p>Summary: The achievement of this particular SA Objective will be dependent upon the successful implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Sustainable Design alongside other initiatives promoted by the Council to encourage recycling.</p>						
Proposed mitigation measures: None.						
9. Reduce the need to travel and promote sustainable modes of transport (public transport, cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways).		The potential issues raised by option 1 would be akin to those raised by Option C. The majority of growth proposed is located close to the railway and, in the longer term, near to the proposed High Quality Public Transport corridor along the		The potential issues raised by option 2 would be akin to those raised by Option A. The majority of growth proposed is located on or near to the Guided Busway or near to a railway station. In the medium to long term, once the		See commentary for SA Objective n° 7.

	+	A428 to Cambridge. However, development on this scale, so close to the station, may encourage people to live in St Neots and work further away in London for example. This would not reduce the need to travel. In order to help combat this potential concern, it would be important to ensure adequate employment provision, of the right type, occurs with any proposed development. There are limited cycle routes which may encourage car journeys for local trips. Improved cycle routes and footpaths would need to be addressed within new development.	+	busway is complete, people may be encouraged to make sustainable travel choices. Where growth is proposed near to the railway station, the infrastructure is already in place to help encourage people to make more sustainable travel choices and, once the proposals for the High Quality Public Transport Corridor between St Neots and Cambridge are confirmed, opportunities for sustainable travel will be improved. There are also good opportunities to provide employment in accessible locations where there is a need, so as to reduce the need to travel. Development would need to contribute to the maintenance and creation of cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways to encourage sustainable travel choices for local trips.	?	
<p>Summary: Option 1 proposes the greatest growth in a location already served relatively well by existing transport infrastructure i.e close to the railway station. This may encourage sustainable travel choices. However, a potential issue that may be raised by large scale development in this location is contrary to this SA Objective - encouraging people to live in St Neots and work elsewhere, for example, London due to the proximity of the station. Option 2 proposes the majority of growth on or near to the route of the Guided Busway which, in the medium to long term, may help encourage people to make sustainable travel choices. The location of Wyton Airfield, close to St Ives, may enable a future extension to be made to the Busway route to serve development if development were to take place here, however, the location of Alconbury Airfield relative to other settlements could encourage more commuting.</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: Options 1 and 2 are favoured over option 3. Further accessibility assessments would be required.</p>						
10. Maximise the use of renewable energy sources and technologies.	~		~		~	
<p>Summary: The achievement of this particular SA Objective will be dependent upon the successful implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Renewable Energy and Energy Use.</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: None.</p>						
11. Encourage healthy lifestyles.		The issues raised by Option 1 will be similar to those discussed in relation to Option c: although		The issues raised by Option 2 will be similar to those discussed in relation to Option A: The majority		Sub option 3(a) (Wyton) could be serviced by a possible extension to the Guided Busway route which

	?	<p>located close to the East Coast Mainline railway, accessibility to health services, particular secondary services, is reduced as the majority of growth is located in an area which is not served by a hospital and pressure may be exerted on existing health care services (eg GPs) as a result of development. However, opportunities to incorporate new primary care services will be provided by new development. The majority of growth is located near to the railway station which may encourage people to make sustainable travel choices and, in the longer term, near to the proposed High Quality Public Transport corridor along the A428 to Cambridge which may encourage use of public transport once proposals are confirmed.</p>	+	<p>of growth is located near to or on the Guided Busway. In the medium and long term this may help encourage people to make sustainable travel choices and contribute to a reduction in trip generation by private car and air pollution which may reduce congestion and improve health for those living close to busy roads. It makes use of existing infrastructure such as cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways and new development will provide opportunities to improve these and create new pedestrian routes. Much of the growth is proposed near to existing health services such as Hinchingsbrooke Hospital and new development may offer opportunities to provide additional primary care services and improve existing services.</p>	?	<p>may encourage sustainable travel choices and accessibility to primary and secondary services. Sub option3(b) Alconbury is located near to the A14 and A1 although this would not serve to encourage sustainable travel choices, it may improve accessibility to primary and secondary services (albeit only for those which access to a car). However, provision of primary services would be necessary with development of this scale in either location.</p>
<p>Summary: Option 1, although being located near to the railway station, which may encourage sustainable travel choices, is located further away from secondary services compared to option 2 which is located near to Hinchingsbrooke Hospital. The sub options presented in option 3 present accessibility issues that would require further information gathering, for example, both are located relatively far from Secondary services, such as Hinchingsbrooke Hospital, however Wyton by virtue of its proximity to St Ives could be served by a possible extension to the route of the Guided Busway to increase accessibility to the Hospital in Huntingdon. Alconbury Airfield is located near to trunk roads which enable access to the Hospital, but only for those with access to a car. The scale of development proposed in each option however, is such that new primary services would be provided.</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: Option 2 is favoured over options 1 and 3. Further accessibility work would be required.</p>						
<p>12. Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space and improve opportunities for people to access wildlife.</p>	?	<p>Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for additional and enhanced open space can be brought forward with development.</p>	?	<p>Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for additional and enhanced open space can be brought forward with development.</p>	?	<p>Development may exert pressure for additional use of existing open space or result in the loss of open space. However, through contributions and conditions, opportunities for additional and enhanced open space can be brought forward with development.</p>
<p>Summary: Effect is largely unknown as there are a number of different variables involved in the protection, provision and enhancement of open space. Although development may create a number of different pressures for open space – increased use as well as loss caused by development it can also bring benefits for open space through conditions</p>						

and contributions.						
Proposed mitigation measures: None.						
13. Reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime.	~		~		~	
Summary: Achievement of this particular SA Objective is largely dependent upon the implementation of emerging Development Control policies relating to Accessibility, Adaptability and Security.						
Proposed mitigation measures: None.						
14. Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (including education and health).	+	The issues raised in this option would be similar to those discussed for Option C. However, as a result of larger scale of growth proposed, the issues may be more acute and the need for proposed mitigation measures greater, in particular to ensure a high standard of education provision. A new secondary school and at least 3-4 primary schools would be generated by development. The growth proposed for the Huntingdon Area in this option is manageable in terms of education provision and there are no anticipated concerns for the scale of growth proposed for St Ives, Ramsey, Little Paxton and Yaxley. The issues of accessibility to services over the railway and the perceived segregation from existing communities in St Neots remains. The need to provide complementary retail provision as part of new development in this location is important. However, greater developer contributions could be sought for the whole of St Neots and development may help start the process of regeneration for some areas of St Neots.	?	The issues raised in this option would be similar to those discussed for Option A. However, despite a larger scale of growth proposed only a relative small proportion of this would be proposed for the Huntingdon Area, which would likely be insufficient to generate a new secondary school. Appropriate mitigation measures would therefore be required for the proposals in this option.	?	Potential issues of accessibility are largely unknown for either sub option. Further accessibility work would be required. It is anticipated, in comparison to Northstowe development, that development of such a scale would generate 6 primary schools and 1 or 2 secondary schools. New primary services, district centres and local centres as well as employment provision and other associated social and physical infrastructure (e.g. community centres, open space) would be generated by an eco town which would improve accessibility to local facilities and services for residents of the eco town but not to secondary care services.

<p>Summary: The scale of growth proposed is considered to be manageable for the Huntingdon area in terms of education provision. However, the accessibility and potential segregation issues for St Neots remain and careful masterplanning in order to sufficiently integrate the development with existing communities would be required. Option 2 would require significant mitigation measures to be implemented for the Huntingdon area as growth would be insufficient to generate a further secondary school and therefore pressure would be exerted on existing services. Additional services including secondary schools and primary care services would be provided with the development of an Eco-Town.</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: Option 1 is favoured over options 2 or 3</p>						
<p>15. Redress inequalities related to age, gender, disability, race, faith, location and income</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>The scale of development proposed and presence of physical barriers (eg railway) may create problems for integrating residents of the new development into existing communities. This could be mitigated by ensuring there are good physical access routes (eg cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways) over the railway as well as providing community benefits for the existing communities through developer contributions. There may be further issues arising from the proximity of the Gypsy and Traveller site which is currently located immediately adjacent the proposed development.</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>Makes use of existing social infrastructure. Long and medium term mitigation measures may involve the provision of additional services alongside development (particularly where new development is located adjacent existing areas of inequality). As growth is proposed on or near to Guided Busway this will improve accessibility to key destinations (eg health care) for those without a car.</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>The creation of an Eco Town would help redress inequalities by ensuring provision of affordable housing and new services and facilities including education, health and employment.</p> <p>Sub Option 3(b) (Wyton) could potentially facilitate better access to services outside of the eco town (eg secondary care services) as it may be possible to extend the route of the Guided Busway to include Wyton.</p>
<p>Summary: Both options 2 and 3 meet this SA Objective more fully than option 1. This is primarily because there are a number of accessibility and integration issues associated with Option 1 which are created by the railway line. If this option were to be taken forward, consideration would need to be given to the Gypsy and Traveller site that lies adjacent to where the majority of growth is proposed.</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: Options 2 and 3 are favoured over option 1.</p>						
<p>16. Ensure all groups have access to decent and affordable housing</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>Primary rationale for including additional options for growth that goes beyond the housing requirements of the emerging East of England Plan.</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>Primary rationale for including additional options for growth that goes beyond the housing requirements of the emerging East of England Plan.</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>Primary rationale for including additional options for growth that go beyond the housing requirements of the emerging East of England Plan.</p>
<p>Summary: Primary rationale for including additional options for growth that goes beyond the housing requirements of the emerging East of England Plan.</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: None.</p>						



<p>17. Improve access to satisfying work appropriate to their skills, potential and place of residence</p>	+	<p>Development will bring forward employment opportunities to help promote investment in St Neots. Appropriate employment opportunities provided alongside housing growth will help curtail the potential issue of out commuting which may arise from being so close to the railway station. However, the employment and retail demand is slightly less compared to Huntingdon.</p>	+	<p>Promotes additional employment growth within the Huntingdon area which has been identified as having particularly strong market demand.</p>	?	<p>No information on market demand is known about either airfield. Alconbury Airfield is close to the trunk road network which may provide attractive to potential investors. Wyton is located close to St Ives and could potentially be served by the Guided Busway should the route be extended to serve development. Both locations would be able to provide significant employment opportunities that, in combination with other employment land provision elsewhere, go beyond that identified in the Employment Land Review.</p>
<p>Summary: Option 2 promotes additional employment generating growth to areas where there is strong market demand. Option 1 proposes the majority of growth towards St Neots which, although having a strong retail and employment market, is not as strong as Huntingdon and does not generate as much demand. There is no employment or retail information available for option 3 – the appraisal is based on physical location which, for both Alconbury and Wyton, is reasonable (Alconbury near to the trunk road network and Wyton near to the Guided Busway route).</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: Further investigation of market demand for employment and retail in Alconbury and Wyton would be required.</p>						
<p>18. Improve the efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy</p>	+	<p>Provides opportunities to enhance the competitiveness of St Neots through increasing employment and retail opportunities and could help regenerate other areas of St Neots to improve levels of investment throughout the town.</p>	+	<p>Proposes additional employment and retail growth for an area where there is very strong market demand and spare capacity.</p>	?	<p>Maybe beneficial to the economy of Huntingdonshire as additional retail and employment opportunities are created however, it is not directed towards an area where there is a known market preference.</p>
<p>Summary: All options may improve Huntingdonshire's economy as they all provide opportunities for employment and retail and potential investment. Options 1 and 2 propose growth for areas that have a strong market demand.</p>						
<p>Proposed mitigation measures: None.</p>						

Appendix 6: Performance indicators and targets to be included in the monitoring framework

Indicator	Indicator Type	Related Spatial Objective(s)	Related SA Objective(s)	Related Policy Wording	Target	Responsible Agencies	Implementation
<b>Land, Water and Resources</b>							
Number of dwellings completed (net)	Core indicator, Significant effects	1, 2, 3	16	2	550 per annum	Huntingdonshire District Council, Private Sector, Registered Social Landlords	Through Planning Proposals DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions SPDs and UDFs
% housing completions on previously developed land	Core output, Significant effects	8, 12	1	2	29%	Huntingdonshire District Council, Private Sector, Registered Social Landlords	Through Planning Proposals DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions SPDs and UDFs
Estimated household water consumption	Local output, Significant effects	12	2	1	Reduce pro capita water consumption rates	Huntingdonshire District Council, Private Sector	Through Planning Proposals DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions SPDs and UDFs
<b>Biodiversity</b>							
Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance:  1. change in priority habitats and species (by	Core output, Significant effects	8, 9	1, 3, 12	1, 9	Increase the number of ha of specified target habitats	Huntingdonshire District Council, Cambs Biodiversity Partnership, Natural England, RSPB	Through Planning Proposals DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions SPDs and UDFs, Countryside Services Initiatives

Indicator	Indicator Type	Related Spatial Objective(s)	Related SA Objective(s)	Related Policy Wording	Target	Responsible Agencies	Implementation
type) 2. change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value including sites of international, national, regional, sub-regional or local significance							
<b>Landscape, Townscape and Archaeology</b>							
Large scale housing sites meeting 'Building for Life' equivalent standards	Local output, Significant effects	10, 11, 12, 13	4, 5, 10, 13	1	60% to achieve Silver Standard equivalent	District Council, Private Sector	Through Planning Proposals DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions SPDs and UDFs, Conservation initiatives
<b>Climate Change and Pollution</b>							
% household waste which is recycled	Local output, Significant effects	12	8	1	50% by 2011 56% by 2016 60% by 2021	District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council	Provision of recycling facilities, Recycling campaigns, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Waste Strategy
% of housing	Local output,	1, 12, 13	7, 9	2, 3	Maximise the %	Huntingdonshire	Through Planning Proposals

*Sustainability Appraisal: Core Strategy Preferred Options*

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Related Spatial Objective(s)</b>	<b>Related SA Objective(s)</b>	<b>Related Policy Wording</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Responsible Agencies</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
completions in Market Towns and Key Service Centres	Significant effects				of housing completions in Market Towns and Key Service Centres	District Council, Private Sector, Registered Social Landlords	DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions SPDs and UDFs
<b>Inclusive Communities</b>							
% of housing completions on qualifying sites which are affordable	Core output, Significant effects	2, 3	15, 16	4, 5	40%	Huntingdonshire District Council, Private Sector, Registered Social Landlords	Through Planning Proposals DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions
Amount of new residential development within 30 mins public transport time of GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, areas of employment and a major retail centre	Core output, Significant effects	1	14, 15	1	Maximise the amount of new residential development within 30 mins public transport time of GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, areas of employment and a major retail centre	Huntingdonshire District Council, Private Sector, Registered Social Landlords	Through Planning Proposals DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions SPDs and UDFs
Number of permissions granted for new public or private Gypsy, Traveller &	Core output	3	15, 16	6	Increase provision of pitches available on legal sites for Gypsies, Travellers &	County Council, Registered Social Landlords, Private Sector	Through Gypsies and Travellers DPD and development control decisions

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Indicator Type</b>	<b>Related Spatial Objective(s)</b>	<b>Related SA Objective(s)</b>	<b>Related Policy Wording</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Responsible Agencies</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
Travelling Showpeople sites, or expansion of existing sites					Travelling Showpeople		
<b>Economic Activity</b>							
Amount and % of employment floorspace developed on previously developed land	Core output, Significant effects	6, 8, 12	1	7	Maximise the % of completed employment floorspace on previously developed land	Huntingdonshire District Council, Private Sector	Through Planning Proposals DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions SPDs and UDFs
Amount of land for which planning permission has been granted for employment uses	Local output, Significant effects	4, 6, 15	17, 18	7	Annual average 4.3 ha	Huntingdonshire District Council, Private Sector	Through Planning Proposals DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions SPDs and UDFs
% of retail completions in Huntingdon and St Neots	Local output, Significant effects	5, 7	14, 17, 18	8	Ensure a balance between the two main market towns of Huntingdon and St Neots	Huntingdonshire District Council, Private Sector	Through Planning Proposals DPD, Huntingdon West AAP, development control decisions SPDs and UDFs

