

Long Stratton Area Action Plan

Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Main Modifications 6 and 11 to the Area Action Plan (November 2015)

Background

On 6 March 2015 South Norfolk Council submitted the Long Stratton AAP to the Secretary of State for examination. Inspector Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI was appointed to undertake the Examination, the hearings for which were carried out on 14, 15 and 16 July 2015.

The Inspector wrote to the Council on 23 July identifying some additional work which was required. A number of Main Modifications (MM) were proposed before the hearing sessions, which were discussed during the sessions, and a number of extra MMs were proposed during the hearing sessions themselves. The Inspector's letter of 23 July requested the Council to *'please consider which, if any, of the draft main modifications would require further Sustainability Appraisal'*.

Sustainability Appraisal of Modifications 6 and 11

The LSAAP has been developed alongside a process of Sustainability Appraisal, as required in order to ensure that any significant effects of the reasonable alternatives and the preferred approach are assessed and presented.

As part of the process of formulating the MMs the Council has made an assessment of their significance in terms of the effects the modifications are likely to have and concluded that two of the modifications require further Sustainability Appraisal. These MMs concern the proposed widening of the corridor of the bypass (MM11) and the removal of the indicative employment areas from the LNGS1 allocation as shown on the Policies Map and their replacement with criteria within the policy wording (MM6).

The information is presented as an addition to the draft SA that accompanied the Submission version of the AAP (**Doc Ref. F3**) and uses the same objectives and decision making criteria as the draft SA. A number of other main alternatives were considered through that SA process when developing the Submission Version of the LSAAP, and these have not been considered again in this SA. Where additional alternatives have been considered, but not considered realistic, these are noted in the summary below and in the introductory text to each SA. The MMs are presented below against the alternative of 'no change' to the submitted plan as a direct comparison.

Key

Each of the assessment Objectives is assessed as having following effects:

++	Major Positive
+	Minor Positive
0	Neutral
-	Minor Negative
--	Major Negative
?	Uncertain

Summary of Outcomes

MM6 – Employment Areas

Both options aim to deliver the required amount of employment land within the LNGS1 allocation, which is a key element of making the settlement more self-contained and therefore reducing the overall environmental impacts. Overall locating the employment within the allocation using a criteria-based approach (Option 2) gives both a greater degree of flexibility to locate different employment types at locations which better reflect their requirements and also allows for a more robust assessment of the implications. In particular this approach may assist in maximising the integration of appropriate employment uses within residential development. It is considered that Option 2 also allows for the more timely delivery of employment alongside the phasing of housing development. Lastly, Option 2 allows greater flexibility to respond to the other requirements of the development plan, rather than fixing the location of the employment unnecessarily.

Conversely, Option 1 has been rejected on the basis that it is more rigid and therefore may not result in the best form of development though the masterplanning, phasing and delivery of development. In particular, employment uses may be unnecessarily divorced from the earlier phases of housing, creating additional journeys within the settlement.

MM11 – Bypass Corridor

Both options aim to provide a corridor within which the bypass can be delivered; both utilise greenfield land and would mark the eastern extent of the growth of Long Stratton. The scale of the road itself does not necessarily vary with the extent of the corridor; the corridor is there to facilitate the provision of a road which responds to the detailed evidence that emerges through the planning application process, providing the best option to: protect that function of the A140 corridor; protect the local environment and residential amenity; and facilitate a high quality of new development.

Option 2 requires the Development Boundary to be extended further, moving slightly to the east. At both the northern and southern connections with the existing A140 (junctions 2 and 4 on the LSAAP Policies Map, Appendix 2) the corridor has been extended to provide a greater area to accommodate possible junction arrangements, the northern end also requires a wider corridor to reflect possible alternative alignments of the bypass itself.

The wider corridor has been proposed in order to ensure that it is possible to produce the most advantageous scheme which balances the requirements of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and those set out in paragraph 5.5 of the AAP (submission version numbering) as well as delivering a bypass that meets the functions set out in proposed MMs 15 and 16 to Policy LNGS1. More detailed evidence will come forward as part of the planning application process and the wider corridor enables the design of the bypass to respond to this in the most appropriate way. The final scheme will need to meet the requirements of the other policies in the AAP, the Development Management Policies document and the JCS, including those concerned with impacts on the historic environment, landscape, residential amenity and accessibility. In addition the bypass will need to facilitate a high quality of new development. Again, Option 2 is considered to give greater flexibility to achieve these aims.

Further widening of the bypass corridor (beyond that proposed under Option 2) would either (to the west) encroach on the area available to accommodate the allocated development or (to the east/north) encroach on the historic landscape and potentially move the route unacceptably close to nearby properties; consequently these were not considered to be reasonable alternatives. The extent to which the MM11 bypass corridor impacts on nearby properties, the landscape and the historic environment is considered in the appraisal below.

Option 1 constrained the possible options unnecessarily, potentially resulting in a suboptimal scheme in terms of both the function of the bypass as part of the A140 strategic road corridor and in terms of mitigating the impacts of the bypass and allowing the final scheme to contribute to a high quality of new development. Consequently Option 1 has been rejected.

Conclusions

For both Modifications the SA has shown that, where there is an identified effect, there is either no material difference between the proposed modification and the 'no change' option, or that the proposed modification shows an improvement over the submitted version.

Long Stratton Area Action Plan

Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Main Modifications 6 and 11 to the Area Action Plan (November 2015)

Bypass Corridor

MM11 involves the creation of a wider bypass corridor within the Development Boundary in order to ensure that an appropriate bypass scheme can be accommodated within the corridor set out in the AAP. The wider corridor requires the Development Boundary to be extended, moving slightly to the east. At both the northern and southern connections with the existing A140 (junction 2 and 4 on the LSAAP Policies Map) the corridor has been extended to provide a greater area to accommodate possible junction arrangements, the northern end also requires a wider corridor to reflect possible alternative alignments of the bypass itself.

The wider corridor has been proposed in order to ensure that it is possible to produce a scheme that takes into account the requirements set out in paragraph 5.5 of the AAP (submission version numbering) and delivers a bypass that meets the functions set out in proposed MM16 to Policy LINGS1. The flexibility of a wider corridor to respond to the more detailed evidence that will come forward as part of the planning application process should ensure that the final scheme can meet the other requirements of the AAP, the Development Management Policies document and the Joint Core Strategy, including impacts on the historic environment, landscape, residential amenity and accessibility and provide for a high quality of new development.

Alternatives, such as the further widening of the bypass corridor would either (to the west) encroach on the area available to accommodate the allocated development or (to the east/north) encroach on the historic landscape and potentially move the route unacceptably close to nearby properties; consequently these were not considered to be reasonable alternatives.

Option 1 has been rejected as constraining the possible options unnecessarily potentially resulting in a scheme which does not achieve the best result in terms of protecting the function of the bypass as part of the A140 strategic road corridor and in terms of mitigating the impacts of the bypass and allowing the final scheme to contribute to a high quality of new development.

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by 	Both corridors have the potential to affect protected species; although it is intended to mitigate this through Green Infrastructure	-	-

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation	<p>development of the site?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development? Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest? Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity? 	<p>requirements.</p> <p>Although the corridor moves further to the east, there is still a considerable distance between the Development Boundary and any identified sites.</p> <p>The wider corridor gives the possibility for better integration with the surrounding countryside/landscape, and could facilitate lower density development on the periphery of the allocation.</p> <p>There are no known sites of geological interest affected by the wider corridor.</p>		
ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will development of the site minimise the risk of flooding? Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns? Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation? Does the proposal make use of SUDS? 	<p>The wider corridor allows greater flexibility for the drainage requirements of future schemes to be incorporated. However, overall there are considered to be no significant impacts or material difference between the Options.</p>	0	0
ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage efficient use of energy? Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development? Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including 	<p>The wider corridor allows for a wider range of potential bypass schemes; as such it increases the scope for schemes that will best manage to the flow of traffic and also schemes which prove the most attractive to users, thus minimising the likelihood of future 'rat-running' through Long Stratton.</p>	0	+

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
	<p>from energy and traffic?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources? 			
ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion? Will it reduce the need to travel? Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment? Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes? 	<p>The principle aim of both corridors is to remove traffic from the centre of Long Stratton and consequently relieve the significant congestion which currently exists. The A140 currently carries approximately 12% HGVs, many of which are part of the through traffic, which again, both corridors will remove from immediate proximity to footways and buildings.</p> <p>The wider corridor allows for a wider range of potential bypass schemes; as such it increases the scope for schemes that will best manage to the flow of traffic and also schemes which prove the most attractive to users, thus minimising the likelihood of future 'rat-running' through Long Stratton.</p>	++	++
ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution? Will it improve air quality? Can it improve the ambiance of local areas? 	<p>The bypass itself is designed to remove a significant volume of traffic from the centre of Long Stratton, in particular reducing congestion and improving air quality, however it is not considered that there is any material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.</p>	+	+
ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development? Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land? 	<p>Under both options the bypass corridor, and the allocation of which it forms a part, have been designed to take account of the landscape to the east of Long Stratton, which is recognised as being of historic importance and vulnerable to changes.</p> <p>Option 2 extends the corridor at the north east extremity to front Church Lane, potentially (although not necessarily) bringing the bypass closer to the listed St Michael's Church and a number of other nearby listed properties.</p>	-	-

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the District's heritage be preserved and/or enhanced? 	<p>The potential for a larger development area within the bypass to give greater flexibility to design development to best protect and enhance the existing townscape and heritage assets in the main part of the village.</p> <p>Other policies of the AAP and the Development Plan provide for the protection and enhancement of the local landscapes, heritage assets and townscapes.</p>		
ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land? Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources? 	Both options will require the use of Greenfield land. Whilst Option 2 potentially increases the area of land used, it may also give greater scope for master-planning development to avoid the best and most productive agricultural land. It is not considered that there is any material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	-	-
ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it conserve ground water resources Will it reduce water consumption? Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network? What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of water bodies as required by WFD? 	No significant impact. It is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	0	0
ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal? Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities? Will it minimise consumption of 	No significant impact. It is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	0	0

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
	resources eg use local materials and sustainably sourced products?			
S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce homelessness? Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all? Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups? 	No significant impact. It is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	0	0
S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected? Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District? Will it support the development of Social Cohesion? Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation? 	No significant impact. It is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	0	0
S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce unemployment overall? Will it improve earnings? Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance? 	No significant impact. It is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	0	0
S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve accessibility to key local services eg health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities? Will it improve access to employment opportunities? 	Whilst the bypass itself will help improve traffic conditions within Long Stratton, helping make walking and cycling a more attractive option for journeys to local facilities, and will also improve accessibility to employment opportunities across a wider area, it is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in	++	++

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
		relation to this Objective.		
S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people? Will it improve access to schools/education facilities for communities? Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace? Will it encourage lifelong learning and training? 	No significant impact. It is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	0	0
S6: To improve the health of the population overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve life expectancy? Will it improve access to high quality health facilities? Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How? 	Whilst the bypass itself will help improve traffic conditions within Long Stratton, helping make walking and cycling a more attractive option for journeys to local facilities, it is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	+	+
S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Fear of crime? Will it encourage engagement in community activities? Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities? 	No significant impact. It is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	0	0
S8: To improve the quality of where people live	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods? 	<p>In both options the bypass itself will help remove traffic and congestion from the centre of Long Stratton, with consequent improvements in the quality of the environment.</p> <p>Option 2 extends the corridor at the north east extremity to front Church Lane, potentially (although not necessarily) bringing the bypass closer to the residential properties in this area.</p>	++	++

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
		<p>To the south the corridor has a widened frontage to the existing A140, to better reflect the potential junction options at this end of the bypass. In both instances, although the corridor is wider, this does not directly reflect any change in the scale of the bypass itself.</p> <p>The policies of the AAP and the other documents of the South Norfolk Local Plan provide protection for the amenity of residents.</p>		
EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (eg research, tourism)? Will it help retain existing businesses? Will it aid farming diversification? Will it increase the vitality and viability of town centres? 	Whilst the bypass itself will help support business by reducing congestion on the A140 and also lead to a better quality environment in the town centre, helping to improve vitality and viability, it is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	++	++
EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses? Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises? Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types? 	Whilst the bypass itself will provide access to new employment locations, it is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	+	+
EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs? Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work? Will it enhance a group of 	Whilst the bypass itself will provide access to new employment locations and reduce journey times by alleviating congestion on the A140, it is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	++	++

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
	<p>existing employment generating uses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it encourage mixed use or live/work? • Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas? 			
EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working? • Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment? 	No significant impact. It is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	0	0
EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it encourage rural diversification? • Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas? • Will it improve electronic communication potential? 	No significant impact. It is not considered that there is a material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.	0	0

Employment Areas

MM6 involves the removal of the indicative employment locations from within LNGS1 on the Policies Map and their replacement with a criteria based approach in the Policy wording itself. Overall locating the employment within the allocation using a criteria-based approach (Option 2) gives both a greater degree of flexibility to locate different employment types at locations which better reflect their requirements and also allows for a more robust assessment of the impacts of the proposed development. It is considered that Option 2 also allows for better integration of the employment uses which responds to the other requirements of the development plan, and more timely delivery of employment alongside the phasing of housing development.

Conversely, Option 1 has been rejected on the basis that it is more rigid and therefore may not result in the best form of development though the masterplanning, phasing and delivery of development.

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site? Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development? Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest? Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity? 	<p>Whilst the LNGS1 allocation is within approximately 1km of the Wood Green County Wildlife Site it is not envisaged that there would be any significant effects. The allocation may also affect protected species; Option 1 identifies locations which do not directly affect the protected species, whereas Option 2 has the potential to disperse the employment to other locations within the allocation. Any impacts should be mitigated by other policies in the AAP and other parts of the Local Plan.</p> <p>It is therefore not considered that there is a significant impact or any material difference between the Options in relation to this Objective.</p>	0	0
ENV2: To limit or reduce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will development of the site minimise the risk of flooding? 	The majority of the LNGS1 allocation is within Flood Zone 1, therefore it is not anticipated that	0	0

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns? Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation? Does the proposal make use of SUDS? 	there would be any significant impacts or material difference between the options.		
ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage efficient use of energy? Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development? Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including from energy and traffic? Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources? 	<p>The Option 1 locations are considered to be well related to the existing and proposed built-up areas helping facilitate sustainable transport. Option 2 potentially disperses the employment uses over a wider area within LNGS1, however the proposed Policy wording seeks to maximise sustainable transport for the employment sites.</p> <p>Option 2 is designed to be more robust in terms of assessing the impacts of employment development, it is therefore anticipated that there would be a greater benefit to this option.</p>	0	+
ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion? Will it reduce the need to travel? Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment? Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes? 	<p>The Option 1 locations are considered to be well related to the existing and proposed built-up areas helping facilitate sustainable transport. Option 2 potentially disperses the employment uses over a wider area within LNGS1, however the proposed Policy wording seeks to maximise sustainable transport for the employment sites.</p> <p>The employment allocations in the AAP are designed to maximise the self-containment of Long Stratton, with the aim of reducing travel.</p> <p>Option 2 is designed to be more robust in terms</p>	+	++

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
		of assessing the impacts of employment development, it is therefore anticipated that there would be a greater benefit to this option.		
ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution? Will it improve air quality? Can it improve the ambiance of local areas? 	<p>The Option 1 locations are considered to be well related to the existing and proposed built-up areas helping to facilitate sustainable transport. Option 2 potentially disperses the employment uses over a wider area within LNGS1, however the proposed Policy wording seeks to maximise sustainable transport for the employment sites and to avoid conflict between employment and housing/other sensitive uses.</p> <p>Option 2 is designed to be more robust in terms of assessing the impacts of employment development, it is therefore anticipated that there would be a greater benefit to this option.</p>	0	+
ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development? Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes? Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land? Will the District's heritage be preserved and/or enhanced? 	Whilst employment uses may not enhance the townscape, it is not anticipated that there would be any significant impacts or material difference between the options.	0	0
ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land? Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources? 	<p>Both options will require the use of Greenfield land as there are very limited brownfield options in Long Stratton.</p> <p>It is not considered that there would be any material difference between the options.</p>	-	-

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
resources				
ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it conserve ground water resources Will it reduce water consumption? Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network? What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of water bodies as required by WFD? 	<p>There are acknowledged limitations to the capacity of the Water Recycling Centre at Long Stratton</p> <p>Any development will need to comply with relevant JCS and Development Management Policies.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that there would be any material difference between the options.</p>	0	0
ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal? Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities? Will it minimise consumption of resources eg use local materials and sustainably sourced products? 	It is not anticipated that there would be any significant impacts or material difference between the options.	0	0
S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce homelessness? Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all? Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups? 	It is not anticipated that there would be any significant impacts or material difference between the options.	0	0
S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected? Will it improve the level of activity available to young 	It is not anticipated that there would be any significant impacts or material difference between the options.	0	0

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
	people in the District? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it support the development of Social Cohesion? Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation? 			
S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce unemployment overall? Will it improve earnings? Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance? 	Provision of employment land is an essential component of the growth at Long Stratton, with a key aim being to provide a better balance of housing and jobs. It is not considered that there would be any material difference between the options.	++	++
S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve accessibility to key local services eg health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities? Will it improve access to employment opportunities? 	Provision of employment land is an essential component of the growth at Long Stratton, with a key aim being to provide a better balance of housing and jobs. It is not considered that there would be any material difference between the options.	++	++
S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people? Will it improve access to schools/education facilities for communities? Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace? Will it encourage lifelong learning and training? 	It is not anticipated that there would be any significant impacts or material difference between the options.	0	0
S6: To improve the health of the population overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve life expectancy? Will it improve access to high quality health facilities? Will it encourage healthy 	Providing a better balance of housing and jobs and encouraging employment locations which are accessible to existing and new residents by walking and cycling are key aims of the employment allocations as part of LNGS1;	+	+

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
	lifestyles? How?	therefore helping to encourage healthier lifestyles. It is not anticipated that there would be any material difference between the options.		
S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Fear of crime? Will it encourage engagement in community activities? Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities? 	It is not anticipated that there would be any significant impacts or material difference between the options.	0	0
S8: To improve the quality of where people live	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods? 	It is not anticipated that there would be any significant impacts or material difference between the options.		
EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (eg research, tourism)? Will it help retain existing businesses? Will it aid farming diversification? Will it increase the vitality and viability of town centres? 	Both options aim to result in expanded employment opportunities in Long Stratton. Retention of existing businesses has been identified as a particular issue, which new employment land will offer opportunities to rectify. It is considered that the greater flexibility offer by Option 2 will increase the probability of employment land being delivered in a timely fashion.	+	++
EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses? Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises? Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types? 	Both options aim to result in expanded employment opportunities in Long Stratton. It is considered that the greater flexibility offer by Option 2 will increase the probability of employment land being delivered in a timely fashion.	+	++

Objective	Decision-Making criteria	Discussion	Option 1 – as submitted	Option 2 – main modification
EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs? Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work? Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses? Will it encourage mixed use or live/work? Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas? 	<p>Both options aim to result in expanded employment opportunities in Long Stratton.</p> <p>It is considered that the greater flexibility offer by Option 2 will increase the probability of employment land being delivered in a timely fashion. Option 2 is also more likely to encourage mixed live/work solutions, were appropriate.</p>	+	++
EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working? Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment? 	<p>Both options aim to result in expanded employment opportunities in Long Stratton.</p> <p>It is anticipated that Option 2 would give greater flexibility</p>	0	+
EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage rural diversification? Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas? Will it improve electronic communication potential? 	It is not anticipated that there would be any significant impacts or material difference between the options.	0	0