



Hartlepool Local Planning Framework

Local Plan

Sustainability Appraisal Addendum



July 2017



Overview

The purpose of this Addendum Report is to provide additional clarity to the Sustainability Appraisal documentation submitted with the Local Plan Submission document. This report will cover the following aspects:

1. A Non-Technical Summary.
2. Assessment of “do nothing” for all policies against SA objectives
3. Assessment of “reasonable alternatives” against SA objectives
4. Unreasonable growth alternatives
5. Conclusion of additional SA assessment

1. Non-Technical Summary

1.1 The following non-technical summary details process of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) undertaken in plain English, avoiding the use of technical terms. The production of a non-technical summary is a requirement of the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive known as the "SEA Directive".

Introduction

1.2 Hartlepool Borough Council has prepared a planning document that will provide a long-term planning vision for the Borough and contain policies and guidance that will be used to guide development in Hartlepool until 2031. This planning document is known as the Local Plan.

1.3 The Local Plan has been developed in a number of stages which are known as the 'Issues and Options' and a 'Preferred Options' stages. Consultation processes were undertaken in May 2014 and May 2016 respectively.

1.4 Comments received at these various stages were taken into account and the Local Authorities response to proposals is set out in the following documents, these record the modifications undertaken to the Local Plan through the development process:

- [Local Plan Publication Draft Consultation Statement Regulation 22 \(HLP01/4\)](#)
- [Local Plan Preferred Options Draft Consultation Statement \(HLP01/18\)](#)
- [Local Plan Issues and Options Draft Consultation Statement \(HPL01/22\)](#)

1.5 The [Local Plan \(HLP01/1\)](#) was submitted to the Secretary of State on 23 March 2017, it is now formally being examined by an independent planning inspector. This document is being prepared to detail that the sustainability appraisal process undertaken, which is a procedural requirement and has been integral to the preparation of the Local Plan has been prepared in accordance with the relevant legal and procedural regulations.

1.6 The Local Plan is expected to be adopted in Spring 2018, and will replace the adopted 2006 Hartlepool Local Plan.

1.7 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all local development documents should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In addition, European Directive 2001/42/EC (the SEA Directive) requires that a formal strategic environment assessment (SEA) should be undertaken of certain plans and programmes which are likely to have significant environmental effects on the environment.

1.8 Sustainability appraisal is a systematic and iterative appraisal process to assess the economic, social and environmental effects of plans and strategies which at the same time incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive.

1.9 SA, incorporating the requirements of SEA, has been carried out by Hartlepool Council for the Local Plan Submission Draft 2017.

1.10 The [Publication Stage Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Document \(December 2016\) \(HLP01/8\)](#), details the process of SA undertaken up until the submission date. The SA work undertaken to support this addendum has followed a consistent approach.

Scoping

1.11 A scoping stage is required as part of the SA. Scoping involves setting the context for the SA by considering local current baseline information (i.e. the current situation) on the environment, communities and the economy, and relevant plans and programmes that guide and manage the area. A report setting out this process was produced in May 2014 and consulted upon for an 8 week period. An updated report setting out the proposed framework for the SA was prepared in August 2014. It includes identifying main sustainability issues that affect the area and the area's characteristics; these are set out in Section 4 of the Scoping Report ([EX/HBC/1](#)); briefly in summary these cover:

Economic

- Boosting the local economy through economic growth and job creation; supporting development of the tourism industry, local business, large scale investment in growth industries such as offshore wind and renewable energy and other eco-industries supported through Enterprise Zone development.
- Infrastructure issues to accommodate development.
- Enhance the regeneration and development of the town centre and waterfront.
- Addressing unemployment levels at all levels, following positive outcomes of reducing the employment in younger people.
- Addressing imbalances in the housing stock and providing greater choice in the housing market.

Environmental

- Pressure on the rural area from expansion of the urban area westwards – housing and infrastructure.
- The Borough is bordered on the east by the North Sea and features extensive areas of attractive coastline including beaches, dunes and coastal grassland. Much of the intertidal area of the coast is internationally important for its bird species and is protected as a Special Protection Area/Ramsar site – protection of these is essential.
- Sea level change and coastal erosion and flooding.
- Protection of Heritage Assets from inappropriate development.

Social

- Addressing issues associated with Hartlepool having a lower proportion of the higher socioeconomic groups than nationally, and conversely a higher proportion of the lower socio-economic groups. Car ownership in Hartlepool is low.
- Enhancing the provision of education and skills facilities across the borough to accommodate growth requirements.
- Enhancing culture and leisure facilities available for residents and visitors.
- Crime rates in Hartlepool are relatively high, but are generally falling.

1.12 Through the scoping work undertaken, key issues and opportunities were identified. These were the central themes used to develop the approach to strategic development set out in the Local Plan. These have been detailed briefly below.

Key Issues

- Geography of the town – the coastal location of the urban area, industrial areas to the south and adjoining authority of Durham to the north limits where expansion of the urban area can occur creating pressure to the west of the urban area.
- Access – The key infrastructure routes to Hartlepool are focused on two key routes, the A689 and A179, development pressure presents capacity and safety issues on the local infrastructure network.
- Limited land within the existing urban core to accommodate growth required.
- Impact of the SPA on development within 6km of the protected coastline.
- Viability due to market conditions impacting upon the delivery of sustainable development.
- Risk of flooding due to coastal location and impact of climate change.
- High levels of unemployment and worklessness within the borough.
- Population statistics demonstrate an ageing population; this will increase the requirement for certain types of accommodation and result in infrastructure requirements.

Opportunities

- Creation of a good quality third access to the town, creating a safe access at Elwick on to the A19 through the development of a bypass and grade separated junction. Additional benefit of this will be on the community of Elwick village as road safety and congestion levels through the village will be improved.
- Widening the choice of housing within the borough through the allocation of a range of housing sites within the villages, western edge, Wynyard and urban area.
- Working with colleges and businesses to retain population previously lost to other areas, through the focused development of the Innovation and Skills Quarter.
- Creation of high quality green spaces within development with multiple social and environmental benefits.
- Attraction of business through working with Combined Authority on the Strategic Economic Plan aided by devolution powers.
- Creating high quality social infrastructure within new developments, through the allocation of sites for new primary schools and community infrastructure.
- Addressing affordable housing needs within the town centre and through strategic site allocations.
- Improving vitality and viability of the villages with the provision of limited growth.
- Development of a sustainable community at Wynyard through the provision of community infrastructure.

1.13 From the scoping exercise undertaking, 15 SA objectives were defined as appropriate indicators to test new Local Plan policies. They cover social, environmental and economic elements and detail comprehensive appraisal criteria.

1.14 Appraisal Criteria Used

SA Objectives	Appraisal Criteria
1. Economy. <i>To encourage strong, diverse and stable</i>	1. Will it encourage and support the establishment and development of inward investment companies? 2. Will it encourage new start business?

economy.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Will it provide a range of quality sustainable jobs? 4. Will it diversify the local economy? 5. Will it diversify the rural economy? 6. Will it improve the viability and vitality of town and local centres? 7. Will it reduce levels of deprivation?
2. Education and Skills. <i>To enable all children and young people to achieve their full potential and to maximise the education and skills levels of Hartlepool Residents.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it contribute to the development of new and improved education facilities? 2. Will it encourage lifelong learning and training to meet the workforce needs of local contractors and other major employers from local sources? 3. Will it increase the levels of attainment and participation in education?
3. Health. <i>To improve the health and well-being of the Hartlepool community.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it improve access to public services and health facilities? 2. Will it provide opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles? 3. Will it provide local play provision, parks and quality green space and increase access to the countryside? 4. Will it promote the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation? 5. Will it reduce poverty and health inequalities?
4. Safety and Security. <i>To create safer and cleaner community, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it create safer and cleaner communities? 2. Will it reduce crime, violence, disorder and anti-social behaviour? 3. Will it help to ensure residents are kept safe in the event of a fire? 4. Will it contribute to maintaining and keeping clean public areas? 5. Will it reduce the perception of crime and allow communities to safely access all areas?
5. Housing. <i>To ensure Hartlepool residents have access to decent, good quality, affordable homes.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it promote the re-use of previously developed land? 2. Will it help to ensure the balance of supply and demand in the housing stock is met in sustainable locations? 3. Will it help to ensure that Hartlepool residents have access to a choice of good quality housing in sustainable communities across tenures that meets their needs and aspirations? 4. Will it encourage improvements in homes to meet and exceed the 'decent homes standard'? 5. Will it provide increased access to open space for residents within Hartlepool? 6. Will it meet the housing needs of vulnerable people? 7. Will it encourage high quality design and sufficient open space in new developments?
6. Transport. <i>To help develop high quality, integrated, accessible and safe transport system.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it reduce the transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care? 2. Will it support the location of new development and provision of services that reduces the need to travel? 3. Will it reduce the incidence and severity of personal injury road crashes? 4. Will it increase personal safety and security whilst travelling? 5. Will it encourage more sustainable modes of travel, especially in urban areas? 6. Will it maintain, improve and make more efficient use of the existing transport network? 7. Will it control and maintain local air quality and seek to reduce transport emissions that contribute to climate change?
7. Built and Natural Environment. <i>To protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of Hartlepool's rural, urban and historic environment.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will the plan enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline? 2. Will it prevent urban development encroaching and/or occurring in the countryside. 3. Will it enhance the quality, character and setting of Hartlepool's designated Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, historic parks, gardens, scheduled ancient monuments, none designated heritage assets and areas of archaeological interest? 4. Will it enhance or increase access to these natural and cultural

	<p>assets?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Will it be of detriment to surrounding landscape and open space? 6. Will it help to ensure that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable? 7. Will it encourage high quality design? 8. Will it provide sufficient open space in new developments? 9. Will it improve Green Infrastructure within Hartlepool and adjacent Boroughs?
<p>8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity. <i>To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it preserve or enhance the quality of Nature Conservation Sites within Hartlepool? 2. Will it improve access to these nature conservation sites? 3. Will it protect habitats and priority species? 4. Will it improve or enhance ecological networks.
<p>9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution. <i>To improve and or retain the quality of watercourses, air quality and soil quality. To achieve sustainable use of water resources.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it help to achieve sustainable use of water resources? 2. Will it protect or improve and monitor local air quality? 3. Will it minimise atmospheric, noise, land, soil and water pollution? 4. Will it protect or improve the quality of controlled waters? 5. Will it improve infrastructure such as coastal defences? 6. Will it prevent and/or reduce the risk of local flooding?
<p>10. Liveability and Place. <i>To create and sustain liveable places, promoting sustainable lifestyles and social cohesion.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it improve accessibility and quality of key services and facilities and improve access to jobs? 2. Will it provide sufficient retail facilities for local people? 3. Will it improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities? 4. Will it create and sustain a vibrant and diverse community and promote a sense of place? 5. Will it promote social cohesion?
<p>11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation <i>To promote strong and inclusive communities</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it promote social inclusion and tackle worklessness? 2. Will it help to reduce deprivation and ensure no group of people are disadvantaged? 3. Will it encourage stronger socially inclusive communities? 4. Will it increase community cohesion? 5. Will it create community ownership, participation and engagement?
<p>12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources. <i>To minimise energy use and support renewable energy production and encourage the prudent use of natural resources.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it minimise energy use through sustainable, efficient and effective use of buildings and land? 2. Will it support or promote the increasing use of renewable energy resources in environmentally acceptable locations? 3. Will it reduce demand for natural resources? 4. Will it encourage the prudent and efficient use of natural resources?
<p>13. Waste. <i>To minimise the production of waste and to maximise opportunities for recycling.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it minimise the generation of household and commercial waste? 2. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with as close to the source as feasible? 3. Will it maximise the opportunities for recycling waste materials? 4. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with in a sustainable manner? 5. Does it make provision for an adequate supply of minerals?
<p>14. Climate Change. <i>To address the causes of climate change and minimise emissions of greenhouse gasses.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it encourage prudent use of natural resources? 2. Will it lead to a reduction in CO₂ emissions? 3. Will it assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change? 4. Will it increase emphasis on the issue of climate change and global warming effects, such as rising sea levels and the impact of additional development? 5. Will it ensure that flood management takes a sustainable approach? 6. Will it reduce the risk of flooding? 7. Will it tackle global sustainability issues?

<p>15. Futurity. <i>To ensure that development that meets the needs of today should not restrict choices and opportunities for future generations</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will its outcomes be detrimental to future generations? 2. Will it restrict the choices of future generations?
---	--

Process of Undertaking the SA

- 1.15 Throughout the development process of the local plan, draft policies have been subject to SA. A comprehensive appraisal was undertaken at the preferred options stage in May 2016 (document [HLP01/19](#)). The impact of each of the policies on the SA objectives was assessed to determine the short, medium and long term impact. Further assessment was then undertaken between the preferred options stage and the publication stage of the Local Plan preparation.
- 1.16 The majority of changes that were made between the Preferred Options and the Publication Document in response to the consultation on the Preferred Options Document were minor, non-material amendments at this stage which did not have any implications for the SA. However consultation at this stage led to the inclusion of additional policies within the plan, full appraisals were undertaken on all additional policies. Details of the original and updated assessments are set out in submitted Sustainability Appraisal; in addition the document also presents a clear audit trail detailing where recommendations from SA were not taken forward as policy changes and the reasoning for this.
- 1.17 Further SA work has been undertaken post submission to present a 'do nothing' alternative on all of the draft policies as well as alternative growth scenarios considered through the development of the local plan. SA work was also carried out on alternative policy and site options that were considered through the SHLAA process; these are detailed within sections 2 and 3 of this report. Unreasonable alternatives were discounted prior to assessment against the SA objectives, these are detailed in section 4 of this reports and include justification for their exclusion.
- 1.18 At all stages of appraisal the assessments were undertaken by a multi-disciplinary team of officers from across the Local Authority to ensure perspectives beyond the scope of strategic planning are appropriately considered.

Conclusions

- 1.19 Policies are justified through the SA process; the policies have been amended through SA appraisal to overcome issues identified, strengthening the draft policies where possible in sustainability terms. Details on the recommendations made are set on in Appendix 2 of this document and how these recommendations have been taken forward are detailed in Section 6 of [Publication Stage Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Document \(December 2016\) \(HLP01/8\)](#).
- 1.20 The further work detailed in this addendum has demonstrated through SA assessment on the 'do nothing' policy option and reasonable alternatives that the draft policies as set out in the submitted Local Plan provide a sound sustainable future for the borough.

2. Assessment of “do nothing” for all policies against SA objectives

- 2.1 In response to the initial observations of the planning inspector as part of the examination process of the submitted local plan and supporting SA document further work was undertaken to assess the impact on the SA objectives of a ‘do nothing’ alternative to each of the proposed draft policies. This has been completed to ensure the SA meets the requirement of the SEA directive.
- 2.2 The assessment considered the 15 SA objectives as set out in 1.14 of this report and was assessed in the same manor using a multidisciplinary team. Appendix 1 records the outcome of these appraisals on the 87 draft policies within the plan.
- 2.3 As a general overview the SA of the ‘do nothing’ approached, presented as the ‘policy off’ alternative in Appendix 1, demonstrates that in all cases the proposed policy is considered the most sustainable approach. For the majority of policies there would be a significant detrimental impact on the SA objectives if a ‘do nothing’ approach was adopted. There are examples where the ‘do nothing’ alternative performs better against some of the individual SA objectives than having the policy in place; for example not having EMP5 (Safeguarded Land for New Nuclear Power Station) would be a more positive benefit on both the Built and Natural Environment; and Biodiversity and Geodiversity SA objectives. However, even where individual objectives do show a positive benefit of the ‘do nothing’ alternative when the 15 SA objective are considered as a whole in all cases the most sustainable option is demonstrated by the draft policy.
- 2.4 Providing the ‘do nothing’ alternative on all of the draft policies have increased the transparency of the decision to pursue the preferred policy option. Appropriate mitigation for the draft policies suggested as a result of the SA process is set out in [HLP01/8](#).

3. Assessment of “reasonable alternatives” against SA objectives

3.1 As part of the development of the Local Plan, officers have considered a range of alternative growth and development scenarios, some of which have resulted from proposals put forward by developers as part of the Preferred Options and Publication Stage consultation periods. As the growth of the Borough is restricted by the geography of the area (north sea to the east and north) and existing industrial uses including a nuclear power station to the south, the range of alternatives is limited. No alternative employment areas were put forward and given the findings of the Employment Land Review which proposed to de-allocate or re-allocate a number of previous employment sites due to an oversupply of employment land it was not considered appropriate to look at any additional areas. In total another eight scenarios have been considered and the appraisal tables in Appendix two provide a comprehensive assessment of the alternative scenarios against the agreed SA objectives. Below is a brief summary of the eight scenarios and the findings of the assessments.

Policy CC4 – Alternative 1 – Four Turbines at Brenda Road only, no turbines at High Volts

3.2 This policy alternative to emerging policy CC4 would see the omission of the proposed additional turbines at High Volts with just a single allocation at Brenda Road for 4 turbines. Whilst this may result in a lesser impact on a number of sustainability appraisal objectives such as the built and natural environment and biodiversity, the reduction in the scale of renewable energy development across the Borough over the plan period would prevent part of the Borough that has been assessed as suitable for wind turbine development (High Volts) from being used for this purpose and ultimately lessen the effectiveness of the policy in addressing climate change and sustainability issues as well as reducing the positive impact on the local economy. The assessment recommended not to progress this policy alternative.

Policy CC4 – Alternative 2 – Three Turbines at High Volts only, no turbines at Brenda Road

3.3 This policy alternative to emerging policy CC4 would see the omission of the proposed wind turbine allocation at Brenda Road with only a single allocation at High Volts for an additional 3 turbines. Whilst this may result in a lesser impact on a number of sustainability appraisal objectives such as the built and natural environment and biodiversity, the reduction in the scale of renewable energy development across the Borough over the plan period would prevent part of the Borough that has been assessed as suitable for wind turbine development (Brenda Road) from being used for this purpose and ultimately lessen the effectiveness of the policy in addressing climate change and sustainability issues as well as reducing the positive impact on the local economy. The assessment recommended not to progress this policy alternative.

Policy Hsg1 – Growth Scenario A – Less Housing at Wynyard and the additional 450 dwellings at Quarry Farm

3.4 Cecil M Yuill Ltd submitted a representation at both the Preferred Options and the Publication Stage of the Local Plan. Within their comments on the Publication stage they suggested that they have land capable of increasing the Quarry Farm development by an

additional 450. Whilst they queried the housing requirement figures, these are based on evidence within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA, 2015), SHMA Addendum (2016) and the Housing and Employment Growth Topic Paper (2017) and is therefore not proposed an acceptable alternative to look at adjusting the annual target as part of this process. Therefore, in order to consider the proposal for additional housing at Quarry Farm, and taking account that the South West Extension has outline planning consent, the only alternative area to take growth from is Wynyard or High Tunstall. As the quantum of development is needed at High Tunstall to help with the viability of the Elwick bypass and grade separated junction this scenario considered moving 450 houses from the proposed Wynyard allocation.

- 3.5 The appraisal objectives were all carefully considered, and some of the criteria showed a positive outcome, however in the case of the economy this was not necessarily as a result of the location of the development, more that development still has a positive impact on the economy through construction, council tax, new homes bonus etc. The alternative was assessed as having a positive impact in terms of housing, however not as positive as the preferred option, with the main difference being that a higher reliance on a particular area of the housing market and a concern that Wynyard would not become a sustainable community with lower numbers of homes as these are crucial to providing the viability to establish the community facilities that are part of the vision for that sustainable community. This was reflected in the assessments of the liveability and place and the Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation objectives which were scored negatively because of this concern. If community facilities are not provided as part of the Wynyard development this would also have an adverse impact in transport terms as more people who already live in the area will have to travel further to access community facilities elsewhere.
- 3.6 It was concluded that the detrimental impact on the sustainability of Wynyard as a settlement through the proposals in Scenario A would outweigh the benefits of improving the viability/deliverability of the bypass of Elwick village, which it concluded will be more deliverable if a recent bid to the National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF) for £10million in grant funding is successful. The assessment recommended not to progress this policy alternative.

Policy Hsg1 – Growth Scenario B – Less Housing at Wynyard and the additional 400 dwellings at Tunstall Farm

- 3.7 As part of the consultation on the Preferred Options and Publication Stages of the Local Plan production Taylor Wimpey made representations seeking the inclusion of approximately 400 dwellings at Tunstall Farm (2). Whilst they queried the housing requirement figures, these are based on evidence within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA, 2015), SHMA Addendum (2016) and the Housing and Employment Growth Topic Paper (2017) and is therefore not proposed an acceptable alternative to look at adjusting the annual target as part of this process. Therefore, in order to consider the proposal for additional housing at Tunstall Farm, and taking account that the South West Extension has outline planning consent, the only alternative area to take growth from is Wynyard or High Tunstall. As the quantum of development is needed at High Tunstall to help with the viability of the Elwick bypass and grade separated junction this scenario considered moving 400 houses from the proposed Wynyard allocation.

- 3.8 The appraisal objectives were all carefully considered, and some of the criteria showed a positive outcome, however in the case of the economy this was not necessarily as a result of the location of the development, more that development still has a positive impact on the economy through construction, council tax, new homes bonus etc. The alternative was assessed as having a positive impact in terms of housing, however not as positive as the preferred option, with the main difference being that a higher reliance on a particular area of the housing market and a concern that Wynyard would not become a sustainable community with lower numbers of homes as these are crucial to providing the viability to establish the community facilities that are part of the vision for that sustainable community. This was reflected in the assessments of the liveability and place and the Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation objectives which were scored negatively because of this concern. If community facilities are not provided as part of the Wynyard development this would also have an adverse impact in transport terms as more people who already live in the area will have to travel further to access community facilities elsewhere.
- 3.9 The assessment of the High Tunstall alternative also noted a number of negative impacts such as on health - Whilst the provision of more housing on the edge of the town would assist in supporting existing facilities, the further development of the Tunstall Farm site would have a detrimental impact on Summerhill Country Park which would have negative implications for promoting healthier lifestyles, providing parks and quality green space, increasing access to the countryside and promoting the use of existing facilities. It is considered this would outweigh any health benefits of the proposal. Furthermore, fewer houses at Wynyard will make the delivery of health and healthcare related services more difficult.
- 3.10 A negative impact was also identified on transport – the assessment identified that the site relies on an access from Summerhill Lane which the developers do not own or have an option on. The proposed access would also cut across a Local Wildlife site near to the entrance of the Summerhill Country Park. Even if this access could be provided there are serious concerns about traffic from 400 homes coming out onto Catcote Road and both the capacity of the road to deal with this and also from a safety point of view due to the location of two schools just to the south of Summerhill Lane.
- 3.11 There were also severe impacts identified in terms of the built and natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity and futurity which identified a significant impact on the Green Wedge and Summerhill Country Park and it was considered the outcome of this option would therefore be significantly detrimental for future generations.
- 3.12 The assessment recommended not to progress this policy alternative.

Policy Hsg1 – Growth Scenario C – Reduced Quantum at High Tunstall and increase the South West Extension

- 3.13 As part of the consultation on the development of the Local Plan production Persimmon made representations seeking additional growth at the South West Extension. Whilst they queried the housing requirement figures, these are based on evidence within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA, 2015), SHMA Addendum (2016) and the Housing and Employment Growth Topic Paper (2017) and is therefore not proposed an acceptable alternative to look at adjusting the annual target as part of this process.

- 3.14 This scenario considers the proposal to put additional housing at the South West Extension. Persimmon have noted that the previously withdrawn Local Plan included the site for up to 2500 and have suggested that additional land should be identified as safeguarded land to provide a fall back position if other sites do not deliver. For the purposes of this assessment we have considered the impact of switching 600 homes from High Tunstall and locating them at the South West Extension.
- 3.15 In terms of the economy there was identified to be a neutral impact in the short and medium term as the housing would develop at both sites and have economic benefits, however in the longer term it was considered it would place too much reliance on one developer meaning that they could control the build out rates more easily to ensure price houses remained at a higher level.
- 3.16 It was considered more growth in the SWE area would place more reliance on health services in the area and also may impact on the viability of new services in the High Tunstall area.
- 3.17 In highway terms the assessment identified a reduction in the quantum of development at High Tunstall could threaten the delivery of a new bypass to the north of Elwick Village and a new grade separated junction at the A19 to create a "third" main access point into Hartlepool. The new grade separated junction will address highway safety issues. The scenario could result in improvements to the local road network but the increased quantum of development would also increase the pressure on the local road network. A reduced quantum of development could potentially threaten the viability of the planned link, for which the emerging Local Plan safeguards land, between the two developments. This scenario could also increase traffic pressure on the A689, which is congested at times, The impact of this development scenario on the A689/A19 have not been assessed; therefore there could be an infrastructure improvement requirement.
- 3.18 In terms of futurity this alternative scenario scored very poorly in relation to the transport impacts and also with regard to the greater reliance on one housing developer that it would create.
- 3.19 Assessors considered that the alternative scenario would have marginal negative impacts for economy, health, housing and, transport and a significant negative impact for futurity.
- 3.20 The assessment recommended not to progress this policy alternative.

Policy Hsg1 – Growth Scenario D – Addition of North Burn site and removal of the High Tunstall allocation

- 3.21 The Homes and Communities Agency own the land formerly allocated as employment land at North Burn within the 2006 Local Plan. They made representations to the Publication Stage of the Local Plan process suggesting a mixed use development included approximately 1000 homes.
- 3.22 The assessment of this option did not identify any positive SA impacts as even the economy objectives only resulted in a neutral effect when compared to the High Tunstall development.

- 3.23 Significant and minor negative impacts were identified against Transport and Safety and Security objectives respectively given the safety issues at A19 Elwick and Dalton junctions – development of High Tunstall will assist in delivering a new grade separated junction and bypass which will improve safety both within Elwick Village (reduced traffic through the village) and on the A19 through the implementation of the new grade separated junction. North Burn would not deliver this necessary improvement, only a new junction into that development. There could also be negative implications for safety and security from the North Burn development as the site only has one entry/exit which may limit access for emergency services or slow response times. In highway terms this scenario would result in housing development in a less sustainable location (North Burn) which would increase the need for travel and encourage more unsustainable modes of transport. There are significant highway infrastructure costs associated with a new junction that is required from the A19 slip road to access the North Burn site which would only be of benefit to that site. Scenario D would render the proposed bypass of Elwick village undeliverable which would have otherwise seen a third good quality access from the A19 into Hartlepool, highway safety improvements on the A19 and within Elwick and would have reduced congestion on the A179 and A689. This would also make other housing sites to the west of the town undeliverable due to highway safety concerns.
- 3.24 Various other negative impacts were identified with regards to the Natural and Built Environment, Biodiversity and Geodiversity, Water, Air and Soil Pollution, Liveability and Place, Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation, waste and climate change.
- 3.25 In terms of Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources Scenario D would require greenfield development and a new junction and highway works for a single site only. The development of North Burn and omission of High Tunstall would also harm the viability of the Elwick bypass which serves a number of developments. This is not considered an efficient or sustainable use of land and given the relatively remote location of the development this would encourage greater car use and increase demand on natural resources.
- 3.26 In terms of futurity North Burn is considered to be an unsustainable location for new housing, particularly when compared to High Tunstall. Given the impact of the proposal on the viability of the town centre, the deliverability of the Elwick bypass and other housing sites it supports, the associated increased energy use and climate change impacts, restrictions on access to the site and implications for safety and security and potential impact on education will all have detrimental impacts on future generations.
- 3.27 The assessment recommended not to progress this policy alternative.

Policy Hsg1 – Growth Scenario E – Additional Housing in the villages with a reduction at Wynyard

- 3.28 This scenario considers whether some increased growth within the villages with slightly less growth at Wynyard would be acceptable.
- 3.29 In terms of the economy, there could be a negative impact on the local economy through a reduction in Council Tax revenue; traditionally Wynyard has higher tax bands. Additional provision in the villages would support businesses in the villages, however as a

consequence a reduction in numbers could have an impact on the deliverability of facilities at Wynyard – impacting on the sustainability of the settlement over the long term.

- 3.30 In education terms a pressure on education facilities within the villages was identified as well as a potential long term risk to the provision of education facilities at Wynyard if the quantum of housing was not sufficient to require the school.
- 3.31 The assessment also concluded that there would be a negative impact in terms of housing as Wynyard will deliver to meet a demand for homes in this location, including executive homes. This adds an additional choice of types and location of development across the borough. Further developments of the villages would increase the supply in the villages and help to address further need in the villages. There is already a level of development allocated in the villages as part of the local plan; it is a fine balance between development of additional dwellings to meet need and overdevelopment of the village, eroding the character of the village – this impacts upon the choice of different dwellings across the Borough.
- 3.32 In terms of Natural and Built environment it was identified that Elwick and Greatham villages both have Conservation Areas within them, these heritage assets include listed buildings and locally listed buildings. The Quality of Place chapter ensures that high quality design is integral to all developments. The additional development of the villages, does risk the changing nature of the village character over the long term.
- 3.33 In terms of Liveability and Place the assessment scored negatively, noting that In Wynyard the improved infrastructure will meet demands created by the development and have a positive impact on the wider connectivity. Limited extension to the villages could extend the facilities available in the villages; however the scope of this is largely reliant on the viability of schemes.
- 3.34 The only positive impact identified was on climate change where it was considered that there would be a slightly improved impact on the Climate Change objective if development was undertaken in the villages. This is due to the closer proximity to services of this location, e.g. wider variety of employment location and retail facilities (supermarkets), it was considered that this would have a positive impact on CO₂ reduction through reduced length of car journeys to access essential services / amenities, although this may be mitigated if additional services, employment, retail etc were created near to Wynyard.
- 3.35 The assessment concluded that overall, this alternative scenario presents a weaker case in terms of sustainability. Development of the villages is finely balanced, allowing incremental growth to support the services within the villages whilst also ensuring that the villages grow and develop in an appropriate manner without impacting on the strategic gap. A reduction in the level of housing development, whilst could reduce the pressure on the local road infrastructure also has the potential impact on the development of this infrastructure and community facilities which will make the development of additional dwellings more sustainable.
- 3.36 The assessment recommended not to progress this policy alternative.

Policy Hsg1 – Growth Scenario F –No development in the villages and an extension to Upper Warren

- 3.37 As part of the consultation on the Publication Stage Local Plan a representation was received from Persimmon on behalf of a landowner to the west of Upper Warren proposing an extension to Upper Warren for development of up to 120 dwellings.
- 3.38 When the assessment of the Upper Warren extension as opposed to the growth in the villages was assessed there was only one positive impact highlighted in terms of climate change and reduced impact on climate change from better access to services in the town.
- 3.39 There were however a number of negative impacts in terms of the economy (impact on the economy of the villages), education and skills (no new pupils within the villages to attend the schools given the ageing population), health, housing (reduction in choices of sites if no village sites were included), built and natural environment (encroachment of the strategic gap between the urban edge and Hart Village if Upper Warren was developed), liveability and place and equity, diversity, equality and participation.
- 3.40 Overall it was considered there would be a significant negative impact on futurity as no further residential development in the villages would restrict the choices of future generations.
- 3.41 The assessment recommended not to progress this policy alternative.

Summary

- 3.42 As has been highlighted above the various alternative growth strategies which have been considered and assessed are not considered as appropriate or as sustainably acceptable as the preferred growth strategy for Hartlepool as set out in the Publication Version of the Hartlepool Local Plan.

4. Unreasonable growth alternatives

- 4.1 During public consultations on the Local Plan some sites were suggested as having potential for housing. The following sites were considered unreasonable for housing for the reasons highlighted below and were therefore not considered as part of the alternative growth scenarios section of this Sustainability Appraisal Addendum.

Wynyard Park Prestige Employment Site (EMP1)

- 4.2 During the Preferred Options consultation it was suggested that the site allocated for prestige employment should be allocated as housing land as there was concern that 54 hectares of employment land would not be deliverable over the plan period. Whilst the Council did make an amendment to the size of the Emp1 allocation in the subsequent Publication version of the Local Plan which reduced the size of the employment allocation to 32.7 hectares of prestige employment land and allocated part of the land as Inf4 (Community Facilities) and 11.4 hectares as additional housing land, the Council noted that while the Employment Land Review did conclude that there is a general oversupply of employment land in Hartlepool the Review did not conclude that the business park allocation at Wynyard should be de-allocated or re-allocated and it is considered critical to the future of Hartlepool's economy to have a prestige employment site capable of attracting international and national companies. The NPPF requires local authorities to plan for sustainable communities. The provision of land for employment uses plays an integral part of creating sustainable communities, providing opportunities for work close to where people live and therefore reducing commuting levels.
- 4.3 The Tees Valley Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) covers the period 2016-2026 and it has been refreshed to ensure that it includes all of the latest priorities to diversify and accelerate growth in the local economy. Its overarching objectives are to enhance productivity and improving lifetime opportunities through the provision of more and better jobs. Its ambition is for the Tees Valley to become a high value, low carbon, diverse and inclusive economy and focuses on six thematic building blocks: business growth; research, development, innovation and energy, education, employment and skills, place, culture, transport and infrastructure. The SEP sets the aim of creating 25,000 jobs over the next ten years across the Tees Valley across the above sectors. Through agreement with neighbouring authorities Hartlepool's proportion of the jobs is set at 290 jobs per year which has been extrapolated over the 15 year plan period. This has been used to help inform the Objectively Assessed Housing Need as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2015), SHMA Addendum (2016) and the Housing and Employment Growth Topic Paper (2017). The prestige employment site at Wynyard is seen as a crucial element of the Borough's employment land supply, needed to help meet this jobs growth. Without this predicted level of jobs growth there would likely be a corresponding reduction in the housing need across the plan period.
- 4.4 Whilst Wynyard Park still sought some changes to the boundary in the locality of the Inf4 allocation to reflect the site of the previous hospital permission, the changes made in the Publication were recognised and welcomed by the landowner and it was noted that they were content that this land remains allocated for future employment development subject to on-going plan reviews and assessments of demand in the future.

Sovereign Park Site (Emp3)

- 4.5 The landowners of Sovereign Park have for some time been seeking to get the land re-allocated from employment land to a residential allocation and have noted the NPPF says that local authorities should not seek to retain employment land where there is no reasonable chance it will be developed. There have been discussions with the local authority regarding the possibility of housing on this site. The Employment Land Review, which forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan, does acknowledge potential flooding and other issues associated with Sovereign Park. However the Employment Land Review does recommend that the employment land allocation be retained.
- 4.6 The owners have noted issues regarding past uses as a smelting works as leaving a legacy of issues which mean the land would need to be remediated to allow development on the site. It is likely that there may be sub-surface foundations, etc that will require removal before development can take place. It is also clear that development is hampered environmental issue relating to the land-forming required to create a development platform. The scale of work needed to remediate the land to make it acceptable for housing development is a significant concern and no viability work to suggest this could be done in a manner which would allow a viable housing development has been submitted.
- 4.7 There is also the issue of flood risk that exists on the site. In flood terms residential development is classified as a more vulnerable use as opposed to warehousing or other likely employment uses which may locate on the site if developed which would be less vulnerable. The landowners consider it is wrongly shown on the Environment Agencies flood maps and believe it should be flood zone 1. The Council noted the comments made about flooding at the Preferred Options stage and acknowledged that the Environment Agency flood zone map may be inaccurate regarding the Sovereign park area but stated that unless more detailed modelling work was undertaken and submitted the EA flood zone map cannot be amended. At the Publication Stage consultation the Council again noted within its comments on the representation that the only way for this flooding issue to be progressed is an assessment by the Environment Agency as a result of additional flood assessments, this is a matter for the owner / agent to pursue with the Environment Agency – it would be at their discretion as to whether they considered information of a flood assessment in relation to a different site being appropriate for reassessment of the flood risk. The Council commissioned a Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The draft Level 1 SFRA shows that 75.09% of the site is in Flood Zone 1 and 24.91% is in Flood Zone 3a (high risk). The current use is classified as 'less vulnerable' in Table 3: Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone 'compatibility' in the National Planning Practice Guidance. Residential use is classified as 'more vulnerable' in Table 3. This means that the allocation of the site for residential development would fail the Sequential Test.
- 4.8 Given the constraints the Council does not accept that Sovereign Park is a viable housing site that could be delivered during the plan period. The recent de-allocation of the SECAAH site to the south of Seaton Lane as a result of the grant of planning permission (originally a decision granted on appeal by the planning inspectorate) resulted in the loss of employment land in this area which is another justification for this site to be retained for employment land and will likely improve the likelihood of Sovereign park attracting new inward investment as an employment site.

Hartville Meadows

- 4.9 The site was put forward as part of the SHLAA process for consideration as a housing site and a representation was also received during the Publication stage local plan consultation for inclusion as a housing site and objecting to the proposed allocation as a Local Wildlife site. The site was assessed as part of the SHLAA under site 19 (Hart Station) and was assessed as not deliverable due to the environmental designation on the site.
- 4.10 It is a Local Wildlife site which was designated in 2010 as part of a Local Wildlife Sites Review. It was then proposed for allocation in the Preferred Options and Publication versions (NE1c) of the emerging Local Plan. The site was assessed by the ecologist at the time of the designation as a grazing field sloping down to a beck, with a high proportion of herbs (particularly clovers, Self-heal and in places Autumn Hawkbit) in the sward. 2 grasses & 10 herbs from approximately 2 Neutral Grassland Flora (other grasses are likely to be present but not flowering at time of survey).
- 4.11 It is also worth noting the proximity of the Special Protection Area on the coast which has been a concern for Natural England on other sites in the vicinity, but further from the SPA, recently considered as part of planning applications.
- 4.12 Given the availability of other land on the edge of the settlement which had been put forward as part of the SHLAA there was not considered to be a justification to propose to allocate housing land on a designated Local Wildlife site and it is therefore considered an unreasonable alternative which has not been assessed.

5. Conclusion of SA assessment

- 5.1 The additional SA work undertaken further strengthens the Council's position that the draft policies present a sustainable growth framework for the next 15 years. Policies which include site allocations tend to score well when assessed against the SA Objectives; this is strengthened further by the presentation of the 'do nothing' alternative in Appendix 1. In addition the growth options set out in the plan performed more positively than alternative growth options assessed. Furthermore, consideration of the reduced policy allocation of wind turbine sites has also concluded that the 'policy on' option would provide the most sustainable option for policy adoption.
- 5.2 The SA process has incorporated many stages, allowing for the consultation and revision of policies to ensure that these final options presented have, where possible, been amended and refined to allow for improved SA outcomes.
- 5.3 Collectively the separate stages SA assessments provide a transparent methodology to understanding the process undertaken to consider the sustainability of the Local Plan and gives a background detailing why certain mitigation measures have been proposed within the policies.
- 5.4 Detailed below is an overview of the main findings of the SA in terms of the three pillars of sustainability.

Economic Objectives

- 5.5 Overall, the policies and site allocations of the Local Plan are considered to be compatible with the economic SA objectives. They provide a long term vision for the sustainable economic growth of the town, encouraging new jobs, enterprise and innovation through the provision of a variety of employment sites; including prestige, high quality, and general employment areas with Enterprise Zone opportunities. In addition the Retail policies in the plan set out a positive growth aspiration of the town centre, Waterfront and Innovation and Skills Quarter; aiming to encourage further enterprise, jobs and education and skills opportunities.
- 5.6 These policies support and go hand in hand with the housing growth policies to ensure the long term economic growth of the borough is focused in the most sustainable locations.
- 5.7 There are environmental mitigation requirements to many of the policies focused on the growth of the town associated to flood risk and ecology, these ensure that development can take place whilst avoiding the most sensitive areas, or in the worst case scenario provide adequate mitigation to ensure long term sustainable growth.

Social Objectives

- 5.8 Overall, the social impact of the policies is positive or neutral. The direct social outcomes to ensuring sustainable town centres, affordable housing, housing choice and encouraging employment growth are evident through the SA assessments.
- 5.9 The Local Plan has to deliver sufficient homes to meet the housing needs of the Borough. There is no reasonable alternative to this. The Local Plan supports this delivery through a suite of housing-based policies and site allocations. The only options available due to the geographical constraints of the borough are to allocate strategic sites on Greenfield land. Whilst this presents opportunity to create sustainable communities from the outset to meet the needs of the growing population, incorporation appropriate infrastructure, community infrastructure, green infrastructure, leisure, health and play provision.
- 5.10 Negative social impacts associated to displacement of communities through housing market renewal was outlined in the short term however the long term benefits of the policy support inclusion. Long term regeneration of the town centre will contribute to positive sustainable outcomes for the future vitality of the town.
- 5.11 There is the need to protect and enhance health communities; this is supported directly through policies for the retention of health services on the hospital site (INF3); and Hot Food Takeaways (RC18) which carefully controls the allocation of these uses near schools. Many of the other policies in the plan contribute indirectly to improving health indicators.

Environmental Objectives

- 5.12 Overall, the policies set out within the plan ensure that environmental considerations have been appropriately taken into consideration through the plan development process. With the development requirement for additional homes in particular it is inevitable that there will be impact on the natural environment, geodiversity and biodiversity. However the SA process in addition to the HRA requirement will ensure that appropriate avoidance and mitigation is undertaken to protect the valuable environmental sites across the borough.
- 5.12 Given the coastal location of the Borough, water management and flood risk is a key consideration, mitigation has been developed into the policy framework, and this is being tested through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
- 5.13 The Quality of Place policies aim to protect the environment against detrimental impacts from development, the SA process has strengthened these policies through additional mitigation measures.

Monitoring

- 5.14 The monitoring approach to the policies is set out in the [Monitoring Framework \(HLP01/3\)](#).

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

--	Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	0	Neutral	?	Uncertain	X	No Relationship
----	-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	---------	---	-----------	---	-----------------

Policy: SD1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development												
Date: 1 st April 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Ryan Cowley (Development Control)									
Date: 29 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)									
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off					
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation				
	S	M	L		S	M	L					
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The policy supports sustainable development. Although it is an overarching policy, it will have clear economic benefits.	-	-	-	Less likely to achieve sustainable development. Less benefit to population and economy in the long term. Risk of less development.				
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on education and skills.	-	-	-	Less sustainable development and impact on education and skills.				
3. Health.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on health.	-	-	-	Less sustainable development, impacts on health.				
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on safety and security.	0	0	0	No impact from not having policy.				
5. Housing.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on housing.	--	--	--	Less emphasis on sustainable locations / housing mix / access to open space.				
6. Transport.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on transport.	--	--	--	Less emphasis on sustainable locations and transport implications.				
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on the built and natural environment.	-	-	-	Less emphasis on sustainable development / strategic development.				
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on biodiversity and geodiversity.	-	-	-					
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on water, air and soil pollution.	--	--	--	Not emphasising sustainable development – environmental impact.				
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on liveability and place.	-	-	-	Not as significant social implications.				
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on equity, diversity, equality and participation.	0	0	0	No direct link.				
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on energy efficiency and natural resources.	--	--	--	Less development but less sustainable.				
13. Waste.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on waste.	0	0	0	Less direct link.				
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	This is an overarching policy; depending on the specific development there may be the opportunity to have a positive impact on climate change. Sustainable development is a key priority for development to address climate change.	--	--	--	Sustainable development is a key priority for development to address climate change. Without this policy in place – there will be a negative impact on climate change.				

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: SD1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development								
Date: 1 st April 2016		Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Ryan Cowley (Development Control)						
Date: 29 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The purpose of the policy is to achieve sustainable development, ensuring that development does not have a detrimental impact on society, the environment or the economy for current and future generations. Therefore the policy protects against unsustainable development.	--	--	--	Loss of flexibility when other policies become out of date. Less emphasis on Sustainable Development.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
Conclusions The policy's purpose is to promote sustainable development, the appraisal suggested that in the form presented it will achieve this.								
Recommendations None.								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Doing nothing in this instance would have an overall negative impact as it would place less emphasis on sustainable development and potentially reduce flexibility and pragmatism in the planning system when other policies become out of date. The absence of this policy, which encourages development provided it is sustainable, may result in less development coming forward however that development that does come forward may be less sustainable.								

Policy: LS1 Locational Strategy								
Date: 1 st April 2016		Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services) and Peter Nixon (Transportation & Traffic)						
Date: 29 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	++	This policy sets out where new development will be located, it reserves land for employment uses thus helping the economy. Possible to provide a range of jobs as the policy provides the land to allow for employment creation in many job areas. Limit to what this policy and the plan overall can do, it can prevent unwanted development in specific locations, but cannot force development to locate in the borough. No reference is made to the rural economy, could it be added? i.e HBC will seek to protect and diversify the rural area etc. the plan has a suite of rural policies but no reference to the rural area in this key strategic policy for the borough. Direct reference to the town centre etc. is positive within the policy. If the benefits come to Hartlepool then the benefits will increase over time. However the policy does allow for short term wins i.e if the Marina developed within the next three years that would be a short term significant benefit. Overall the policy will allow for many benefits to the borough, with increasing benefits as the borough develops.	0	0	0	Not having the policy wouldn't stifle development as there would still be other policies to guide development however there would be no strategic overview.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LS1 Locational Strategy								
Date: 1 st April 2016		Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services) and Peter Nixon (Transportation & Traffic)						
Date: 29 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	<p>No mention of education – recommend a positive link goes in the policy, or link to all town centre uses as educational establishments are main town centre uses.</p> <p>More employment equates to more jobs and training but the policy does not specifically provide training etc. it provides the land for opportunities.</p> <p>Cross reference the policy with the planning obligations policy as that has a link to training and skills of local people.</p> <p>Overall there is deemed to be no relationship between the policy and the SA criteria. The policy does not preclude education and training etc. but it does allow for development to happen within certain locations.</p>	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	+	+	+	<p>Mention all other town centre development as that will cover doctors etc. in the town centre section.</p> <p>GI and other infrastructure element is a positive which should help increase physical activity.</p> <p>The policy safeguards land for employment uses across the borough, and an increase in employment should help tackle poverty.</p> <p>This is not specifically a health policy but it could have positive aspects for tackling health inequalities within the borough.</p>	-	-	-	Without this policy there would be no defined development limits or Strategic Gap allocation- there would therefore be negative implications for unprotected areas of countryside and access to this, which would have a detrimental impact on health.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	<p>Not for this policy to focus on safety and security, other policies achieve this and ensure the plan as a whole is sustainable. It is not essential that this policy is cross referenced with the safety and security policy as the policy focuses on the location of development, not specifically the design elements of development.</p>	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	0	0	0	<p>Policy will allow for lots of greenfield housing development, but not all sites are in sustainable locations i.e Wynyard.</p> <p>Policy does not mention overall design but open space and GI elements are positive.</p> <p>The policy focuses on where homes will be it does not stipulate the quality of them. So overall the policy is neutral.</p>	-	-	-	Without policy there would be no emphasis on reuse of previously developed land, no emphasis on providing access to a choice of good quality housing in sustainable communities across tenures (more market driven development) and there may be less access to open space (countryside) for residents.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	<p>The need to travel by car could be reduced as the locations of many sites are quite accessible. However where sites are not in sustainable locations they tend to be quite isolated and detached from the main urban area i.e Wynyard which is likely to require movement particularly by car and thus will lead to an increase in Co2.</p> <p>The bespoke policies will improve the transport network not this policy, although reference to infrastructure improvements is positive. Policy tries to maximize on sustainable locations by stating where development can go so overall it is a positive policy.</p>	--	--	--	Not having the policy would encourage more development in unsustainable locations that requires an increase in unsustainable modes of transport.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LS1 Locational Strategy									
Date: 1 st April 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services) and Peter Nixon (Transportation & Traffic)						
Date: 29 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	<p>This policy does not link to design specifically. Policy seeks to look after the best bits of the borough; it is other policies that secure the improvements and protection. This policy will allow the spread of the urban area and many sites are on the urban/village edge.</p> <p>Policy has regard to heritage but it is the other plan policies that will ensure heritage is delivered/ moved forward /protected.</p> <p>The policy allows for development on open space and it is often considered that development destroys the landscape. More employment in employment locations will not be negative as it exists at present, but a new nuclear power station could impact upon Seaton Common landscape. More homes on greenfield land will destroy the landscape too.</p> <p>The link to GI is positive but there is no reference to design. This policy focuses on location not design.</p> <p>The plan puts forward sites with least impact so by locations the policy protects the features but other policies would seek to improve the environment etc.</p>	--	--	--	<p>There would be less emphasis on maintaining and enhancing the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline as unchecked development, without a strategic overview (no development limits or Strategic Gap) could result in urban sprawl, loss of countryside and coalescence of the urban area and rural villages.</p> <p>Without the policy there could be less access to natural and cultural assets, and less opportunity to ensure that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable.</p>	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship.	-	-	-	Whilst there would still be Natural Environment policies, focus on biodiversity and geodiversity protection and enhancement would be weakened. There would also be negative implications should there be more development in the countryside.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship.	-	-	-	Without the policy there could be more development in unsustainable locations which could increase flood risk and generate more pollution.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	<p>In many instances the location of these sites is in the urban area, which is generally accessible to all by a variety of modes of transport. So employment opportunities are offered across the borough.</p> <p>The policy sets out the retail hierarchy, which seeks to prevent the unwanted spread of retail and concentrate it in specific areas.</p> <p>There are no direct links to sense of place and social cohesion. However the design policies should assist in ensuring a sense of place and create spaces for social interaction.</p>	-	-	-	Less likelihood of creating and sustaining vibrant/sustainable/diverse communities and promoting a sense of place (urban sprawl and in wrong locations). Negative implications for social cohesion. Coalescence with villages- loss of individual communities.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	As above.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	<p>Lots of greenfield development with regard to housing but other elements i.e. employment and retail are in sustainable locations.</p> <p>No link to renewable energy – should there be a reference.</p> <p>Neutral overall because housing is in unsustainable locations but retail and leisure etc. are generally in sustainable locations.</p>	-	-	-	Greater chance of development in unsustainable locations, less emphasis on minimising energy use, increased demand for and less prudent and efficient use of natural resources.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LS1 Locational Strategy								
Date: 1 st April 2016		Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services) and Peter Nixon (Transportation & Traffic)						
Date: 29 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
13. Waste.	+	+	+		0	0	0	Potential link between likelihood of more development in unsustainable locations contributing to increased distances in transporting waste however not significant given the limited size of the Borough.
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	<p>Lots of greenfield development with regard to housing but other elements i.e. employment and retail are in sustainable locations.</p> <p>Policy will not lead to a reduction in Co² as all development will increase Co² but this policy does not directly link to reducing the impact of carbon emissions. However GI helps with mitigation and there is reference to flood risk which can help climate change so there are positives within the policy.</p> <p>Positive overall because of the location of development in generally sustainable locations. Other less sustainable sites could have been chosen, but in general sites are deemed to be in sustainable locations.</p>	-	-	-	Greater likelihood of development in unsustainable locations. Potential increased flood risk.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Positive overall because of the location of development in generally sustainable locations. The choice of locations should not be detrimental to future generations.	-	-	-	Less control over development- less sustainable development. Environment implications for future generations. Potentially less choice in terms of housing mix and location however not certain. Impact on agricultural industry (development in countryside).
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Overall the policy is positive where is expected to be, but this policy focuses on the location of development so does not need to go into detail about design, habitat and biodiversity etc. The policy is designed to set out where new development will be located and the majority of locations chosen are in sustainable locations. The only exception to this are some of the housing sites either detached from the urban area such as Wynyard or on the urban edge, thus encroaching into the countryside at High Tunstall and in the villages.</p> <p>Recommendations: Make a reference to the importance of the rural area and its economy not just the protection of the strategic gaps. Second paragraph, add in sustainable transport before recreation and leisure to emphasise the importance of the walking and cycling links. Draw reference to education or in the town centre section add in other town centre uses as that relates to many things other than retail and commercial development such as educational establishments and GP's and medical centres. Draw reference to renewable energy, have specific locations been set for where renewable energy may or may not be located?</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
The policy sets out the strategic approach of the Council with respect to development across the Borough over the next 15 years, without setting this out clearly, there is likely to be less control over development, particularly with respect to maintaining the limits to development and strategic gap, as these are only referenced directly in this policy. However, other policies still cover the majority of areas referred to in LS1.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: CC1 Minimising and Adapting to Climate Change									
Date: 8 th November 2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 29 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	0	+	++	In the long term, the policy has indirect benefits to the economy. By adapting to climate change, land and any business developments on the land will be better protected from detrimental climate change effects such as floods. The policy encourages mitigation/precautionary procedures to be put in place to protect developments hence the economy benefits.	0	-	--	Without emphasis on minimising and adapting to climate change, there would be negative implications for economy in long term as negative environmental effects of climate change and lack of preparedness have impacts on communities / businesses / tourism / industry	
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship.	0	0	0	Potential relationship but not strong either way.	
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x		
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The policy encourages improvements to buildings to make them more energy efficient, building in sustainable locations less prone to flooding therefore this encourages good quality housing.	-	-	-	Not having the policy would result in less energy efficient housing, in less sustainable locations, more susceptible to flooding which would therefore be lower quality.	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The policy encourages more sustainable modes of transport and makes more efficient use of existing transport network. This has high potential to reduce reliance on the private car thereby reducing transport greenhouse gas emissions and contributing to better air quality.	-	-	-	Less emphasis on sustainable modes of transport and efficient use of existing network. This would not help in the reduction in reliance on private car usage, thereby failing to reduce transport greenhouse gas emissions and encourage better air quality.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	+	Policy promotes high quality design, building on sustainable locations and incorporating green infrastructure in new developments. Therefore it will contribute to a better built and natural environment. On the other hand, by promoting renewable low carbon energy in new developments, the policy will promote structures on/off shore such as wind turbines and these will have an impact on visual amenity. However, in the long term there is a possibility of getting used to such structures.	0	0	-	Long term negative impact on built environment through lower quality buildings in less sustainable locations with less green infrastructure that are more prone to flooding.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	By promoting mitigation against climate change effects, the policy has potential of protecting nature conservation sites, habitats, plant and animal species. However, preservation and protection of coastal nature conservation sites such as SPAs/RAMSAR sites will be highly dependent on the type of flood defence works promoted by the policy to alleviate anticipated sea level rises as a result of climate change.	-	-	-	Not having the policy would likely result in detrimental impacts on Nature Conservation Sites, habitats, priority species and ecological networks through increased flooding, less emphasis on reusing brownfield sites and maintaining/enhancing habitat networks and green infrastructure.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	++	++	++	The policy addresses nearly all of the assessment criteria for this objective.	--	--	--	Not having the policy would fail to achieve/address any of the assessment criteria	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: CC1 Minimising and Adapting to Climate Change								
Date: 8 th November 2016		Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 29 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
10. Liveability and Place.	x	x	x	No relationship. However policy does promote sense of place by making the built environment attractive and promoting sustainable modes of transport.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	++	++	++	The policy addresses all of the assessment criteria for this objective. The policy promotes development on Brownfield sites, efficient use of land in sustainable locations and promotes different types of renewable energy in new developments as well as making new buildings more energy efficient. Seeking on site renewables on a case-by-case basis where development does not fall within the threshold stated in the policy, reinforces the strong performance of the policy against this criterion.	--	--	--	Not having the policy would fail to achieve/address any of the assessment criteria
13. Waste.	+	+	+	Policy encourages reduction, re-use and recycling of waste.	-	-	-	Loss of policy would have negative implications for reduction, re-use and recycling of waste
14. Climate Change.	++	++	++	Policy is significantly relevant to climate change and addresses all of the assessment criteria.	--	--	--	The purpose of the policy is to minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change, not having the policy would therefore be negative when assessed against all assessment criteria and the objective as a whole
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	Policy encourages recycling, preservation, and sustainable use of natural resources. It also promotes reduction of green house gas emissions, use of renewable energy and reduces reliance on non renewable sources of energy. It therefore ensures futurity.	--	--	--	Not having the policy would be failing to prepare for climate change which would result in detrimental outcomes for future generations and the choices of future generations.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The climate change policy is significantly strong in mitigating against climate change effects, ensuring sustainable development, increasing energy efficiency and preservation of natural resources, improving water/air/soil pollution and promoting use of low carbon renewable sources of energy. It is strong in protecting the economy, encouraging good quality energy efficient housing, increasing sustainable modes of transport, protecting biodiversity and encouraging waste minimisation and recycling. The policy is neutral on the built and natural environment objective since its benefits somehow balance out with its 'dis-benefits'. The changes to the policy have resulted in any changes to the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Recommendations: None</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Failing to take into account climate change in decision making now will have a significant detrimental impact on sustainability objectives and the long term welfare of future generations.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: CC2 Reducing and Mitigating Flood Risk									
Date: 8 th November 2016		Appraisers: Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)							
Date: 29 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)							
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	x	x	x	There is no direct relationship with the objective however it is noted that well located sites with less flooding issues may attract investors/developers more than those located in high flood risk areas.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship with this objective however it is noted that policy encourages green wedges, SUDs which can provide habitats and improve biodiversity. This can be used for educating the community/school pupils about nature in their locality.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
3. Health.	0	0	0	No direct relationship but policy makes provision for SUDs which can be used for recreational purposes and also encourage people to walk to these places for leisure and exercise.	0	0	0	Less emphasis on SuDS creation could result in less opportunity for recreation though not significant link	
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No direct relationship but the policy has great potential to contribute in terms of flooding safety and flooding incidents.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship but policy has potential to direct housing developments to good locations.	-	-	-	Could result in poorly designed developments with increased flood risk, in poor/inappropriate locations with less SuDS/open space	
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Through encouraging SUDs, policy has potential of improving quality of the built and natural environment.	-	-	-	Less emphasis on SuDS would result in a poorer quality built and natural environment, less character and local distinctiveness, less attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable environments. Less likely to provide sufficient open space in new developments and less likely to improve green infrastructure within Hartlepool and adjacent Boroughs.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	By encouraging SUDs and green wedges, policy has potential of creating new habitats enhancing biodiversity.	-	-	-	Less likely that SuDS and green wedges would be created in new development therefore less likelihood of creating new habitats and enhancing biodiversity. Negative implications for biodiversity through increased flood risk.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	++	++	++	Policy will prevent and reduce the risk of locating developments in high risk flooding areas. Assessors consider that the changes to the policy improve the performance against this objective from + to ++.	--	--	--	Not having the policy would not help achieve sustainable use of water resources, protect air quality, minimise pollution, improve the quality of controlled waters, improve coastal defences or reduce the risk of flooding.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Policy creates opportunities for recreational facilities through SUDs. Assessors considered that the changes to the policy means that it now performs positively against this objective.	0	0	0	There is unlikely to be any significant implications for liveability and place through not having the policy.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship with this objective.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	x	x	x	No relationship with this objective.	-	-	-	Less prudent use of water resources and watercourses.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: CC2 Reducing and Mitigating Flood Risk								
Date: 8 th November 2016		Appraisers: Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 29 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship with this objective.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	++	++	++	Policy is directly relevant to managing the adverse effects of climate change.	--	--	--	Not having policy would not encourage prudent use of natural resources, would not assist in mitigating or adapting to climate change, would not increase emphasis on climate change issues, would not ensure that flood management takes a sustainable approach and would not reduce flood risk.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	Policy encourages developments in suitable locations with less flooding issues.	--	--	--	Not having the policy would increase flood risk which would be detrimental to future generations and restrict their choices.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy is strong on climate change and futurity as it directs developments to sustainable locations and also deals with flooding which is one of the effects of climate change. Through its provision for SUDs, the policy is strong for several objectives. The changes to the policy have strengthened its performance against objectives 9 and 10.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
The absence of this policy is likely to increase flood risk across the Borough to the detriment of residents and businesses both now and in the future.								

Policy: CC3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation (Assessed as INF6)								
Date: 17 th March 2016		Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Phillip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services) and Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology)						
Date: 30 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The policy could lead to the creation of supplier chain jobs linked to the sector. The policy will also help to diversify the rural economy.	-	-	-	Less support for growing renewable energy industry would have a detrimental impact on the economy.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	Noted that poor siting and design may impact house prices however not considered to relate to objective.
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy will help to safeguard heritage assets. Negative impacts on surrounding areas are guarded against by the criteria within the policy.	-	-	-	Not having the policy would result in less control over the siting and design of renewable and low carbon energy generation related development.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: CC3 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation (Assessed as INF6)								
Date: 17 th March 2016		Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Phillip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services) and Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology)						
Date: 30 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				It was noted that distinctiveness is quite a subjective issue. For example some people do not think turbines have a negative impact on the landscape and feel they add a point of interest.				
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	The policy is positive in that it seeks to ensure that habitats are protected. It is suggested that the policy needs to link to the natural policies or mention mitigation within the policy.	-	-	-	Less control over location and less emphasis on ensuring habitats are protected would be detrimental to biodiversity and geodiversity.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	The policy should help to protect and see an improvement in local air quality through minimising pollution from other forms of energy generation.	-	-	-	Less control over such development and may encourage more non-renewable forms of energy generation in its absence, resulting in more pollution.
10. Liveability and Place.	x	x	x	No relationship.	0	0	0	Primarily related to the built and natural environment objective but may have an impact on sense of place if development is not adequately controlled.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship.	0	0	0	Less job creation without support of the policy could have negative implications for this objective though the link is not considered significant.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	++	++	++	The policy supports the use of renewable energy generation in environmentally acceptable locations and will reduce the demand for natural resources over the plan period.	--	--	--	Less emphasis on use of renewable energy generation in environmentally acceptable locations. Increased likelihood of increased demand for natural resources.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship.	0	0	0	Other types of power generation may generate more waste.
14. Climate Change.	++	++	++	The policy, through encouraging renewable energy generation will encourage the prudent use of natural resources and in turn will lead to a reduction in emissions and will help in the fight against climate change.	--	--	--	Not encouraging renewable energy generation will in turn encourage less prudent use of natural resources and lead to more emissions, contributing to climate change.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The environmental benefits the policy could result in will be beneficial to current and future generations.	--	--	--	Not having the policy may result in further environmental harm which would be detrimental to future generations.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy scores very well environmentally and should help in the fight against climate change. There are some slight economic benefits. Socially, the policy guards against inappropriate development which could impact on the lives of residents.</p> <p>Recommendations: It is suggested that the policy needs to link to the natural policies or mention mitigation within the policy.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Doing nothing in this instance will fail to support measures that seek to address environmental issues that are a contributing factor to climate change. The absence of this policy would also weaken control over the nature of the development. This would be detrimental to future generations.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: CC4 Strategic Wind Turbine Developments								
Date: 8 th November 2016		Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017		Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	Having a policy which is supportive of wind turbine development in certain areas may attract energy companies to locate / choose sites in Hartlepool for their turbines and create jobs in the construction and maintenance of the turbines.	-	-	-	It is accepted that the wind turbine development market is niche however there would be an impact of not having this policy as it would restrict wind turbine related development in Hartlepool.
2. Education and Skills.	X	x	x	No relationship.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No relationship.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	By being specific about the two areas that are suitable, the policy helps to protect the distinctiveness of the rest of the countryside and helps to protect designated heritage assets.	++	++	++	Due to the national position – no additional wind turbine development will go ahead without a policy allocating suitable sites. Therefore there would be no impact on landscapes and heritage as the development would not take place.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	The policy helps to ensure key habitats are protected from negative impacts of development. A cross reference to the relevant natural policies may strengthen policy.	++	++	++	Due to the national position – no additional wind turbine development will go ahead without a policy allocating suitable sites. Therefore there would be no impact on existing habitats or protected environments.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	It will help to protect air quality through minimising the need for the use of fossil fuels and ultimately through helping fight climate change will help to prevent flooding in the long term.	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place has the potential to increase the demands on fossil fuels by not providing opportunity for this form of greener energy.
10. Liveability and Place.	x	x	x	No relationship.	0	0	0	There is a level of interest in the local community in relation to development of the Brenda Road site for wind turbines. Not having the policy in place has no change on this objective. It is acknowledged that there may be an impact on the local community if the policy is in place, although the policy does specify criteria to negate negative impacts.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	++	++	++	The policy supports the use of renewable energy generation in environmentally acceptable locations and will reduce the demand for natural resources over the plan period.	--	--	--	Removes opportunity for wind turbine development.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	++	++	++	The policy, through encouraging renewable energy generation will encourage the prudent use of natural resources and in turn will lead to a reduction in emissions and will help in the fight against climate change.	-	-	-	Not having the policy removes the opportunity for this type of development in Hartlepool. This directly has a negative impact in not enabling the reduction of emissions as a result of using such technologies.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: CC4 Strategic Wind Turbine Developments								
Date: 8 th November 2016		Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017		Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The environmental benefits the policy could result in will be beneficial to current and future generations.	-	-	--	The impact of not having opportunity to use such technologies will have more of an impact in the longer term as fossil fuel resources diminish.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy is extremely positive from an environmental viewpoint and also will lead to social benefits in terms of health through reductions in pollution etc. There are some smaller economic benefits. The changes to the policy have not resulted in any changes to the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Recommendations: None</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
The impact of not having the policy whilst it can be seen as having a positive impact on landscape and local environment and biodiversity, the impact on the wider environment and climate change on the medium to long term is greater and therefore overall the impact of not having the policy in place is seen as negative.								

Policy: CC5 Large scale Solar Photovoltaic developments (Assessed as INF8)								
Date: 5 th April 2016		Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Graham Megson (Ecologist), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017		Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The policy could have a positive impact on the local economy. Boosting businesses related to solar farm development. In addition with the majority of such developments being in the rural area, landowners would benefit from such development which would potentially have a positive impact on the rural economy.	+	+	+	The development of large scale Solar Photovoltaic developments could still happen without this policy being in place therefore there is no change on the impact on the economy.
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified. Whilst the policy does refer to safety and security, however such issues would also be covered by other policies.
5. Housing.	X	X	X	Whilst no relationship is identified to the objective overall, the policy does reference the reuse of previously developed land.	X	X	X	Whilst no relationship is identified to the objective overall, the policy does reference the reuse of previously developed land.
6. Transport.	X	X	X	Whilst no relationship is identified to the objective overall, the policy does reference protection from glare, which has the potential to impact upon users of the local transport network.	X	X	X	Whilst no relationship is identified to the objective overall, the policy does reference protection from glare, which has the potential to impact upon users of the local transport network.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	The policy could support development that will have an adverse impact upon landscape quality. However the policy does ensure that adequate mitigation is provided, outlining landscape, heritage and the requirement for a Landscape and Visual Assessment. The policy also requires high quality development.	--	--	--	The policy protects from development of certain landscapes. There is the potential for this impact on the landscape to be detrimental without the protection of the policy.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: CC5 Large scale Solar Photovoltaic developments (Assessed as INF8)								
Date: 5 th April 2016		Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Graham Megson (Ecologist), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017		Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	The policy does refer to mitigation in relation to landscape which refers to tree planting and hedges. The currently favoured mitigation for such development is wildflower meadow, suggested that the policy could be amended to reflect this. This habitat provides nectar, shelter and increased foraging opportunities for wildlife.	--	--	--	The lack of having this policy in place has the potential for a detrimental impact on security of appropriate mitigation.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	Whilst no direct relationship is identified to the objective overall, the policy will reduce the need for fossil fuel usage; in the long run this would improve local air quality.	X	X	X	Whilst no direct relationship is identified to the objective overall, the policy will reduce the need for fossil fuel usage; in the long run this would improve local air quality therefore not having the policy in place has the opposite impact.
10. Liveability and Place.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	The policy refers to acceptable neighbouring uses; this has the potential to have a social impact. Therefore not having the policy in place to consider these directly has the potential to have a detrimental social impact.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	X	X	X	No direct relationship identified, however the policy does refer to a requirement for the developer to engage with the local community.	-	-	-	The policy refers to community engagement; this has the potential to have a social impact. Therefore not having the policy in place to consider these directly has the potential to have a detrimental social impact.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	++	++	++	The policy supports the development of renewable energy generation. This will contribute directly towards increasing the percentage of energy used being generated through renewable sources. Therefore this will reduce pressure on finite natural resources.	-	-	-	Removing the policy has the potential to weaken how this type of development can be managed at the application stage; this may particularly impact upon the location of development.
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	++	++	++	The policy supports the development of renewable energy generation, which will have a direct impact - reducing CO2 emissions and will contribute towards addressing global sustainability issues.	++	++	++	Without the policy in place this type of development will not be guided as closely however the absence of the policy does not preclude this type of development which would have a positive benefit on climate change.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The policy helps to reduce the pressure on finite natural resources which helps preserve resources for future generations.	-	-	--	Not having a policy in place to safeguard against the negative impact of development, this has the potential to have a negative impact on future generations.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy supports sustainable development by supporting development of renewable energy generation. The policy sets out clear criteria which aim to mitigate against any potential adverse impacts created by such development.</p> <p>Recommendations: The policy could be improved relating to ecology and biodiversity by referring to wildflower planting as a means of mitigation. There has been a recent press release where the RSPB outlines the opportunities for native species provided by wildflower planting around solar farms (http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/mar/07/solar-farms-to-create-natural-habitats-for-threatened-british-species).</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Whilst it is acknowledged that not having the policy in place would not preclude this type of development, the lack of such a policy would have a potentially detrimental impact on this type of development, the environment, amenity (visual and residential) and the overall quality of life in the Borough.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF1 Sustainable Transport Policy									
Date: 22 nd March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Fiona McCall (Development Control)						
Date: 29 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	++	++	++	This policy has the potential to have a very positive impact on the economy by supporting the delivery of a high class transport system which would encourage businesses to locate within the town and allow employees to travel to work with minimal congestion or using a high quality public transport system.	--	--	--	Less emphasis on sustainable transport and improving the strategic transport network is ultimately bad for the economy by restricting access to employment for workers and businesses for consumers. More congestion and poorer linkages will discourage investment and stifle the viability and vitality of town and local centres, increasing levels of deprivation.	
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	A better, more sustainable transport network is more likely to lead to positive decisions in terms of investment in educational facilities and could therefore lead to a positive impact.	-	-	-	More congestion and poorer public transport and pedestrian and cycle linkages will restrict access to education facilities. Poorer transport network will restrict opportunities for investment in educational facilities.	
3. Health.	++	++	++	Improving access enables people to access health services in a timelier manner and through a choice of means of transport.	--	--	--	Absence of policy will likely result in less opportunities for cycling and walking and poorer access to health facilities	
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	Better transport networks allow emergency services to access emergencies in a timelier manner.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could lead to poorer safe access to areas and self policing through pedestrian walkways and cycle paths	
5. Housing.	+	+	+	A better transport system will help lead to investment from developers into new housing within the town. This is also a key consideration for people buying the new homes – knowing the transport networks are of good quality.	0	0	0	Whilst there is considered to be some relationship between delivery of a sustainable transport network and the supply of decent, good quality, affordable homes, it is not considered significant.	
6. Transport.	++	++	++	The policy will help meet and achieve all of the assessment criteria and will lead to a better and more sustainable transport network within Hartlepool.	--	--	--	The absence of this policy would fail to address the appraisal criteria of this objective, in particular it would not reduce the transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care, would not support the location of new development and service that reduces the need to travel, would not encourage sustainable travel, would not make more efficient use of the existing transport network and would not reduce emissions.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	Whilst an improved transport network may help to enhance access to heritage assets, new roads and infrastructure will have a negative impact where delivered in the countryside. It is important that where improvements to infrastructure and road networks are proposed that the avoid landscape and environmental designations.	-	-	-	The absence of this policy could result in less well design development and poorer access.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	The policy supports the improvement of footpaths and cycle ways and that could enhance access to areas of biodiversity interest.	0	0	0	The absence of the policy may restrict access to areas of biodiversity interest; this can be both good and bad with respect to this objective.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship.	-	-	-	A less sustainable transport network will result in greater levels of pollution through vehicle emissions	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF1 Sustainable Transport Policy								
Date: 22 nd March 2016		Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Fiona McCall (Development Control)						
Date: 29 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Philip Timmins (Estates)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	This policy will help to meet criteria 1 and 3 in terms of improving access to key services and facilities.	0	0	0	Not significant link however implications for accessibility of key services, facilities and jobs as well as culture, leisure and recreational activities.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy should help to tackle worklessness by improving access to jobs.	0	0	0	Not significant link however implications for tackling worklessness
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	Despite the policy seeking to establish a sustainable transport network, ultimately development of the infrastructure and the ongoing use will use natural resources – albeit, less than if the network was not a sustainable one.	--	--	--	A less sustainable transport network will exacerbate the issues presented through the SA of the ‘policy on’ scenario.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	0	+	++	Developing a more sustainable network will involve the use of natural resources, but long term likely to move towards a more sustainable network.	0	-	--	Failing to develop a sustainable transport network will not encourage the prudent use of natural resources, would lead to greater CO2 emissions, would not seek to mitigate or adapt to climate change, would fail to increase emphasis on issues of climate change and would not reduce the risk of flooding. The implications of this would worsen over time.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The policy will lead to a sustainable transport network developing over the plan period which will benefit both existing and future generations.	--	--	--	Not having the policy would be detrimental to future generations for the aforementioned reasons and would restrict choices in terms of transport and access to housing, services, key facilities and employment.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy scores very positively from an economic and social viewpoint and despite longer term environmental benefits there is likely to be some short term negative impacts.</p> <p>Recommendations: It is recommended that the policy could benefit from a reference to the Planning Obligations SPD and Policy within the final paragraph.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
The absence of this policy would have significant detrimental effects on the local economy, health, transport and sustainability. This is likely to worsen significantly over time as the town grows and with increased pressure on the existing transport system, to the detriment of future generations.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF2 Improving Connectivity in Hartlepool								
Date: 5 th April 2016		Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Graham Megson (Ecologist)						
Date: 30 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	The policy supports the provision of infrastructure to provide good connectivity in Hartlepool and to the wider sub region. Having such good links does support the local economy and provides opportunities for further businesses to locate within the Borough. Indirectly if infrastructure and connectivity is improved there is the potential for additional employment opportunities in Hartlepool.	-	-	--	Failing to improve connectivity is ultimately bad for the economy by restricting access to employment for workers and businesses for consumers. More congestion and poorer linkages will discourage investment and stifle the viability and vitality of the town and local centres, increasing levels of deprivation. The implications of this will worsen over time without intervention as the town grows.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The policy supports improved connectivity at all levels. This therefore has the potential to improve access to schools and other education, this policy has the potential to contribute towards reducing / removing barriers to access to education and learning opportunities. There is potentially a weak link to raising attainment - this is by increasing accessibility.	-	-	--	With expansions to education facilities and wider growth of the town, access to education and skills will be restricted if the transport network and connectivity of the town is not improved accordingly.
3. Health.	+	+	+	The policy refers to cycling and pedestrian links; there are direct links between increased physical activity and health benefits. The policy also has the potential to increase links to the countryside, which links to open-air recreation. Health benefits can also be linked to the wider choice of shops (perhaps healthier food) enabled by better connectivity across the Borough.	-	-	-	Failing to improve connectivity would stifle opportunities for cycling and walking which would be detrimental to public health. Poorer connectivity to the countryside would also exacerbate this.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	In the longer term the policy encourages the reduction in car usage. There is a clear safety benefit to road users by improving the infrastructure network across Hartlepool. A more frequent bus service has the potential to increase natural surveillance within an area, therefore there is the possibility that fear of crime and the perception of crime could be reduced.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy may result in less safe cycle routes through poorer provision (lower quality, poorly lit) and increased traffic on roads.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The policy links to housing as it aims to ensure that adequate new development contributes towards development of the infrastructure network to ensure sustainable development. There is the potential that enhancement of the infrastructure network to accommodate greenfield development will have a negative impact on the potential of brownfield development sites within the urban area.	-	-	-	Poorer connectivity may be dissuasive for developers. Poorer access between housing and employment may restrict choices. Without the policy there may be less access to open space for residents of housing schemes. However not having the policy may result in less cost for developers in funding infrastructure through planning obligations. Overall negative.
6. Transport.	++	++	++	The policy supports improvements to connectivity across Hartlepool. This will have a direct positive benefit to accessibility to jobs, education, healthcare and services. Junction improvements and new roads will alleviate congestion and have a positive impact on reducing manoeuvres at higher risk junctions. The policy encourages more sustainable methods of transport, e.g. the enhancement of cycle lanes. It is noted that improving infrastructure could increase travel which may increase transport emissions.	--	--	--	Failing to support improvements to connectivity across Hartlepool will have a negative impact on accessibility to jobs, education, healthcare and services. Failing to improve junctions or build new roads will exacerbate congestion as the town grows and would have a negative impact on highway safety.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF2 Improving Connectivity in Hartlepool									
Date: 5 th April 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Graham Megson (Ecologist)						
Date: 30 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
7. Built and Natural Environment.	-	-	-	The impact of the policy has the potential to have a positive impact on the built environment in Elwick Village, as well as increasing access across the wider borough. The development of new roads and junctions will have a negative impact on the natural environment (such as direct habitat loss, severing wildlife corridors, increased road mortality of animals, increased disturbance, increased light pollution). As well as having a direct impact on the areas of land impacted upon it will also encourage / facilitate further greenfield development leading to further encroachment of urban development into the countryside.	-	-	--	Increased congestion and poorer connectivity will have a detrimental impact on the quality and character of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline. This would also be detrimental to the setting and character of Heritage Assets and access to natural and cultural attractions. The impact would worsen over time as the town grows and pressure increases on the network.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	-	-	-	The policy supports the development of new roads to improve human connectivity. This has the potential to cut through existing ecological networks and sever wildlife connectivity. It could cause direct habitat loss, increased road mortality of animals, increased disturbance, such as from people, dogs and increased light pollution. The best way to mitigate this is to design in wildlife bridges and wildlife underpasses, which are costly and generally resisted. On the minor + side it may improve access to nature conservation sites but this is not a key aim of the policy and is marginal. Cross reference with Green Networks Policies.	-	-	-	Without the policy, still negative implications for biodiversity and geodiversity which could potentially be worsened without a strategic approach and appropriate control over highway/connectivity improvement schemes. Poorer access to nature conservation sites without the policy.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	0	0	0	The policy does not mention monitoring of local air quality, however there is the potential to improve it, especially in Elwick Village and through the support of more efficient connectivity. However there is also the potential for additional traffic and vehicle noise increases. The opening up of potential greenfield development sites could also cause additional pollution indirectly.	-	-	-	Poorer connectivity, increased congestion and less emphasis on sustainable travel will have a detrimental impact on water, air and soil pollution.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy supports better bus services. Better connectivity to jobs and services has a positive impact on liveability.	-	-	--	Poorer access to jobs and services will be detrimental to liveability. More traffic and fewer opportunities for recreation due to poor connectivity will be detrimental to social cohesion which will worsen with time as the town grows.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy supports better connectivity across the borough, this can directly relate to improving social interactions between communities.	-	-	--	Similar issues to the previous objective with respect to absence of the policy being detrimental to social cohesion, ownership, participation and engagement. Absence of the policy would not assist in tackling worklessness or reducing deprivation.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	There is the potential that the policy could increase the use of natural resources.	-	-	-	Less emphasis on sustainable travel would be of further detriment to energy efficiency and natural resources.	
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF2 Improving Connectivity in Hartlepool								
Date: 5 th April 2016		Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Graham Megson (Ecologist)						
Date: 30 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	The policy supports sustainable transport which has the potential to reduce emissions however there is the risk that road improvements and efficiencies within the road network could increase usage and therefore also have an impact upon emissions.	-	-	-	Less emphasis on sustainable travel will be detrimental to addressing the causes of climate change and minimising emissions of greenhouse gasses.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy supports the improvement of connectivity across the Borough which has clear positive benefits for current and future generations.	-	-	--	The absence of the policy would be detrimental to future generations due to the aforementioned economic, environment and social consequences of failing to improve connectivity across the town. This would restrict choices for future generations in terms of access to employment, retail, social activities and housing. Impacts of poor transport connectivity would worsen with time as the town grows.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy is overall positive, there are strong economic and social benefits to the policy, however there is the potential for negative impacts on the environment; mitigation would be required to ensure sustainable development.</p> <p>Recommendations: Consider referencing lit cycle lanes (where appropriate), to improve the safety aspect of such travel. In addition it is suggested that the policy is cross referenced to design policies, green network policies and the planning obligations policy and SPD.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Failing to encourage and support investment in improvements to connectivity across the Borough is likely to have a significant detrimental impact on overall health, the economy and liveability, as well as the character of the built and natural environment. This is likely to worsen as the town grows and pressure increases on the existing transport network.								

Policy: INF3 University Hospital of Hartlepool								
Date: 22 nd March 2016		Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Fiona Reeve (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)						
Date: 30 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	x	+	+	Given the policy is creating a health sector within this area, it could lead to supply chain businesses locating in the area and therefore potential for a medium to long term benefit.	-	-	-	Without the policy there could be less healthcare jobs and related/supply chain businesses. Failure to provide and protect adequate healthcare facilities within the Borough could lead to a less healthy and productive population which would have a negative economic impact.
2. Education and Skills.	x	+	+	The policy could lead to an opportunity to link with education organisations to provide a range of health related learning opportunities with the health hub.	-	-	-	Less opportunity for links with education, skills and training without the policy or if the hospital site were to change use.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF3 University Hospital of Hartlepool								
Date: 22 nd March 2016		Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Fiona Reeve (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)						
Date: 30 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
3. Health.	++	++	++	It is crucial for the long term wellbeing of the residents of Hartlepool that the hospital is retained. Through promoting the creation of a health hub surrounding the hospital it is hoped this will help to ensure these vital facilities remain and expand over the plan period.	--	--	--	It is crucial for the long term wellbeing of the residents of Hartlepool that the hospital is retained. Without this policy it is much more likely that the site will be lost for healthcare and related uses which will have a detrimental impact on the health objective with respect to access to health facilities, opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles, promoting the use of existing facilities and reducing health inequalities.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	The policy promotes the retention of the hospital and future expansion of the health services this means that residents of Hartlepool will be able to access the hospital quickly – if the hospital is closed this could have safety concerns for residents who may have to travel to Stockton or further when urgent care is needed.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy may lead to loss of facilities or hospital in its entirety. More likely people would have to travel to Stockton. Having to travel makes people feel less secure, increases travel safety risk, adds to urgent care worries and creates issues for both patients and visitors.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship	0	0	0	Without protection provided by the policy, the site may be used as an urban brownfield site for housing, however this is not a given and without details of the proposal it is unclear how it would perform against this objective.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	By encouraging the health facilities to stay and locate within this area it is helping to create a viable health hub. This in turn will mean people won't need to travel as far / to other towns for health services and will help to minimise journeys on the road.	-	-	-	Failing to protect the existing health facilities within this location will mean people will likely need to travel more/further to other towns for health services, increasing road and public transport pressures.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	x	x	x	No relationship.	0	0	0	Redevelopment of the site (without the policy) may or may not present opportunity to improve aesthetics however not a given.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship.	0	0	0	Absence of the policy may result in fewer health facilities in Hartlepool and increase the need to travel. Increased travel would likely result in additional pollution however link is not direct or significant.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	This policy would help to locate health facilities in one location meaning easier access and hopefully the development of a sense of place or health hub.	-	-	-	There may be reduced access to employment (health sector) and key services and facilities without the policy. However, redevelopment of the site for other uses may lead to a better sense of place and community, though not considered a significant link. Existing hospital services and support may help create a sense of community and place e.g. support groups, rehabilitation.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy could lead to the provision of new jobs as well as safeguard existing jobs and should therefore help to prevent worklessness.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy could lead to fewer new jobs and would fail to safeguard existing jobs, potentially increasing worklessness.
12. Energy	++	++	++	The policy is highly sustainable as it seeks to	-	-	-	Loss of the site for hospital use could

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF3 University Hospital of Hartlepool								
Date: 22 nd March 2016		Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Fiona Reeve (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)						
Date: 30 th June 2017		Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)						
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
Efficiency and Natural Resources.				keep the health facilities within the town therefore minimising future need to travel to other towns to access health care. The policy also links to policies which promote sustainable construction and use of renewables.				reduce energy demands in this area however would lead to increased travel, would not constitute sustainable, efficient and effective use of existing buildings and land and could conversely increase demand for natural resources (through increased travel).
13. Waste.	0	0	0	The facilities will obviously create waste during their use, however use of recycling within the NHS is promoted.	0	0	0	Unclear what would happen without the policy and so difficult to determine whether this would have a positive or negative impact with respect to the waste SA objective. Loss of the hospital would result in less NHS waste.
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	The various benefits in relation to keeping health facilities within the town all will help to reduce the effects of climate change.	0	0	0	Absence of the policy and potential loss of hospital facility could increase the need to travel from the town to other boroughs (making the town less sustainable) and increase CO2 emissions but would reduce trips into and within Hartlepool. Not a significant relationship with other climate change appraisal criteria.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	This policy is positive for both existing and future generations as it seeks to keep key health facilities within the town and develop a health hub around the hospital.	--	--	--	The loss of the hospital site would be detrimental to future generations for the above mentioned reasons, in particular loss of access to a major employer, supply chain employers and key NHS services for residents. Would restrict choices of future generations in terms of healthcare and employment.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Socially this policy scores very positively. It also scores positively in both environmental and economy terms. The Policy will be crucial in helping to protect health facilities and to help develop a health hub within the location around the hospital.</p> <p>Recommendations: Recommended that the policy specifically refers to supporting supplier chain businesses which link to the health sector. Also, it is thought it may be beneficial if the policy required the need for new buildings to use renewable technologies.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Failing to protect the hospital site for healthcare uses could result in its redevelopment for alternative uses in future. This would be detrimental to public health, jobs and the local economy. This would also reduce the sustainability of the town overall through encouraging increased travel to locations outside of the Borough for health services.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF4 Community Facilities & Services								
Date: 1 st April 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development) , Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 30 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	0	0	0	This policy has the potential to support businesses that provide community facilities and services, although it is proposed that the impact will be marginal.	0	0	0	Given marginal impact on the economy it is not considered that the absence of the policy would move significantly towards or away from this objective.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The policy refers to the primary school required as part of the High Tunstall development. The local authority has an employment charter which links development to training and skills, although this is not cross referenced in the policy. This policy will help to increase the facilities available for communities.	-	-	-	The absence of this policy would limit the availability of educational facilities for communities.
3. Health.	+	+	+	The policy supports the provision of community facilities; therefore there is the potential to reduce health inequalities if leisure and recreational facilities are improved across the borough.	-	-	-	Absence of this policy would lead to limited access to sports, leisure and recreational facilities.
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	There is the potential for the policy to help to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour as a result of increased provision of activities.	-	-	-	Failure to provide and support adequate community facilities and services could result in increases in anti-social behaviour. Likely to result in poorer social cohesion.
5. Housing.	0	0	0	Open space within new housing developments has the potential to accommodate new community facilities. Cross reference policy to Planning Obligations policy.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would fail to promote sustainable communities with adequate community facilities.
6. Transport.	0	0	0	Community facilities are supported in local communities; therefore there is the potential to make facilities and services more accessible.	-	-	-	Failure to provide and support adequate community facilities within new and existing developments will lead to increased travel and pressure on transport infrastructure.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	The policy refers to the protection, maintenance and improvement of facilities, e.g. sports pitches may help to enhance the quality of open space if maintained. However it is recognised that it depends on what is being built.	-	-	-	Less or poorer quality recreational space will have a detrimental impact on quality of place and the character of the area.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	0	0	0	There is the potential that the policy will help to enhance ecological networks through the provision of open space. There is also the potential that the policy could support development that may have a detrimental impact on habitats; this will be dependent on what is being built and where it is being built.	0	0	0	There is a relationship between recreational space provision and biodiversity however not significant.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Potential increase in noise and air pollution through increased travel where adequate facilities have not been provided plus increased noise and disturbance from associated anti-social behaviour due to a lack of facilities and activities.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF4 Community Facilities & Services								
Date: 1 st April 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development) , Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 30 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation				Commentary/ explanation				
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	--	--	--	Promotes new facilities for the access of all. This has the potential to encourage team facilities which can contribute positively to social cohesion.	Failure to provide and improve facilities will reduce their accessibility and quality, reducing access to culture, leisure and recreational activities. This in turn can damage community cohesion and sense of place.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	++	++	++	--	--	--	The policy supports development of community facilities and services. This has the potential to increase services within localities which could increase social cohesion.	Failure to provide and improve facilities will reduce their accessibility and quality, reducing access to culture, leisure and recreational activities. This in turn can damage community cohesion and sense of place.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	-	-	-	There is the potential that this policy could impact upon energy efficiency and natural resources; this is if existing facilities are replaced by newer ones which are more efficient or new builds as part of new developments.	Less investment in facilities will result in poorer energy efficiency and more need to travel to access better quality facilities.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	0	0	0	Increasing the amount of facilities has the potential to increase waste generation. Suggested that the policy should be cross referenced with the climate change policy.	Considered to be a link however not significant.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	0	0	0	Provision of facilities within communities has the potential to reduce the need to travel.	Facilities are likely to be less energy efficient without the policy and may result in additional travel/emissions though not considered a strong relationship.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	--	--	--	The policy will support the development of additional facilities; this enables increased choices for residents.	Poor quality of facilities and less access to these will reduce choices for future generations.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Overall the policy is a strong positive policy which will encourage sustainable development.</p> <p>Recommendations: Cross reference with the Planning Obligations and Climate Change policies. The flow of the chapter is dissected by the Hospital Policy, therefore it is suggested that the flow of the chapter is looked at.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Failing to support and protect community facilities will reduce choices for future generations and impact on the sustainability of areas of the town, damaging sense of place and social cohesion by reducing opportunities for engagement, interaction and participation in sport, leisure and community activities and possibly resulting in increased antisocial behaviour. The absence of the policy would also have a negative impact on the health of the population.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF5 Telecommunications									
Date: 22 nd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Israr Hussain (Economic Regeneration)						
Date: 30 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	++	++	++	This policy will have a positive impact on the viability of businesses within the Borough, enablement and access to adequate telecommunications services provides opportunities for the economy. There is the potential that the policy could have a positive impact on employment. Digital media is a high skills market.	--	--	--	Failing to support telecommunications infrastructure will be detrimental to the local economy by stifling connectivity and reducing the borough's attractiveness to new business. Employment opportunities associated with the telecommunications industry may also be lost.	
2. Education and Skills.	++	++	++	The policy supports the development of telecommunications. This has a direct link to education and skills as online resources develop and become more integral to the education system. This will help to support increased access from home.	--	--	--	The absence of this policy would not support telecommunications related jobs and skills/training. Failing to provide a high quality telecommunications network will also reduce access to educational online resources.	
3. Health.	+	+	+	The policy links to increasing access to health services. Shifts to online provision within the health service to access services (e.g. online booking, NHS Choices and teleconferencing appointments). In addition there is increasing online publicity related to the health service.	-	-	-	The absence of this policy may reduce access to online health and welfare resources/services and would reduce safeguards for ensuring health impacts of masts are taken into consideration.	
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	There are increasing links between telecommunications and safety and crime prevention. Safety equipment can be connected to media devices as technology improves, demand for telecommunications will increase. E.g. CCTV which is internet enabled is becoming more popular.	-	-	--	A poorer communication network is likely to reduce safety and security as it may hamper the ability to contact emergency services, reduce effectiveness of connected media devices (e.g. CCTV) and result in less information sharing online (e.g. through social media). This is likely to worsen the sense of safety and security over time.	
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	Noted that digital connectivity of new housing stock could be an indicator of the quality of the housing.	
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	Failing to enhance the telecommunications network may encourage more travel as people have less access to online services, teleconferencing etc.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	The only potential impact of the policy on the built and natural environment is the placing of masts in the countryside, whilst these have the potential to have an impact upon the landscape character and heritage assets the policy does require suitable mitigation against adverse impacts of development.	-	-	-	The policy gives the Council greater control over the siting and design of telecommunications equipment so that it is sympathetic to the built and natural environment; the absence of this policy would negate this.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	Similar to above (7), without the policy, uncontrolled siting and design may have an impact on biodiversity/geodiversity.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	Acknowledged potential for increased travel however not significant link and relates more to other objectives.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: INF5 Telecommunications								
Date: 22 nd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Israr Hussain (Economic Regeneration)					
Date: 30 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
10. Liveability and Place.	0	0	0	There is the possibility that by increasing access to broadband; residents and businesses can access a greater amount of services. It is not envisaged that this policy will have a direct impact on social and community interaction.	0	0	0	Considered neutral overall as not improving telecommunications may increase the demand for and necessitate improvements to physical services and facilities however would restrict access to online services. Greater physical interaction is more likely to promote a sense of place and social cohesion however a poorer telecommunications network will reduce online connectivity between people and limit access to online services.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy supports growth of telecommunications. This will have a direct impact on increasing accessibility to services and information.	-	-	-	Failing to support the telecommunications network will be detrimental to social inclusion and worklessness as it would reduce access to services and information, this would not help reduce deprivation or ensure groups are not disadvantaged. Acknowledged, as above, that limited online connectivity may encourage greater face-to-face interaction however not considered to outweigh negatives.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	There is the potential that this policy could relate to an increase in energy usage as availability of broadband is increased. There may also be the opportunity to raise awareness of efficient energy usage.	0	0	0	Acknowledged that more travel (and therefore less efficient use of natural resources) may result from poorer telecommunications infrastructure however there would likely be less demand for energy to power devices. Not considered significant link either way.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The policy will have a direct positive impact on communications, which will increase opportunities and access to and awareness of services.	--	--	--	The absence of this policy is likely to reduce access to services and information and restrict opportunities and choices for future generations
Conclusions and Recommendations								
Conclusions: Overall the policy is a strong positive policy which will encourage sustainable development.								
Recommendations: Cross reference with the Rural Policy section due to the potential impact on masts on the rural area.								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Not setting out a policy supporting the growth of telecommunications infrastructure whilst also safeguarding against inappropriate development would have a detrimental impact on the local economy through limited connectivity and would reduce the attractiveness of the town to new businesses and residents. There would also likely be adverse impacts on the built and natural environment without appropriate control over development.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP1 Planning Obligations									
Date: 24 th March 2016				Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	X	X	X	Overall no relationship, although there may be a minor positive on the provision of sustainable jobs as planning obligations can be used to specify training and employment for local people as part of a development approval	X	X	X	No relationship – see ‘policy on’ comment.	
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as planning obligations can specify training requirements as part of a new development	-	-	-	This is the main mechanism within the planning process to secure planning obligations towards education provision.	
3. Health.	++	++	++	There will be significant positive benefits as planning obligations can specify play facilities, playing pitches, outdoor sports facilities, built sports facilities and green infrastructure elements, all of which can increase opportunities for people to access such facilities and their associated health benefits.	--	--	--	Not having this policy in place will have a negative impact on the health objective as a direct result of not securing health related planning obligations, including contributions towards play, built sports and green infrastructure.	
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	Neutral overall, although the policy does specify maintenance as an appropriate planning obligation	0	0	0	Neutral overall, although the policy does specify maintenance as an appropriate planning obligation – so removal of the policy has no direct impact.	
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The provision of affordable homes as part of a wider housing development can be a key planning obligation making a major contribution to the supply of affordable homes in Hartlepool. Planning obligations can also provide adequate open space within housing developments and provide more opportunities for accessing such open space as part of a green infrastructure contribution.	--	--	--	Not having the policy will have a negative impact on the Council's ability to secure affordable housing within sites and off site contributions towards delivering affordable homes (although this is also covered by the HSG9 Affordable Housing Policy). This also has a potential negative impact on the design of new housing as open space and green infrastructure are secured using this policy.	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Planning obligations can help to secure a number of positive transport benefits including the provision of bus services to new developments which will provide opportunities to access jobs and key facilities; footpaths and cycle routes which can provide attractive alternatives to the use of private cars, and can provide for improvements to existing transport services. Contribution to provide new or improved sections of the more strategic road network can also help to improve safety on more congested and busier sections of the network.	-	-	-	Not having this policy in place has a direct impact on the delivery of sustainable development in relation to infrastructure required.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	Positive benefits for most of the appraisal criteria including the provision of open space, improved access to natural and cultural facilities, and elements of green infrastructure. The Council can also ensure through planning obligations that all facilities meet required design and other quality standards.	--	--	--	There is a negative impact from not having the policy as it impacts on the ability improve the built and natural environment as a direct response to ensuring development is sustainable.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP1 Planning Obligations								
Date: 24 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	++	++	++	Planning obligations can be used to improve and protect most of the appraisal criteria.	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place has the potential to impact upon the provision of green infrastructure and open space within developments which have benefits for biodiversity and geodiversity. In addition there is the potential for a negative impact on mitigation requirements however these are also covered in the Natural Environment chapter of the plan.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as planning obligations can be used to require the provision of sustainable drainage schemes (SuDS) which can help to achieve sustainable use of water resources and reduce the risk of flooding;	-	-	-	Potentially more challenging to secure adequate mitigation measures without the policy in place.
10. Liveability and Place.	0	0	0	Neutral overall although it should be noted that measures to improve transport associated with new development, will also help improve accessibility to jobs and services.	-	-	-	Negative social impact of lack of provision of community facilities within developments, impacts on the perception of place and sustainability of development in the long term.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	The provision of social facilities provides opportunities for social inclusion. Not having this policy impacts the ability to deliver this as part of new developments.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	Neutral overall although it is possible to specify contributions for energy from renewable sources. However it should also be noted that new development could increase demand for natural resources.	-	-	-	The policy refers to energy efficiency and adaptation which have a positive impact on climate change. Not having the policy in place has a negative impact with respect to this however it is acknowledged that this is dealt with by other related policies.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Neutral overall as could increase use of natural resources but could also work towards sustainable flood risk management through the use of SuDS, and a reduction in CO2 emissions through greater accessibility to sustainable transport modes.	-	-	-	The policy refers to energy efficiency and adaptation which have a positive impact on climate change. Not having the policy in place has a negative impact with respect to this however it is acknowledged that this is dealt with by other related policies.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Through the use of planning obligations the policy can ensure that new development can meet changing needs into the future.	--	--	--	Significant impact on the sustainability of future developments without the policy in place.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Planning obligations can play an essential role in making new development acceptable both now and into the future. Planning obligations are driven by the need for development to be sustainable.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Significant negative impacts in relation to the sustainability appraisal objectives if this policy was removed.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP2 Compulsory Purchase Orders								
Date: 23rd March 2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Richard Harrison (Regeneration), Daniel James (Development Control)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	Policy aims at improving and making the physical environment attractive thereby improving perception of place. This may lead to inward investor interest, more businesses and job creation in the town hence encouraging economy growth. However, economic growth will be marginal as it will depend on the type of development on the acquired derelict building/land.	-	-	-	There would be a negative impact of not having a mechanism to address problem buildings once all other enforcement options have been exhausted. Not addressing decline can be a catalyst for downward decline which can have a negative impact on the local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	0	0	0	Effect of policy on education depends on the type of development on the acquired derelict building/land. If re-developed for education it will be positive and vice versa hence neutral score	0	0	0	Dependent on uses, therefore neutral impact.
3. Health.	+	+	+	If derelict building/land is left unattended for a long time, they may pose health hazard, increased risk of injury, dust, asbestosis, local air pollution. Policy will marginally help provide a cleaner environment and improve health	-	-	-	There is a health impact of not addressing problem areas / derelict buildings as there can be an ongoing negative impact on the environment. Can result in the decline of an area.
4. Safety and Security.	++	++	++	Derelict buildings/land can provide meeting spots for crime and antisocial behaviour thereby increasing fear of crime in the community. They can also encourage fly tipping and increase waste This policy seeks to address the problem of derelict buildings/land. Therefore the policy will significantly contribute to creating safer and cleaner communities and reduce crime and antisocial behaviour.	--	--	--	Derelict buildings/land can provide hot spots for crime and antisocial behaviour thereby increasing fear of crime in the community. They can also encourage fly tipping and increase waste. Not having the policy in place could have a negative impact on local communities.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Effect of policy on housing depends on the type of development that goes on the acquired derelict building/land. If re-developed for housing it will be positive and vice versa. Policy will promote re-use of previously developed land and assuming that it is for housing then this will have a marginal positive effect on housing	-	-	-	Reduces ability to positively address problem areas / derelict buildings. Therefore has the potential to impact on deliverability of housing sites.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Large development schemes such as housing require new roads, new access points or by-passes and new routes e.g. the planned Elwick by pass as a result of a large housing development at Tunstall Farm In such circumstances properties/land along planned new routes may require to be purchased from the owners to make way for the new route. Therefore this policy can contribute towards delivery of the transport infrastructure.	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place could weaken the position, for example of the ability to deliver road infrastructure if CPOs are required for land acquisition.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Policy aims at improving and making the physical environment clean and attractive hence positive for both the built and natural environment	-	-	-	The presence of derelict land and buildings can have a negative impact on the wider community.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP2 Compulsory Purchase Orders								
Date: 23rd March 2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Richard Harrison (Regeneration), Daniel James (Development Control)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	0	0	0	Derelict buildings/land can provide habitat for animals and new plant species but on the other hand can also encourage pests such as rats and invasive plant species. On balance this policy is therefore neutral	0	0	0	Neutral benefit of not having the policy is in line with the impact of having the policy.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	Derelict buildings/land depending on their state and previous use can act as pollutants to water, local air and soil. This policy will therefore be positive for this objective.	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place has the potential to prevent issues in relation to water, air and soil pollution caused by derelict land and buildings from being addressed.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Policy will promote sense of place among the community by increasing place perception.	--	--	--	Untidy and derelict land and buildings can have a detrimental impact on neighbourhoods and the communities that reside in the vicinity of these sites. Not addressing such issues can lead to a spiral of decline.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	0	0	0	Effect of policy on objective (11) will depend on the type of development on the acquired derelict building/land. Due to the uncertainty of what type of development will take place once the land/building is acquired, a neutral score is appropriate	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place will potentially lead to the failure of issues which directly impact on communities being addressed.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	The policy promotes efficient use of Brownfield sites hence encourages prudent use of the land natural resource	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place has the potential to prevent the redevelopment of brownfield sites which can be a valuable land resource.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship	-	-	-	Impact of not addressing such issues has the potential to create negative litter problems. Derelict buildings can attract waste issues such as fly tipping.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Policy encourages sustainable use of land as a natural resource but does not necessarily minimise greenhouse gas emissions	-	-	-	Not having the policy has the potential to create a marginal negative impact in relation to climate change as the opportunities to reuse such sites may not be present.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Policy will encourage sustainable use of the land resource hence preserving it for future generations	-	-	--	There is the potential for a worsening negative impact on communities as sites and buildings potentially remain issues for longer.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy is strongest on encouraging safety and security for the community by dealing with unsightly derelict land/buildings. Although it is strong on many objectives (1, 3, 5,6,7, 9,10 and 15), its strength is highly dependent on what type of development goes on the acquired land/building. The policy is neutral on objectives 2, 8 and 14. It has no direct relationship with only one objective i.e. waste but policy does discourage fly tipping hence indirectly reduces illegal waste dumping.</p> <p>Recommendations: To make it stronger, this policy may need additional wording in the direction of types of development(s) to go on the acquired land/building(s). Example of wording to add '<i>Development needs in or within the vicinity of the acquired land/buildings will be assessed and appropriate development delivered accordingly</i>'</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Not having this policy in place would have social and environmental negative impacts.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP3 Location, Accessibility, Highway Safety and Parking									
Date: 8 th November 2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	+	+	+	Well designed developments in sustainable locations will attract investors and visitors and this will marginally improve the economy. This policy therefore encourages economic growth.	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place can impact how developments are designed which can in turn impact on their usability and vitality. For example the policy ensures adequate parking.	
2. Education and Skills.	0	0	0	The policy has a weak link with this objective. The policy has the potential of improving sustainable access to education facilities.	-	-	-	Marginally weak negative impact as there is the potential that development of sustainable access to education facilities may be weakened.	
3. Health.	+	+	+	Policy has the potential to encourage healthier lifestyles through promoting sustainable modes of transport for all by encouraging walking, cycling and use of public transport.	-	-	-	Without the policy in place there is the risk that encouragement of sustainable modes of transport for all won't take place.	
4. Safety and Security.	++	++	++	The policy is strong in this objective as it directly influences highway safety.	-	-	-	The policy directly refers to highway safety; therefore not having this policy in place has a negative impact on this element of safety and security.	
5. Housing.	0	0	0	No relationship with affordable housing provision however policy promotes good quality housing through sustainable design in sustainable locations.	-	-	-	Marginally weak negative impact as there is the potential that development design to improve the sustainability of housing locations will be weakened.	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	This objective is well promoted by policy. It reduces transport barriers, promotes sustainable modes of transport, safe transport systems and also personal security. Assessors noted that the policy now allows the intensification of road use but this is subject to the approval of Highways England and/or the highways authority and is in conjunction with the proportionate provision of sustainable travel modes. It is considered that the policy no longer performs as strongly against this objective.	--	--	--	Without the policy which states to reduce transport barriers, promote sustainable modes of transport, safe transport systems and also personal security, securing such provision will be more challenging as such this will have a negative impact on the achievement of sustainable development.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Through promoting sustainable design in new developments, green infrastructure, tree planting, the policy enhances quality of the built environment.	--	--	--	Negative impact as the mechanism to ensure developments enhance the quality of the built environment will not be present.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	0	0	0	The policy has a weak link to this objective. By promoting green infrastructure and tree planting in new developments this may contribute to biodiversity but not significantly so.	0	0	0	By virtue to the original assessment identifying a very weak link to the objective, not having it in place would suggest a neutral impact.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	No direct link but policy seeks to reduce reliance on the car and promotes sustainable modes of transport hence carbon emissions will be reduced.	-	-	-	No direct link but policy seeks to reduce reliance on the car and promotes sustainable modes of transport hence carbon emissions will be reduced. Therefore not having the policy in place has the potential to have a negative impact on this objective.	
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	Sustainable design in sustainable locations with sustainable transport modes is promoted by this policy hence liveability and place objective will be most probably met by end of the plan period and beyond.	--	--	--	The policy supports sustainable design in sustainable locations with sustainable transport modes promoted hence liveability and place objective will be most probably met by end of the plan period and beyond. Not having the policy will negatively impact this.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Policy has weak link with this objective since it seeks to promote sustainable developments which indirectly influence	--	--	--	Without the policy in place there is the potential that this would have a negative impact on the creation of	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP3 Location, Accessibility, Highway Safety and Parking								
Date: 8 th November 2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				inclusive communities.				inclusive communities.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	Indirect benefit through reducing reliance on the car thereby reducing demand for fuel which is a non renewable natural resource.	-	-	-	Negative impact as without the policy it will impact the achievability of reducing car reliance.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	Policy is silent on how waste arising as result of new developments will be treated. Linking this policy with waste policies in the Local Plan will probably address this and make policy stronger.	0	0	0	No reference in the policy to waste therefore not having the policy in place would have a neutral impact on waste.
14. Climate Change.	++	++	++	Policy is strong on mitigating against effects of climate change by promoting developments that reflect sustainable design principles. It contributes towards minimising greenhouse gas emissions by promoting sustainable travel and reducing reliance on the private car.	--	--	--	Given the policy is strong on addressing Climate change, not having the policy will result in a negative impact.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	Policy is not detrimental to future generations but strong in conserving the environment and the land natural resource for future generations.	--	--	--	The impact of not having the policy in place could result in developments in poor locations with poor access.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy is strongest on safety and security, transport, liveability and place, climate change and futurity. It is strong in promoting the economy, health, built and natural environment, reducing air, water soil pollution, promoting strong and inclusive communities and increasing energy efficiency of new developments. The policy is neutral in objectives education and skills, housing, biodiversity and geodiversity. The policy is silent on waste. The changes to the policy have resulted in the policy no longer performing as strongly against the transport objective.</p> <p>Recommendations: None</p> <p>Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:</p> <p>Not having the policy in place will have an impact on safety and security, transport, liveability and place, climate change and futurity. As the policy is strong in promoting the economy, health, built and natural environment, reducing air, water soil pollution, promoting strong and inclusive communities and increasing energy efficiency of new developments – not having it will have a negative impact.</p>								

Policy: QP4 Layout and design of new development								
Date: 8 th November 2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	0	0	0	Quality of design and layout of business parks can encourage new investment to locate at a particular location. A cross reference to the Queen’s Meadow and Wynyard Business Park policies may be beneficial.	0	0	0	Given it was considered that the policy would have a neutral benefit it is considered that not having the policy would have the same impact.
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP4 Layout and design of new development								
Date: 8 th November 2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
3. Health.	++	++	++	Well planned and located open space will encourage people to use such spaces which in turn may lead to people adopting healthier lifestyles. Ensuring that vehicles are prevented from parking on areas not designated for vehicles has the potential to improve open-air recreation. Assessors consider that the changes to the policy have strengthened its performance against this objective.	--	--	--	Not having the policy in place would have a significant detrimental impact on ensuring design features within developments that have a positive impact on health, e.g. requirement for open spaces.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	Overall marginally positive as there is potential through well designed developments to reduce the opportunity for crime and make people feel safer.	--	--	--	Without the policy there is the potential that design features which improve people feeling safe and secure are not implemented. There can be long term detrimental impacts relating to anti-social behaviour as a result of poor quality design.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	In conjunction with the relevant housing policies, this policy will help to provide good quality housing in sustainable locations, with adequate, good quality open space. While the policy does refer to the needs of an ageing population consideration should also be given to referring to the needs of dementia sufferers as this is covered in the supporting text.	--	--	--	Without the policy there is a weakened local policy position in securing quality design in new developments which will have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of housing development.
6. Transport.	X	X	X	Overall no direct relationship but consideration should be given to including a cross reference to the sustainable transport policy as the layout and design of new development can facilitate the provision of foot and cycle links and access to bus stops.	X	X	X	No direct relationship identified.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	This policy should contribute significantly to enhancing quality, character and distinctiveness of townscapes and streetscapes; enhancing the setting of heritage assets; improving the physical environment, and encouraging high quality design. The policy also has potential for contributing positively to elements of the green infrastructure network and improving access to natural and cultural assets.	--	--	--	The policy will have a significant impact on the quality of developments achieved therefore not having it in place will potentially have a negative impact on the quality of design impacting directly the built and natural environment.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No direct relationship but consideration could be given to cross reference to the open space and ecological network policies.	-	-	-	Removes opportunities for creating habitats through green infrastructure enhancements.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Marginally positive overall as the policy could contribute to improving access to services and facilities, although this depends to some extent on the size of the development proposal. There should also be positive effects on promoting a sense of place and community cohesion.	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place may impact on the delivery of well designed developments as a result there is the possibility that this would have a negative impact on Liveability and Place.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Marginally positive as the policy should contribute to increasing community cohesion, and creating ownership and	-	-	-	Well designed places have a positive impact on those who engage with those spaces, promote engagement

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP4 Layout and design of new development								
Date: 8 th November 2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				engagement.				and have positive impacts on community ownership.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	The policy has potential through good design to contribute to energy efficiency and the use of renewable sources.	-	-	-	Has the potential to have the opposite impact of the policy being in place.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	Overall no relationship, although it should be noted that most types of new built development will generate more household and/or commercial waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified. Comment on 'policy on' option should be noted.
14. Climate Change.	x	x	x	No direct relationship but there is a link between good design and the creation of a good quality green infrastructure network.	x	x	x	No relationship identified. Comment on 'policy on' option should be noted.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Taking into account the changing needs of users as part of the design process should 'future proof' development for future generations.	--	--	--	Design and layout of development is essential to sustainable development. The policy promotes good design which will help to address issues (such as the appropriate location for green space) ensuring that developments are sustainable in the short, medium and long term. Not having the tools in place to ensure this from the outset can have a significant detrimental impact on development.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Overall the policy will contribute towards achieving sustainable development as there should be positive benefits for health, safety and security, successful housing schemes, promoting a sense of place and future proofing for the changing needs of users. There should be significant benefits for enhancing the built environment and the setting of heritage assets, providing an attractive and sustainable physical environment. Assessors considered that the changes to the policy reinforce the existing strong performance against the built and natural environment objective and result in the policy now performing strongly against the health objective.</p>								
<p>Recommendations: None</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
The policy is vital to ensure high quality, well designed developments, without this policy in place there are potential detrimental impacts which could have long term consequences for the sustainable development of sites.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP5 Safety and Security									
Date: 24 th March 2016				Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development) and Peter Nixon (Transportation & Traffic)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017				Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	X	X	X	No relationship	X	X	X	Safer environments are more conducive to economic prosperity so not having an emphasis on safety and security could be detrimental however not considered to be a significant link. Less tree planting may result without policy however other policies cover this so no significant link.	
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
3. Health.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as having safe and secure developments should encourage people to make more use of outdoor space, with consequent benefits for health. The policy specifically mentions shading and cooling which will provide health benefits.	-	-	-	Less emphasis on safety and security without policy which could result in less safe development. This may discourage people from using open space, play space and walkways/cycle routes for recreation or for access to recreation sites/health facilities	
4. Safety and Security.	++	++	++	This policy is designed to support the creation of safe and clean communities; help in reducing incidences of crime and antisocial behaviour; reduce fear of crime and ensure safe access to all public areas	--	--	--	Without policy there would be no emphasis on supporting the creation of safe and clean communities, helping to reduce incidence of crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour. Less safe access to public areas.	
5. Housing.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Failing to include the policy would not encourage improvements in standard of housing, would not provide increased access to open space, would not meet the housing needs of vulnerable people and would not encourage high quality design	
6. Transport.	X	X	X	No direct relationship. Reference is made in the policy to ‘Secured by Design’ but consideration should be given to cross-referencing the policy on layout and design of new developments.	-	-	-	Not implementing policy may have implications for safe pedestrian/cycle links and therefore create transport barriers	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as the policy will complement other design related policies and help to ensure that the physical environment can be responsive and sustainable	-	-	-	Absence of policy would be detrimental to Secured by Design objectives/principles, resulting in poorer safety and security of green infrastructure/open space, lower quality design, less strategic landscaping	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as a safe and secure environment will positively contribute towards a sense of place and social cohesion	-	-	-	Less emphasis on safety and security will have a negative impact on sense of place, safe access to services, facilities and recreational spaces and social cohesion.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Marginally positive as the policy should contribute towards increasing community cohesion and engagement	-	-	-	Poorer sense of place and lack of community cohesion will have detrimental impact on equity, diversity, equality and participation	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as the policy promotes the use of shading and cooling elements as part of new development which can also promote energy efficiency	-	-	-	Failing to encourage urban cooling and sun shading would be detrimental to energy efficiency.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP5 Safety and Security									
Date: 24 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development) and Peter Nixon (Transportation & Traffic)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as there will be opportunities for incorporating climate mitigation measures such as shade trees and green roofs which form part of the overall package of climate change mitigation	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would not encourage prudent use of natural resources due to energy efficiency implications and would therefore fail to assist in the mitigation and/or adaption to climate change	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	All the elements of the policy will provide for the needs of future generations.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would be detrimental to future generations in terms of failing to ensure safety and security in new developments.	
Conclusions and Recommendations									
<p>Conclusions: Safety and security are key concerns of local communities. By ensuring that new development take account of safety standards and elements of design that improve safety and security the policy will be able to meet the needs of existing and future communities.</p> <p>Recommendations: Consideration should be given to including a cross reference to the layout and design of new development policy.</p>									
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:									
Failing to include a policy that references safety and security would move away significantly from the safety and security objective. This would have negative implications in terms of the ability of the Council to ensure developments, amenity open space, transport links etc. are safe and secure for people to use. This would be detrimental to public health, liveability and equity, diversity, equality and participation. The policy also references strategic landscaping and urban cooling and as such its absence could be detrimental to ensuring energy efficiency and the prudent use of natural resources as well as being able to encourage a high standard of design in new developments.									

Policy: QP6 Technical Matters									
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	0	0	0	Neutral overall, although it can be noted that successfully addressing the issues listed in the policy will support suitable and appropriate economic development.	0	0	0	Failure to highlight issues in advance could result in developers wasting time and money on plans without adequately taking into account constraints.	
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
3. Health.	+	+	+	Elements such as dealing with land contamination, avoiding cables and pipelines, minimising noise, dust, fumes etc., and ensuring that there is clean water and adequate drainage, all add up to reducing the risks to health	-	-	-	Failing to deal with technical matters will increase risk to health with respect to noise, dust, fumes, drainage and flood risk etc.	
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	As with the health objective above addressing all the matters listed in the policy will contribute to safer and cleaner communities, including reducing fire risk. The changes to the policy reinforces its performance against this objective.	0	0	0	Relationship however not significant as picked up by other policies/requirements.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP6 Technical Matters									
Date: 09/11/2016				Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017				Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The strengthened flood risk criterion encourages high quality design and sufficient open space in developments.	-	-	-	Absence of policy would deprive the Council of a policy tool to identify issues in advance and work with developers to address them, likely to result in poorer design, increased flood risk etc.	
6. Transport.	0	0	0	Neutral overall although it should be noted that transport issues, particularly road capacity and associated congestion, can be a constraint on the development of some sites even if the capacity issue is some distance from the development site on, for example, parts of the strategic road network..	0	0	0	Neutral for same reasons as 'policy on' appraisal however not considered a significant impact as covered in part by other policies/ Development Management . Policy only refers to air traffic directly.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Taking into account agricultural land quality will help to maintain the quality and character of the countryside. The policy will also help to ensure that the physical environment is attractive and sustainable in future years. As wildlife and habitats are included in the policy there is a query over whether heritage assets should also be included	-	-	-	Absence of policy would fail to enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline by failing to emphasise on the issues highlighted in the policy. Not working with developers and providing guidance through the policy will be detrimental to ensuring the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	The policy specifically refers to the effects of development on wildlife and habitats, and also landscape features and trees	-	-	-	Loss of reference to effects on wildlife and habitats without policy	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	The policy addresses a number of pollution related issues included contaminated land, noise, air quality, water quality, and dealing with surface water and foul drainage. However it may be useful for the policy to refer specifically to flood risk, and the need to address surface water and foul drainage issues in a sustainable manner.	-	-	-	Loss of reference to addressing pollution related issues.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Overall the policy will help to create liveable places where technical matters that could affect quality of life and the creation of safe environments have been addressed. It is suggested however that the policy should ensure that all the matters listed in the policy are <u>satisfactorily</u> addressed	-	-	-	The absence of this policy would be less likely to foster liveable places as there is more risk of technical matters not being satisfactorily address, however Development Management process should still address issues on a case by case basis.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	Neutral overall, although references to agricultural land and contaminated land should contribute towards the efficient use of land	-	-	-	Loss of reference to agricultural land considerations and dealing with water sustainably without policy could be detrimental for energy efficiency and prudent use of natural resources	
13. Waste.	0	0	0	The policy may facilitate the recycling of materials on sites and dealing with any waste issues in a sustainable manner.	X	X	X	Technical matters with respect to waste are principally covered by the Tees Valley Minerals and Waste DPD	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP6 Technical Matters								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	The strengthened flood risk criterion will assist in mitigation and adaption to climate change.	-	-	-	Absence of policy would not encourage prudent use of natural resources or assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change, however it is noted these are also covered in other policies. Absence of the policy could result in increased flood risk.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Addressing the issue listed in the policy will ensure that development sites do not store up problems for future generations. Adding 'throughout the design life of the site' the flood risk mitigation aspect of the policy reinforces this.	-	-	-	Failure to address technical matters on developments satisfactorily and pro-actively could store up problems for future generations and result in detrimental outcomes and restrict choice.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy provides a very useful checklist of key sustainability and other issues that need to be considered and addressed when determining planning applications and proposals for development. The changes to the policy reinforce its performance against objective 15 and strengthen its performance against the housing and climate change objectives.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
The absence of this policy would reduce the ability of the Council to ensure that technical matters are taken into consideration when determining applications, which can ensure developments are sustainable, resilient and of a high standard of design. Doing nothing in this instance would also fail to prevent unnecessary delays in the planning process and prevent issues from arising in future.								

Policy: QP7 Energy Efficiency								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Garry Hutchison (Building Control), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The policy has the potential to have a positive impact on the local economy. The policy aims to increase the energy efficiency of all development. This has the potential to benefit commercial premises and businesses through more efficient running of buildings and subsequent reduction in energy bills. In particular this may make heritage assets and older buildings viable, and contribute towards addressing voids in the town centre.	-	-	-	Without encouraging energy efficiency, commercial premises and businesses are more likely to incur undue costs in energy bills. Failing to improve the energy efficiency credentials of commercial premises is likely to deter new businesses and investment.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The policy has the potential to help to improve school buildings and facilities, reducing costs, so schools could possibly use funding for other purposes, such as improving facilities. Improving energy efficiency of building can reduce fuel costs in the home and have a positive impact on the home environment in terms of heating, which can have a potential positive impact on learning and attainment.	0	0	0	Marginal impact on sustainability and cost efficiency of running education facilities without policy however not considered to be a significant link.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP7 Energy Efficiency									
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Garry Hutchison (Building Control), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
3. Health.	+	+	+	Improving the energy efficiency of dwellings can have a positive impact on the quality of housing. There are proven links between health (particularly breathing difficulties) and poor quality housing. The policy will indirectly reduce pressure on health facilities. The policy refers directly to the adequate provision of Green Infrastructure.	-	-	-	Poorer quality housing is likely to exacerbate health issues, particularly for elderly residents.	
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The policy will ensure that new development incorporates a high rate of energy efficiency; this gives a greater choice dwelling for residents in Hartlepool. The policy encourages the use of green infrastructure within developments to assist in ensuring energy efficiency. The policy supports high quality design to make the best use of passive solar gain, natural lighting, heating and cooling.	--	--	--	Failing to encourage energy efficiency will result in poorer quality housing stock and poorer standards of design. Less emphasis on using green infrastructure.	
6. Transport.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy supports the inclusion of green infrastructure within developments which has the potential to ensure new development is of a high standard. As fuel becomes more expensive, there is the possibility that older properties which in some cases can be less energy efficient become less attractive to potential occupiers. This could have a detrimental impact on these buildings and the wider environment.	-	-	-	Less energy efficient buildings are less attractive to potential occupiers, buildings (and in particular heritage assets) could fall into disrepair which would be detrimental to the built environment. Less emphasis on green infrastructure.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	The policy refers to the requirement of sustainable drainage methods, which will prevent against flood risk. Inclusion of green infrastructure will contribute towards improving local air quality. There is the possibility that the inclusion of grey water capture schemes may reduce surface run off which could in turn have a detrimental impact on small scale water courses.	-	-	-	Energy efficiency would result in better use of natural resources and greater sustainability which can reduce pollution; harder to achieve this without policy. Less emphasis on sustainable drainage methods will reduce sustainable use of water resources.	
10. Liveability and Place.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The outcome of the policy will be more energy efficient housing; this will have a positive impact on deprivation.	-	-	-	Less energy efficient housing would be detrimental through increased deprivation.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	++	++	++	The purpose of the policy is to achieve this objective.	--	--	--	The purpose of the policy is to achieve this objective, the absence of this policy would therefore be significantly move away from achieving this objective	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified. The policy does not reference waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP7 Energy Efficiency								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Garry Hutchison (Building Control), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
14. Climate Change.	++	++	++	The policy aims to ensure that all developments have high levels of energy efficiency; if this is successfully implemented there will be a positive benefit on climate change. The policy will also aim to ensure awareness is raised in relation to global climate change issues, addressing these at the local scale.	--	--	--	Failure to achieve high levels of energy efficiency will not reduce CO2 emissions, encourage prudent use of natural resources or assist in mitigation/adaptation to climate change. Less emphasis on raising awareness of issues related to climate change.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The policy is positive and promotes sustainable development. The policy will directly contribute towards reducing development using fossil fuels which has a direct benefit for future generations.	--	--	--	Given the above it is considered the outcome of not having the policy would be significantly detrimental to future generations and restrict their choices.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
Conclusions: The policy will have a positive impact on sustainable development. The policy supports energy efficient development.								
Recommendations: In relation to the wording of the policy, in point 2 of the policy 'solar energy' should be changed to 'solar gain'. The policy should be cross referenced to the waste policy, renewable energy policy and green infrastructure policy.								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Doing nothing in this instance would have a particularly significant detrimental impact on the ability to ensure housing is high quality and of a good standard of design. The absence of this policy is also likely to significantly impact on climate change objectives and the ability to ensure energy efficiency and the prudent use of natural resources in new development.								

Policy: QP8 Advertisements Policy								
Date: 23/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Richard Harrison (Regeneration), Daniel James (Development Control)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	Rightly located advertisements promote businesses and services in the Borough and this is promoted by this policy	-	-	-	Poorly designed or located advertisements will have a detrimental impact on the built environment of the town which is likely to dissuade businesses and consumers
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	The policy ensures that advertisements are well located in safe locations and do not obstruct or have impact on public or highway safety	-	-	-	Less emphasis on public safety without policy.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No relationship	-	-	-	Increased risk to highway safety from poorly design or located signs

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: QP8 Advertisements Policy									
Date: 23/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Richard Harrison (Regeneration), Daniel James (Development Control)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy ensures adverts do not individually or cumulatively impact on the built environment or public amenity by means of their location, size and appearance	--	--	--	Poorly designed or located signs can have a significant detrimental impact on the character of the built and natural environment.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	By ensuring advertisements are rightly located, of right size and appearance the policy contributes to liveability and place	-	-	-	Poorer designed and located signage that has a detrimental impact on the built environment will negatively impact upon sense of place and community cohesion	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
14. Climate Change.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
15. Futurity.	0	0	0	Policy is not detrimental to future generations and will not restrict their choices for future generations, however it does not ensure futurity	-	-	-	Without control afforded by policy, the resulting detrimental impact on the character of the built and natural environment (and subsequent indirect impacts on liveability, sense of place and the economy) would be detrimental for future generations.	
Conclusions and Recommendations									
Conclusions: This policy is marginally strong on economy, safety and security, built and natural environment, liveability and place. It is neutral on health, transport and futurity. The policy has no relationship with a number of objectives: 2, 5, 8,9,11, 12, 13 and 14.									
Recommendations: None									
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:									
Without appropriate control over new development for advertisements there are likely to be detrimental impacts on the visual amenity of the built and natural environment in particular.									

Policy: HSG1 New Housing Provision									
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	0	0	0	The policy will lead to job creation due to house building but skills are unlikely to be high skilled and wide ranging. Two sites are in urban edge and one is to the east of the A19 so there is a strong possibility that many in the new housing	-	-	-	Failing to plan for new housing to address need will have a negative impact on the economy as there would be less housing for workers, less jobs in house building and supply chain etc. Note concerns with respect to	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG1 New Housing Provision									
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
				areas will use out of town facilities especially as they are easily accessible from the A689, a new bypass and the A19. There is a risk that those currently living in the inner area of the borough may move to the urban edge so there could be a void for a period of time within the inner area. Other policies need to ensure that homes in the urban area are well designed and attractive to ensure residents stay there or new ones are attracted.				allowing out of the centre of the town through urban edge expansion, though unclear whether not having the policy would be beneficial in this respect.	
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	Policy does not relate to education and skills etc. The planning obligations policy draws reference to a requirement for local training and employment, so this SA objective will be met elsewhere within the plan.	0	0	0	Loss of planning contributions towards improving education facilities without new housing however covered by other policies.	
3. Health.	+	+	+	The policy will provide the opportunities to provide healthier lifestyles in conjunction with other policies. There will be green space provision through the allocation of housing sites.	0	0	0	No a significant link as there are still other policies that seek health improvements.	
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	Achieving the safety and security SA objective will be delivered through other policies within the plan.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The policy will allow for much needed homes to be built in a variety of locations, at various sale prices, across the borough. There are a high proportion of greenfield sites listed for development so the policy does not prioritise brownfield land. Urban edge sites are the next best sustainable locations after the urban area, the edge of area sites can be made more sustainable by utilising and expanding upon existing infrastructure but Wynyard is isolated and will not reduce the need to travel by car. The options to utilise existing infrastructure are limited as the area (Wynyard) only has limited local services and facilities. Much of the SA criteria will be achieved through other policies within the Local Plan. Adding a link to the planning obligations policy will assist in ensuring the housing sites are as sustainable as possible.	-	-	-	Policy only addresses some criteria within objective. Slight negative impact on housing objective therefore without policy.	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	This policy specifically relates to the location of housing. There is no direct link in the policy to the SA criteria although the assessors note that the location of some housing sites can have a positive impact on the transport infrastructure in the borough and for carbon emissions. Other policies within the Local Plan will ensure that the transport network is maintained and enhanced. Although the volume of traffic will increase as a result of the policy, the group considered that the associated contributions to infrastructure mean that on balance the policy is positive in relation to this objective.	0	0	0	Transport is covered within other policies however there are potentially some links between strategic planning for housing growth and transport impact. Absence of the policy may therefore have implications though not considered significant.	
7. Built and Natural	+	+	+	The location of some housing sites means that many of the boroughs key features	0	0	0	Absence of policy would not necessarily have a significant impact	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG1 New Housing Provision									
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)						
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
Environment.				such as the SPA will be retained. Although the policy can be viewed as purely numeric, the group considered that the sites allocated will, in conjunction with other relevant policies, contribute to this objective.				on the built/natural environment as it is primarily numeric/strategic and does not refer to design, this is covered by other policies.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	-	-	-	There is the potential to increase access to nature conservation sites but there is also the potential for harm to the overall objective. Although the Habitats Regulation Assessment has identified that this harm can be mitigated, the group considered that the policy has the potential for a negative impact.	0	0	0	Absence of policy would not necessarily have a significant impact on the biodiversity/geodiversity as it is primarily numeric/strategic and does not refer to ecology or nature conservation, this is covered by other policies.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	-	-	-	The policy will result in greater pressure on water resources and the potential for greater surface water runoff in a flood risk context.	0	0	0	Absence of policy would not necessarily have a significant impact on water, air and soil pollution as it is primarily numeric/strategic and does not refer to pollution mitigation etc., this is covered by other policies.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Assessors considered that, in conjunction with other relevant policies, the policy will contribute towards promoting a sense of place and promoting social cohesion.	0	0	0	Absence of policy would not necessarily have a significant impact on the liveability and place as it is primarily numeric/strategic and does not refer to design/place making, this is covered by other policies.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Assessors considered that, in conjunction with other relevant policies, the policy will encourage stronger socially inclusive communities and increase community cohesion.	0	0	0	Absence of policy would not necessarily have a significant impact on the equity, diversity, equality and participation as it is primarily numeric/strategic and does not refer to design/place making or fostering a sense of community/community ownership, this is covered by other policies.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	The policy allows for a significant amount of greenfield development. Assessors note the link to the climate change policy. The energy efficiency policy should also be cross referenced in this policy.	0	0	0	Energy efficiency is not the principle aim of this policy, this is covered in other areas. However, failing to plan strategically for housing growth may be detrimental in terms of sustainable, efficient and effective use of land.	
13. Waste.	-	-	-	The policy will result in the generation of additional household waste.	0	0	0	Policy does not refer to waste directly and this is covered by other policies however it is acknowledged there is a link between the level of housing growth and waste generation.	
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	The policy does not specifically assist in reducing carbon emissions or mitigating against climate changes. Some sites are provided in sustainable locations but others are not. The policy will have a neutral impact overall.	0	0	0	Relationship between location/quantum of housing development and climate change issues however absence of policy does not move towards or away from this objective significantly.	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Assessors acknowledge that the policy allocates greenfield sites but consider that this is unavoidable if the housing requirement for the Borough is to be delivered. The choice of allocations aims to achieve a balance between the social, environmental and economic aspects of sustainable development and assessors consider that it achieves this.	-	-	-	Failing to plan for future housing need will be detrimental to future generations and their choices for housing. There would be less certainty for developers going forward without the policy.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG1 New Housing Provision							
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)				
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
Conclusions and Recommendations							
<p>Conclusions: The key function is to set out where new homes will be built across the borough. The other policies within the local plan have a role in ensuring that the sites are developed accordingly by being of high quality, with open spaces and other key features such as local centres that may be required.</p> <p>The policy is positive overall, it is noted that some sites are on the urban edge on greenfield land, however the policy does provide sites within the urban area and the edge of borough sites are the next best options as they can be made to be more sustainable over time. The Wynyard site is isolated from the main built up area of Hartlepool and there are limited benefits when considering the SA criteria. However assessors note that the sites do offer a range of housing to serve different markets within a number of locations and that the mix of location can help Hartlepool become a more attractive place to live.</p> <p>Assessors for the Publication Draft of the policy considered that the policy had been assessed as a purely numeric policy at the Preferred Options stage but that it should be considered in the context of the Plan as a whole. This has resulted in a number of changes to the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p> <p>Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:</p> <p>Doing nothing in this instance would provide less certainty for developers and likely impact upon the supply of housing which in turn can be detrimental to the local economy.</p>							

Policy: HSG2 Overall Housing Mix								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control) & Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	0	0	0	The aim of this policy is to promote and ensure that an appropriate mix of housing type is delivered to meet the future needs of the town. The allocation of specific sites identified in this policy will help to ensure the viability and vitality of local centres in the vicinity of these sites.	0	0	0	Policy principally relates to ensuring diversity of housing stock though there is a relationship between addressing housing need and economic growth.
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	Whilst the intention of this policy is to ensure there is the right housing mix, there is the potential to have an impact on the local economy.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	0	0	0	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	Providing an adequate mix of housing could address health issue particularly with respect to providing housing for the elderly, this could be more difficult to achieve without policy.
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	If appropriate types of housing are provided there are links to associated health benefits. Provision of an appropriate mix of housing could enable elderly people to remain living in the community for longer, i.e. there is opportunity to move into suitable housing. This could have an impact on health and wellbeing of residents. Hartlepool has poor levels of health inequalities, and there is a high proportion of people suffering from poor health. As a result demand for adapted housing and bungalows is high. Action: Consider inclusion of reference to bungalows in policy or definition in Table 5.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG2 Overall Housing Mix									
Date: 29 th March 2016				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control) & Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017				Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			Commentary/ explanation	
	Timescale				Timescale				
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
5. Housing.	+	+	+	<p>The purpose of the policy is to ensure that all new development in Hartlepool provides a range of housing types to meet housing need, helping to ensure that the development of new homes creates a supply that meets demand. The evidence for this is set out in the Hartlepool SHMA.</p> <p>The policy when cross referenced with Table 5 indicates that a range of housing types includes reference to tenure.</p>	-	-	-	Without policy there would likely be less choice and a less sustainable mix of housing. Poorer access to housing that is needed and less diversity of design in new developments.	
6. Transport.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	-	-	-	<p>This policy is specifically about the range of housing type and tenure which should be built on sites to deliver sustainable development. As sites identified in HSG1 (New Housing Provision) are listed, all of which are greenfield development, it is considered that whilst policy does state that development is appropriate to its surroundings it doesn't require that this should be an enhancement to the area. This policy therefore actively supports the encroachment of urban development into the countryside (2).</p> <p>The policy does not mention design. Possible suggestion to strengthen the policy is to cross-reference with the forthcoming Design SPD.</p>	-	-	-	Absence of policy could result in less diversity of design in new developments with negative implications for character and local distinctiveness.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	This policy encourages social mix within housing developments if the right mix of housing is provided. This policy encourages development to meet housing need. The policy will help to sustain local communities as it provides a range of housing options which will address different needs at different periods in people's lives.	-	-	-	Absence of policy would result in less social mix, less housing to meet housing need and less sustainable and socially cohesive communities.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	0	0	0	This policy provides the opportunity to help ensure sustainable inclusive communities, providing a range of housing options within a community allows greater opportunity for movement within the community; this will have an impact on ensuring communities remain.	-	-	-	Absence of this policy would not help to reduce deprivation or ensure no group of people are disadvantaged as more homogeneous development will exclude certain groups and damage social cohesion.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG2 Overall Housing Mix								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control) & Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The aim of the policy is provide a range of housing options on all new development. This will have a clear benefit to current and future generations as it provides housing options for residents. The impact is in relation to the environmental impact and loss of Greenfield land that future generations will not have access to.	-	-	-	Outcome of not having policy would be detrimental to future generations and restrict their choices in terms of housing stock, sense of place, community cohesion and sustainability of communities.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Overall whilst assessment has reviewed the policy as relatively balanced, the policy will contribute towards the provision of sustainable development by providing a range of housing type and tenure to meet needs.</p> <p>Recommendations: Suggested that the policy could be strengthened with reference to bungalows specifically in the policy or definitions outlined in Table 5. The policy could also be strengthened by cross reference to the forthcoming Design SPD.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Doing nothing in this instance could result in a less sustainable mix of house types and tenures and could have a detrimental impact on the built environment, liveability and equity, diversity, equality and participation.								

Policy: HSG3 - Urban Local Plan Sites								
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	Will lead to the creation of a number of jobs in the construction of the housing sites. Additional people living in these areas will support the local economy.	-	-	-	Likely to be less construction jobs in housing without site allocations and less support for the local economy of areas adjacent to urban local plan sites from the additional people that would have lived in that area.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The policy links to the planning obligations policy – this could lead to contributions being secured from developments towards increasing the capacity of schools within the vicinity of the developments. In addition it could also lead to apprenticeships with the house builders through local labour agreements and training initiatives.	-	-	-	Less development likely in these areas without policy and therefore fewer contributions towards educational facility improvements. Fewer opportunities for apprenticeships with house builders through local labour agreements and training initiatives.
3. Health.	+	+	+	The developments could lead to opportunities for healthier lifestyles and open space and play provision both within the development and through securing planning obligations towards play and open space if not provided on site.	-	-	-	Failing to provide sustainable urban sites for housing will move away from the health objective with respect to improving access to public services and health facilities, providing play provision and recreational space (either on site or off site) and promoting the use of existing facilities.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	The policy links to the design policy which should ensure the developments adhere to secure by design principles. Also there may be a betterment by developing derelict sites which may attract anti-social behaviour at present.	-	-	-	Failing to redevelop disused or brownfield sites may leave them subject to antisocial behaviour.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG3 - Urban Local Plan Sites								
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
5. Housing.	++	++	++	<p>Promotes the re-use of previously developed land and will help to provide housing in sustainable locations within the urban area, helping to address particular housing needs.</p> <p>The developments will help to increase access to open space both on site and near to development sites through improved green infrastructure.</p>	--	--	--	Absence of policy would not promote re-use of previously developed land and would not ensure housing need is met in sustainable locations.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	As the sites are all within the urban area this helps to promote development in areas which reduce the need to travel.	-	-	-	Less sustainable if urban/brownfield sites are not identified in Local Plan, increased travel and greater transport barriers without policy.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	<p>The development of these sites will help to improve the townscape as it will remove derelict, eyesore sights.</p> <p>The policy also helps to minimise the number of greenfield housing sites needed over the plan period.</p> <p>The links to other policies including heritage policies will help to ensure inappropriate development does not occur in the vicinity of conservation areas.</p> <p>The reduction in the number of sites allocated within the urban area has reduced the performance against this objective to a single +.</p>	-	-	-	Failing to identify suitable brownfield sites would not help to prevent urban development encroaching into the countryside. Likely to bring derelict sites back into use however could be positive or negative on built/natural environment dependent on characteristics of each site and development.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	-	-	-	There may be some slight negative impact on ecological habitats on some of the sites which are “green.” The links to the design and green infrastructure policies will help to minimise any detrimental impact and provide mitigation where necessary.	0	0	0	Neutral overall as this is dependent on the nature of each site. Generally brownfield development likely to reduce greenfield development (which can be of greater ecological significance) however some brownfield sites can also be of ecological or geological interest.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	0	0	0	Although development on these sites may increase the risk of flooding in their locality, the link to the climate change policy should ensure the risks of this are taken into account in the development and may include the provision of SuDS where necessary.	0	0	0	Loss of brownfield sites may result in more greenfield development which is less sustainable and could result in greater levels of pollution though link not considered significant.
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	<p>The development of these sites is likely to lead to opportunities for jobs in the construction phase.</p> <p>The development of the sites will also improve the sense of community and social cohesion.</p> <p>Planning Obligations associated with the developments could also improve access to leisure and recreational facilities.</p>	-	-	-	Redeveloping brownfield sites is likely to improve sense of place and community cohesion, absence of policy would make this less likely. Noted that Briarfields site could have a detrimental impact on sense of place given impact on heritage assets (though no evidence to suggest absence of policy would improve this).
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	++	++	++	<p>The development of these sites is likely to lead to opportunities for jobs in the construction phase.</p> <p>The development of the sites will also improve the sense of community and social cohesion.</p> <p>The sites with more than 15 dwellings will also contribute to affordable housing provision helping to ensure no group of people are disadvantaged.</p>	-	-	-	Redeveloping brownfield sites is likely to improve sense of place and community cohesion, absence of policy would make this less likely. Less likely to receive affordable housing contributions in those areas without policy.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural	0	0	0	The development of these sites is considered efficient use of brownfield land within the urban area, helping to minimise the need for	0	0	0	Not encouraging redevelopment of these sites would not assist in minimising the need for travel though there may

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG3 - Urban Local Plan Sites								
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 3 rd July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control), Robert Alstead (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
Resources.				travel. The development and ongoing energy costs of the housing however will use natural resources.				be less use of natural resources should the housing not be developed.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	The development of new housing areas will add to the level of residential waste which needs to be dealt with. The sites location within the urban area helps to minimise the distance to processing sites.	-	-	-	Absence of policy does not necessarily reduce waste as development still likely to come forward in other areas. Less likely to be closer to processing sites without policy.
14. Climate Change.	-	-	-	The development of new housing areas will add to the emissions levels which will have an impact on climate change. The negative impacts are minimised by the link to the design policy which helps to ensure sustainable construction is used.	-	-	-	Absence of policy does not address any climate change criteria.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The policy is considered beneficial both to the existing and future generation in terms of housing opportunities and the re-use of brownfield sites along with the job opportunities it creates.	--	--	--	Outcome of not having policy would be detrimental to future generations in terms of poorer choice with respect to new housing and poorer urban environments.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions This policy is very positive from an economic and social viewpoint. Environmentally there are some slight negatives which are minimised by links to other policies within the plan. The reduction in the number of sites allocated within the urban area has reduced the performance against the housing objective to a single +.</p> <p>Recommendations – No proposed changes.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
<p>The principle of using previously developed land for housing is positive in addressing sustainability issues, ensuring the prudent use of natural resources and that development is well related to existing services and facilities. The absence of this policy therefore is significantly negative in terms of addressing the majority of the sustainability appraisal objectives. Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be different outcomes depending on the nature of each site, and in some instances redevelopment of brownfield sites may have negative implications for these objectives (for instance where it affects heritage assets or sites of biodiversity value or creates viability constraints), it is considered the absence of this policy would be significantly detrimental to achieving sustainable development objectives, in particular with respect to providing a balance of supply of housing in sustainable locations and taking into account the needs of future generations.</p>								

Policy: HSG4 South West Extension housing site								
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 4 July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	House building will lead to limited job creation, but the jobs would not all be high skilled, wide ranging and long lasting. The local centre should provide long term employment but in the main the jobs are not high skilled. This site is on the urban edge of Hartlepool, some residents may choose to visit the town centre as it is a short drive or bus ride away. Recommendation – link this policy to the planning obligations policy as that has link to local skills and employment.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that as the land has been identified for development in the locational strategy and is a sustainable location, development would almost certainly occur (and the associated economic benefits) irrespective of having its own specific policy.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG4 South West Extension housing site								
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 4 July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	Direct reference to the provision of a school assists in making this policy positive when compared with the SA objective. Recommendation – link this policy to the planning obligations policy as that has link to local skills and employment.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy safeguards land for primary education provision.
3. Health.	+	+	+	Positive elements in the policy will help achieve access to health services and facilities i.e. the local centre and green wedge. Play space will be provided on site, this is important for children's physical and mental health and social interaction. The green wedge will assist in linking the site to the countryside.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy allocates land for a local centre which will include health facilities and the policy also seeks to provide multifunctional green infrastructure which will encourage healthy lifestyles.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No overall relationship but the assessors note the positive link to the design policy, safety and security should however be included.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the policy encourages good design and if the site is not developed in this way it would lead to a detrimental effect on safety and security.
5. Housing.	+	+	++	The site is in one of the next best sustainable location, the site is not in the town centre but it is urban edge and not in an isolated rural area. The site is in a more sustainable location than some other sites chosen. Given its urban edge location it can tap into some existing services and facilities and as the site develops it should be seen as an extension to Hartlepool and have strong links to existing residential areas. Development on the open fields will reduce the level of open space overall but will create public space in the green wedge which is currently private. Affordable housing will be provided on site, link to housing mix policy also covers elderly so vulnerable groups are covered. Aim to develop the green wedge from an early stage to make sure the benefits are seen in the early stages and not at the end. This should be set out within the policy.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that housing development would not be of the same quality without the policy providing a strong guiding framework.
6. Transport.	++	++	++	Policy allows for walking and cycling links, most residents will have cars so no real barrier to transport but the policy does allow for sustainable modes of transports especially through the green wedge. Local centre will provide convenience shopping close to where people live this helps reduce movement. GI also helps with creating sustainable transport links. The positives should increase over time as routes become established, if the routes are there the developer and Council can do more to promote the use of the links etc. The new criterion means that transport issues will be considered throughout each phase of the development.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy might result in the loss of pedestrian cycle linkages.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	The development will lead to urban development in the countryside. The development will be on open fields which many consider to be an attractive part of the landscape, so developing he	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could lead to a reduction in the quality of the built and natural environment as the policy ensures benefits such as setting aside land for

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG4 South West Extension housing site								
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 4 July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				land will impact upon the landscape. Links to the design policy are positive and should ensure development is of a high standard. The provisions in the policy will ensure sufficient open space is provided within the development. The policy will allow for urban development in the rural area, possibly improve the policy to draw reference to the fact that these homes are in the rural area and that design should reflect it. Typical suburbia should not be encouraged here. The policy is neutral overall; a significant amount of greenfield land will be developed upon which is negative, yet the housing area should be attractive which is positive.				neighbourhood facilities, requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship overall however the assessors note the slight positive that the green wedge along the beck corridor will add to ecological enhancements.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the green infrastructure requirements stated in the policy could have an adverse impact on biodiversity.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	?	?	?	The green wedge will run along the beck corridor and thus maintain the beck but, it does not specifically improve or prevent the flooding situation. It will just provide a flood alleviation area so that new homes are not flooded. Assessors considered that to give a positive outcome when viewing the SA criteria it would depend upon what is planted in the green wedge, reed beds etc will be positive. The policy does not elaborate on what will specifically occur to help pollution control etc. Assessors are not aware of what the green wedge will contain i.e if trees are provided then the can act as a carbon sink. Due to the number of unknowns assessors scored this policy with as uncertain (?)	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as this topic is not referenced within the policy.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Due to its location the site should be seen as an extension to Hartlepool so people can link in to existing facilities and community groups etc. The provision of a local centre on site will assist in providing facilities close to home. The greens spaces on site will allow for social interaction and possible cohesion etc.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact on liveability and place as the policy ensures benefits such as setting aside land for neighbourhood facilities, requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	X	X	X	No relationship	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as the policy does not specifically relate to this topic.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	The policy will allow for development on greenfield land, on the urban edge so some residents will head straight out by car to the A689 and then the A19 to access services and facilities in Stockton, Middlesbrough, Sunderland and Newcastle. This is viewed as being negative when considering car borne carbon emissions. The policy does not ensure development is energy efficient there is no requirement for the development to be carbon negative which in turn could render the overall scheme carbon natural. The policy should	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as the policy does not ensure that development is energy efficient.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG4 South West Extension housing site								
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 4 July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				be linked to the energy efficiency policy and climate change policy. The policy could also encourage the reuse of vacant buildings as a priority, the old farmsteads on site council be incorporated into new homes or the local centre.				
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no impact as the policy does not address this topic.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	The site is urban edge so the next best sustainable location after the urban area. Facilities are within walking distance and there are opportunities to use sustainable modes of transport. Policy is neutral overall as it will lead to development on a significant amount of greenfield land but opportunities to be sustainable are embedded in the policy and its location allows for that.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as there pedestrian and cycle linkages and the green infrastructure would not be safeguarded by the policy.
15. Futurity.	0	0	0	The policy is neutral overall, the homes will be built on greenfield land but the policy will assist in providing new homes that existing and future generations need.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy provides benefits such as safeguarding land for neighbourhood facilities. Also pedestrian and cycle linkages and the green infrastructure would not be safeguarded in the absence of the policy.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy will allow for significant development in the countryside, development in the countryside does inevitably change the character and landscape which in many instance is deemed to be negative. Due to its urban edge location it is likely that many residents will leave the site and go straight to the A689 and then the A19 to access services and facilities out of town, however this has been mitigated against by ensuring that green links are provided which many encourage residents to interact with the local areas. The policy will allow for much needed homes to be built but it could be made more positive by following the recommendations set out below. The new criterion means that transport issues will be considered throughout each phase of the development. The sustainability appraisal against the transport object therefore now performs strongly over the short and medium as well as the long term.</p> <p>Recommendations: None</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
The policy has been assessed on the basis that there is strong interest in developing this site for housing and it has therefore been assumed that the site will be developed for housing irrespective of whether or not the site is allocated in the emerging Local Plan. There would be significant negative impacts in relation to the sustainability appraisal objectives if the policy were removed.								

Policy: HSG5 High Tunstall								
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Public Health)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	House building will lead to limited job creation, but the jobs would not all be high skilled, wide ranging and long lasting. The local centre should provide long term employment but in the main the jobs are not high skilled. This site is on the urban edge of Hartlepool, some residents may choose to visit the town	0	0	0	Assessors considered that as the land has been identified for development in the locational strategy and is a sustainable location, development would almost certainly occur (and the associated economic benefits) irrespective of having its own specific policy.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG5 High Tunstall							
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Public Health)				
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
				centre as it is a short drive or bus ride away. The town centre is probably not within walking distance for many, but some may choose to cycle, especially if town centre cycling facilities are improved.			
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	Direct reference to the provision of a school assists in making this policy positive when compared with the SA objective.	-	-	-
3. Health.	+	+	+	Positive elements in the policy will help achieve access to health services and facilities i.e. the local centre and green wedge. Play space will be provided on site, this is important for children's physical and mental health and social interaction. The green wedge will assist in linking the site to the countryside.	-	-	-
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No overall relationship but the assessors note the positive link to the design policy, safety and security should however be included.	-	-	-
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The High Tunstall site is in one of the next best sustainable location, the site is not in the town centre but it is urban edge and not in an isolated rural area. Policy has direct link to the design policy. The site is in a more sustainable location than some other sites chosen. Given its urban edge location it can tap into some existing services and facilities and as the site develops it should be seen as an extension to Hartlepool and have strong links to existing residential areas.	-	-	-
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The bypass and grade separated junction should improve what exists at present especially the safety and access to the A19. The location of the site and policy criteria will not reduce the need to travel but to get to Hartlepool and its facilities is only a short distance so if in the car the emissions will be limited but there is potential to walk or cycle. The positive link to pedestrian and cycle improvements will help this. Bypass is a significant improvement, will reduce traffic through Elwick. The bypass will however increase traffic along Elwick Road to the point where the bypass begins. By directing more traffic along the countryside section of Elwick Road there could be more danger for vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians' unless a better cycle link is added in. Assessors would like to see walking and cycling links along the route of the new bypass to protect the vulnerable users who walk and cycle to and from Elwick.	-	-	-
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	The development of High Tunstall will lead to urban development in the countryside. The development will be on open fields which many consider to be an attractive part of the landscape, so developing the land will impact upon the landscape.			

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG5 High Tunstall								
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Public Health)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				Links to the design policy are positive and should ensure development is of a high standard. The provisions in the policy will ensure sufficient open space is provided within the development and will ensure GI links are improved. The policy will allow for urban development in the rural area, possibly improve the policy to draw reference to the fact that these homes are in the rural area and that design should reflect it. Typical suburbia should not be encouraged here. The policy is neutral overall, a significant amount of greenfield land will be developed upon which is negative, yet the housing area should be attractive which is positive.	-	-	-	landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the green infrastructure requirements stated in the policy could have an adverse impact on biodiversity.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	The addition of 'In order to ensure that necessary utilities infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner a phasing plan should be submitted as part of the initial planning application' will help to achieve the sustainable use of water resources.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as this topic is not referenced within the policy.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Due to its location the site should be seen as an extension to Hartlepool so people can link in to existing facilities and community groups etc. The provision of a local centre on site will assist in providing facilities close to home. The green spaces on site will allow for social interaction and possible cohesion etc.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact on liveability and place as the policy ensures benefits such as setting aside land for neighbourhood facilities, requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as the policy does not specifically relate to this topic.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	The policy will allow for development on greenfield land, on the urban edge so some residents will head straight out by car to the A19 to access services and facilities in Stockton, Middlesbrough, Sunderland and Newcastle. This is viewed as being negative when considering car borne carbon emissions. The policy does not ensure development is energy efficient. The policy should be linked to the energy efficiency policy and climate change policy.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as the policy does not ensure that development is energy efficient.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no impact as the policy does not address this topic.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	The site is urban edge so the next best sustainable location after the urban area. Facilities are within walking distance and there are opportunities to use sustainable modes of transport. Policy is neutral overall as it will lead to development on a significant amount of greenfield land but opportunities to be sustainable are embedded in the policy and its location allows for that.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy supports pedestrian and cycle linkages. These provide alternatives to travel by car to the local facilities which are within walking distance.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG5 High Tunstall								
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Public Health)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
15. Futurity.	0	0	0	The policy is neutral overall, the homes will be built on greenfield land but the policy will assist in providing new homes that existing and future generations need.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy provides benefits such as safeguarding land for neighbourhood facilities. Furthermore pedestrian and cycle linkages and the green infrastructure would not be safeguarded in the absence of the policy.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy will allow for significant development in the countryside, by virtue of homes and a bypass. Development in the countryside does inevitably change the character and landscape which in many instance is deemed to be negative. Due to its urban edge location it is likely that many residents will leave the site and go straight to the A19 to access services and facilities out of town, however this has been mitigated against by ensuring that green links are provided which many encourage residents to interact with the local areas. The site is also close to existing services and facilities and not too far from the town centre.</p> <p>The policy will allow for much needed homes to be built and to improve traffic through Elwick village and the A19 access points.</p> <p>The addition of 'In order to ensure that necessary utilities infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner a phasing plan should be submitted as part of the initial planning application' will help to achieve the sustainable use of water resources and has resulted in the policy performing positively (one +) against the water, air and soil pollution objective.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for education and skills, health, safety and security, housing, transport, built and natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity, liveability and place, climate change and futurity.								

Policy: HSG5a Quarry Farm Housing Site								
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Public Health)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	House building will lead to limited job creation, but the jobs would not all be high skilled, wide ranging and long lasting. The local centre should provide long term employment but in the main the jobs are not high skilled. This site is on the urban edge of Hartlepool, some residents may choose to visit the town centre as it is a short drive or bus ride away. The town centre is probably not within walking distance for many, but some may choose to cycle, especially if town centre cycling facilities are improved.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that as the land has been identified for development in the locational strategy and is a sustainable location, development would almost certainly occur (and the associated economic benefits) irrespective of having its own specific policy.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	Direct reference to the provision of a school assists in making this policy positive when compared with the SA objective.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy requires a contribution on a pro-rata basis to the single form primary school on the High Tunstall development.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG5a Quarry Farm Housing Site								
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Public Health)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
3. Health.	+	+	+	Positive elements in the policy will help provide opportunities for healthy lifestyles, for example the provision of green infrastructure.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy supports multi-functional green infrastructure provision which encourages healthy lifestyles.
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	No overall relationship	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the policy encourages good design and if the site is not developed in this way it would lead to a detrimental effect on safety and security.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The Quarry Farm site is in one of the next best sustainable locations (after brownfield urban sites), the site is not in the town centre but it is urban edge and not in an isolated rural area. The site is in a more sustainable location than some other sites chosen. Given its urban edge location it can tap into some existing services and facilities and as the site develops it should be seen as an extension to Hartlepool and have strong links to existing residential areas.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that housing development would not be of the same quality without the policy providing a strong guiding framework.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The bypass and grade separated junction should improve what exists at present especially the safety and access to the A19. The location of the site and policy criteria will not reduce the need to travel but to get to Hartlepool and its facilities is only a short distance so if in the car the emissions will be limited but there is potential to walk or cycle. The positive link to pedestrian and cycle improvements will help this. Bypass is a significant improvement, will reduce traffic through Elwick. The bypass will however increase traffic along Elwick Road to the point where the bypass begins. By directing more traffic along the countryside section of Elwick Road there could be more danger for vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians' unless a better cycle link is added in. Assessors would like to see walking and cycling links along the route of the new bypass to protect the vulnerable users who walk and cycle too and from Elwick.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would result in a negative impact due to the potential weakening of the transport infrastructure requirements and pedestrian and cycle linkages that are referenced within the policy.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	The development of Quarry Farm will lead to urban development in the countryside. The development will be on open fields which many consider to be an attractive part of the landscape, so developing the land will impact upon the landscape. Links to the design policy are positive and should ensure development is of a high standard. The provisions in the policy will ensure sufficient open space is provided within the development and will ensure GI links are improved. The policy will allow for urban development in the rural area, possibly improve the policy to draw reference to the fact that these homes are in the rural area and that design should reflect it. Typical suburbia should not be encouraged here.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could lead to a reduction in the quality of the built and natural environment as the policy ensures benefits such as the provision of multi-functional green infrastructure, a landscape buffer and cycle and pedestrian linkages to the adjoining urban and rural areas.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG5a Quarry Farm Housing Site							
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Public Health)				
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
				The policy is neutral overall, a significant amount of greenfield land will be developed upon which is negative, yet the housing area should be attractive which is positive.			
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	0	0	0	There will be an impact but mitigation should ensure that the impact is neutral overall.	-	-	-
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	0	0	0	There will be an impact but mitigation should ensure that the impact is neutral overall.	X	X	X
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Due to its location the site should be seen as an extension to Hartlepool so people can link in to existing facilities and community groups etc.	-	-	-
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The housing allocations will provide opportunities to create stronger socially inclusive communities.	X	X	X
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	The policy will allow for development on greenfield land, on the urban edge so some residents will head straight out by car to the A19 to access services and facilities in Stockton, Middlesbrough, Sunderland and Newcastle. This is viewed as being negative when considering car borne carbon emissions.	X	X	X
13. Waste.	0	0	0	The site is edge of centre which should mean that it can be easily linked to existing waste collection services although it will result in the generation of additional household waste. On balance its impact is neutral overall.	X	X	X
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	The site is urban edge so the next best sustainable location after the urban area. Facilities are within walking distance and there are opportunities to use sustainable modes of transport. Policy is neutral overall as it will lead to development on a significant amount of greenfield land but opportunities to be sustainable are embedded in the policy and its location allows for that.	-	-	-
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy is positive overall, the homes will be built on greenfield land but it is a sustainable edge of centre location and the policy will assist in providing new homes that existing and future generations need.	-	-	-

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG5a Quarry Farm Housing Site							
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Steven Carter (Public Health)				
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
Conclusions and Recommendations							
<p>Conclusions: The policy will allow for significant development in the countryside, by virtue of homes and a bypass. Development in the countryside does inevitably change the character and landscape which in many instance is deemed to be negative. Due to its urban edge location it is likely that many residents will leave the site and go straight to the A19 to access services and facilities out of town, however this has been mitigated against by ensuring that green links are provided which many encourage residents to interact with the local areas. The site is also close to existing services and facilities and not too far from the town centre. The policy will allow for much needed homes to be built and to improve traffic through Elwick village and the A19 access points.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>							
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:							
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for education and skills, health, safety and security, housing, transport, built and natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity, liveability and place, climate change and futurity.							

Policy: HSG6 Wynyard housing site								
Date: 15.11.2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The provision of homes will lead to limited jobs in house building but the jobs are unlikely to be wide ranging and not all high skilled. The site location is not particularly helpful to Town Centre as it is unlikely that residents will travel from Wynyard to Town centre.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that as the land has been identified for development in the locational strategy and is a sustainable location, development would almost certainly occur (and the associated economic benefits) irrespective of having its own specific policy.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The policy seeks the provision of a primary school.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy safeguards land for primary education provision.
3. Health.	+	+	+	There are positive elements in the policy that will help achieve the health objective i.e. infrastructure links such as walking and cycling along with the provision of play space on site and links to the surrounding countryside will improve access.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy allocates land for a local centre which will include health facilities and the policy also seeks to provide multifunctional green infrastructure which will encourage healthy lifestyles.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No overall relationship but assessors note the positive link to the design policy. Reference to the safety and security policy should also be included.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the policy encourages good design and if the site is not developed in this way it would lead to a detrimental effect on safety and security.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG6 Wynyard housing site								
Date: 15.11.2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
5. Housing.	0	0	0	It is possible that a sustainable community could be created, given the local centre, green infrastructure etc but the site is not in a sustainable location. The policy has links to the design policy which established high quality design. The site will ensure that the residents who live in Wynyard have increased access to open space; assessors note the positive walking link improvements. The policy/site does not provide all residents with access to housing due to its location; the homes are likely to be high end housing so more expensive than the average Hartlepool house price. Affordable housing will be required on the larger site which will assist in providing quality homes for all in a variety of locations but the other sites will be required to pay an off site sum which will be used to regenerate parts of the urban area, so not to provide homes within Wynyard. Neutral overall due to the site location, there are some pros and some cons but they balance each other out.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that housing development would not be of the same quality without the policy providing a strong guiding framework.
6. Transport.	-	-	-	Due to the location residents are likely to have to travel by car. The new A689 cycle link will be a positive. More cyclists will have to go along the A19 junction, there is a link through Wolviston but commuting cyclists are most likely to go across the A19 to access so there is unlikely to be an improvement to the safety of cyclists as the A19 crossing point is heavily trafficked and often traffic is at high speeds. The policy will have a neutral effect on the highway network, there may be some extending waiting times but the aim is to maintain it, not improve it. Due to the location there is likely to be an increase in Co2 emissions. The site is in an isolated location, disconnected from the main services and facilities within Wynyard and Stockton. There is likely to be an onus on car use. There are not enough services on site i.e cinema etc so people will have to travel. However, the policy will result in the provision of new facilities which will reduce traffic, thereby making development more sustainable.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would result in a negative impact due to the potential weakening of the transport infrastructure requirements and pedestrian and cycle linkages that are referenced within the policy.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	This site would lead to urban development in the countryside. The policy will allow for building on areas of open space and some woodland. It could be to the detriment of that landscape but the policy seeks to mitigate this and create a high quality landscape. Overall it is neutral against this objective.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could lead to a reduction in the quality of the built and natural environment as the policy ensures benefits such as setting aside land for neighbourhood facilities, requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	0	0	0	The allocation will have an impact but mitigation should ensure that it is neutral overall.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the green infrastructure requirements stated in the policy could have an adverse impact on biodiversity.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	0	0	0	The allocation will have an impact but mitigation should ensure that it is neutral overall.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as this topic is not referenced within the policy.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG6 Wynyard housing site								
Date: 15.11.2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Local centre is a benefit but it is likely to be for top up shopping, residents are still likely to need to travel to access wider retail options. This policy would allow urban development in the rural area, in a location that is detached from Hartlepool. Assessors do not see how a sense of place can be created. The policy and site are unlikely to create social cohesion as there is unlikely to be a mix of people. The policy is likely to generate a housing estate in the rural area where many people work all day, drive home and do not generally not interacting with neighbours. However the policy does all it can to assist in creating social cohesion as it provides spaces for interaction. There area some activities (walking groups etc.) in the south of the A689, so links to south of A689 need to be ensured.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact on liveability and place as the policy ensures benefits such as setting aside land for neighbourhood facilities, requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	0	0	0	The local centre, green wedge and green links will help people interact. The impact should be neutral overall.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as the policy does not specifically relate to this topic.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	This policy allows for build development on natural resources and does not ensure prudent use like other sites close to the urban edge would. This site would have to be built to a carbon negative level to a assist in mitigating against the carbon impacts. The policy does not require this.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as the policy does not ensure that development is energy efficient.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	The allocation will generate household waste.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no impact as the policy does not address this topic.
14. Climate Change.	-	-	-	The policy will not encourage prudent use of natural resources as it will allow for greenfield development. Residents are likely to need to travel by car and therefore there is likely to be an increase in carbon emissions, not a decrease. Note that green infrastructure can act as a carbon sink especially if trees are planted. The policy is negative when compared to the SA criteria, mainly due to the location. This location is not as sustainable as other green locations. The only likely way to overcome this would be to make the develop carbon negative.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as there pedestrian and cycle linkages and the green infrastructure would not be safeguarded by the policy.
15. Futurity.	0	0	0	The policy is slightly negative and could be detrimental to future generations as it would allow building in a detached location which does not reduce the need to travel by car. Building in other areas could be more sustainable. The site does adds to a package of choices on where future home will be built, thus providing choice for future generations. Policy deemed to be neutral when considered against the SA objective as it's not in a sustainable location and is likely to increase Co2 emissions but it will create new homes.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy provides benefits such as safeguarding land for neighbourhood facilities. also pedestrian and cycle linkages and the green infrastructure would not be safeguarded in the absence of the policy.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG6 Wynyard housing site							
Date: 15.11.2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)				
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
Conclusions and Recommendations							
<p>Conclusions: This policy would allow for residential development on greenfield land in a location that is detached from the main built up area of Hartlepool. The benefits to the main area of Hartlepool are likely to be limited. The site does provide an alternative to the two other strategic sites in the borough (South West Extension and High Tunstall) and the policy will ensure that the site is developed to a high standard with adequate open space, improved infrastructure including cycling and walking links.</p> <p>There have been some changes to the sustainability appraisal at the Publication Draft stage such as having a positive performance against the education and skills objective and a neutral impact on the built and natural environment, biodiversity and geo-diversity, water, air and soil pollution and equity, diversity, equality and participation objectives.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>							
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:							
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for education and skills, health, safety and security, housing, transport, built and natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity, liveability and place, climate change and futurity.							

Policy: HSG7 Elwick Village Housing Developments								
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	0	0	0	The aim of this policy to set prescriptive parameters for development in Elwick Village. It is acknowledges that whilst the policy is a criteria based policy in reference to a particular site in the village, an outcome of the development will be more residents in the vicinity of local services which should improve the viability and vitality of the village centre.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that as the land has been identified for development in the locational strategy and is a sustainable location, development would almost certainly occur (and the associated economic benefits) irrespective of having its own specific policy.
2. Education and Skills.	0	0	0	New development of the level proposed will require planning obligations towards the provision and improvement of education facilities to ensure sustainable development.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no impact as the policy does not address this topic.
3. Health.	+	+	+	The policy helps to provide opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles as there is direct reference to the improvement of cycle and footpath links to both the urban area of Hartlepool and the countryside. Access to services in the urban area of Hartlepool will be improved as the policy ensures the provision of a subsidised bus service.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy requires green infrastructure, open space and pedestrian and cycle linkages, all of which encourage healthy lifestyles.
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no impact as the policy does not address this topic.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG7 Elwick Village Housing Developments								
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 4th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The policy is a prescriptive policy for the guidance of development at this particular site. The site is mentioned in HSG2 (overall housing mix), this policy in conjunction will ensure that development of the site will meet housing needs to ensure sustainable development. The policy provides the opportunity for increased access to open space within the landscape buffer between the housing site and the proposed route for the new bypass. The policy specifically refers to design which will ensure that development of the site will be of high quality. The policy could possibly be improved by referencing the forthcoming Design SPD.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that housing development would not be of the same quality without the policy providing a strong guiding framework.
6. Transport.	++	++	++	The policy actively encourages the development of sustainable modes of transport by improving cycling and walking links. In addition the policy is prescriptive about the provision of safe access to the site and sets out how the development should be designed in context to the bypass. . The policy ensures the provision of a subsidised bus service to the urban area which has the potential to reduce transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care. This policy supports a sustainable extension to the village.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would result in a negative impact due to the potential weakening of the transport infrastructure requirements that are referenced within the policy.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	The policy promotes an extension to Elwick Village on greenfield land, therefore it will expand the size of the village into the countryside. The new criterion will ensure that the adjacent heritage assets are taken account of, respected and protected. Overall the impact on the built and natural environment should be neutral.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could lead to a reduction in the quality of the built and natural environment as the policy ensures benefits such as requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	-	-	-	The policy encourages the development of housing in the village which will impact upon the natural environment; therefore there is the potential to impact upon habitats and priority species. Mitigation against harm is a possibility.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the green infrastructure requirements stated in the policy could have an adverse impact on biodiversity.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	0	0	0	The policy encourages the development of housing. The policy directly refers to site requirements, which includes site constraints. Any development should take into account water, air and soil pollution. Risk can be minimised and mitigated against.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as this topic is not referenced within the policy.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	This policy encourages and supports additional dwellings in Elwick village, providing a sustainable extension to the village. The focus of site specific policy promotes sustainable lifestyles. Creating additional housing options in the village will help to sustain and develop the community.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact on liveability and place as the policy ensures benefits such requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	-	+	+	This policy encourages housing development on a specific site in the village. There has been a lot of community consultation undertaken as part of the development of the Rural Neighbourhood Plan, whilst this site is identified in the Neighbourhood Plan; the numbers identified in this policy are higher which has the potential to create issues relating to social cohesion in the short term.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as providing more rural housing choices including affordable housing can assist in promoting community cohesion.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG7 Elwick Village Housing Developments								
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 4th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as the policy does not ensure that development is energy efficient.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	The policy will encourage housing at Elwick; this additional housing will increase landfill. This waste will have to travel to the urban area which is not sustainable.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no impact as the policy does not address this topic.
14. Climate Change.	-	-	-	The policy will encourage housing at Elwick; there is the potential to increase greenhouse gas both through the build process and the impact of new dwellings. Flood risk will be mitigated against although a reduction of surface for drainage has the potential to create an issue. The policy could be strengthened by direct reference to flood risk if not covered in the design SPD.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as there pedestrian and cycle linkages and the green infrastructure would not be safeguarded by the policy.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The aim of the policy is to provide additional housing in the village which will create additional housing options for current and future generations. The benefit of adequate housing in a sustainable location contributes directly to the Governments house building agenda.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact on liveability and place as the policy ensures benefits such requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Overall the impact of this policy will be positive as it facilitates sustainable development of a strategic extension to Elwick Village. The change to the policy has resulted in a neutral overall impact against the built and natural environment objective.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for, health, housing, transport, built and natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity, liveability and place, equality, diversity and participation, climate change and futurity.								

Policy: HSG8 Hart Village Housing Developments								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control) & Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	0	0	0	The aim of this policy is to set prescriptive parameters for development in Hart Village. It is acknowledges that whilst the policy is a criteria based policy in reference to a particular site in the village, an outcome of the development will be more residents in the vicinity of local businesses which should improve the viability and vitality of the village centre.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that as the land has been identified for development in the locational strategy and is a sustainable location, development would almost certainly occur (and the associated economic benefits) irrespective of having its own specific policy.
2. Education and Skills.	0	0	0	New development of the level proposed will require planning obligations towards the provision and improvement of education facilities to ensure sustainable development.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no impact as the policy does not address this topic.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG8 Hart Village Housing Developments								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control) & Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
3. Health.	++	++	++	The policy will ensure the provision of a new playing field and play provision as part of the development of the sites. This will benefit the residents of these new developments and the wider village as a whole. Play provision is mentioned in the preamble to the policy but not in the policy itself. Due to the intent of the policy, it could be strengthened by direct reference to play provision within the policy.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy allocates land for a local centre which will include health facilities and the policy also seeks to provide multifunctional green infrastructure which will encourage healthy lifestyles.
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	Whilst there are many environmental and social benefits to the incorporation of play facilities and a playing field there is the possibility that such a facility could increase anti-social behaviour, both real and perceived.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no impact as the policy does not address this topic.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The policy is a prescriptive policy for the guidance of development at this particular site. The site is mentioned in HSG2 (overall housing mix), this policy in conjunction will ensure that development of the site will meet housing needs to ensure sustainable development. The policy will ensure that access to open space for residents is increased. The policy specifically refers to design which will ensure that development of the site will be of high quality. The policy could possibly be improved by referencing the forthcoming Design SPD.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that housing development would not be of the same quality without the policy providing a strong guiding framework.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The policy actively encourages the development of sustainable modes of transport by improving cycling and walking links. There are already good links between Hart village and the urban area of Hartlepool. This policy supports a sustainable extension to the village.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would result in a negative impact due to the potential weakening of the transport infrastructure requirements that are referenced within the policy.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	The policy promotes an extension to the village on greenfield land, therefore it will expand the size of the village into the countryside as such does promote encroachment into the countryside. There are a number of heritage assets in the vicinity of the sites; development in these locations has the potential to have a detrimental impact on setting of such heritage assets. The policy could be enhanced by cross referencing to relevant heritage policies. The policy will ensure the inclusion of new open space within the site which will be accessible to all.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact on liveability and place as the policy ensures benefits such as requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	-	-	-	The policy encourages the development of housing in this location in Hart village which will impact upon the natural environment; therefore there is the potential to impact upon habitats and priority species. Mitigation against harm is a possibility.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the green infrastructure requirements stated in the policy could have an adverse impact on biodiversity.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	-	-	-	The policy encourages the development of housing. The policy directly refers to site	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG8 Hart Village Housing Developments								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control) & Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				requirements, which includes site constraints. Any development should take into account water, air and soil pollution. Risk can be minimised and mitigated against. However in the case of these sites development could impact upon the flood zone and there is the potential that the sites include best and most versatile land.				impact as this topic is not referenced within the policy.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	This policy encourages additional dwellings in the village, providing a sustainable extension to the village. The focus of site specific policy promotes sustainable lifestyles. Creating additional housing options in the village will help to sustain and develop the community.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact on liveability and place as the policy ensures benefits such requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	-	+	+	This policy encourages housing development on a specific site in the village. There has been a lot of community consultation undertaken as part of the development of the Rural Neighbourhood Plan, whilst these sites are identified in the Neighbourhood Plan; the numbers identified within this policy are higher which has the potential to create issues relating to social cohesion in the short term.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as providing more rural housing choices including affordable housing can assist in promoting community cohesion.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would not have an impact as the policy does not ensure that development is energy efficient.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	The policy will encourage housing at Hart; this additional housing will increase landfill. This waste will have to travel to the urban area which is not the most sustainable approach.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no impact as the policy does not address this topic.
14. Climate Change.	-	-	-	The policy will encourage housing at Hart; there is the potential to increase greenhouse gas both through the build process and the impact of new dwellings. Flood risk will be mitigated against although reduction of surface for drainage has the potential to create an issue. The policy could be strengthened by the inclusion of direct reference to flood risk if not covered in the design SPD.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the pedestrian and cycle linkages and the green infrastructure would not be safeguarded by the policy.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The aim of the policy is provide additional housing in the village which will create additional housing options for current and future generations. The benefit of adequate housing in a sustainable location contributes directly to the Governments house building agenda.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact on liveability and place as the policy ensures benefits such as requiring a landscape buffer and green infrastructure.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG8 Hart Village Housing Developments							
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Daniel James (Development Control) & Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation)				
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
Conclusions and Recommendations							
<p>Conclusions: Overall the impact of this policy will be positive as it facilitates sustainable development of a strategic extension to Hart Village, in addition this development will facilitate significant improvements to provision of open space and play facilities for public access within the village.</p> <p>Recommendations: Suggested that the policy could be strengthened by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross reference this policy with the heritage policies relevant. • Include reference to flooding. <p>Referencing the requirement for the provision of play facilities as part of the development of the open space.</p>							
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:							
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for, health, housing, transport, built and natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity, liveability and place, equality, diversity and participation, climate change and futurity.							

Policy: HSG9 Affordable Housing								
Date: 8th April 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The policy will allow for positive impacts upon social depredation but the assessors did not consider that there were no links to economic activity.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact on the economy as an adequate supply of affordable homes as well as market homes is considered to be an economic benefit.
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that there is no relationship between this topic and the policy.
3. Health.	X	X	X	No relationship overall but the assessors note the positive that better housing may be provided that is not full of damp etc and thus mental health and wellbeing can be improved.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as an adequate supply of affordable housing contributes towards health and wellbeing.
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	No overall relationship but assessors did note that the policy does not tackle crime and anti social behaviour. Perception of those in affordable housing need is negative and if families are not integrated it could give rise to the perception of crime etc.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that there the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as an adequate supply of affordable housing contributes to social cohesion which helps create safer communities.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The policy will assist in creating a choice of homes and will assist in providing for those in affordable housing need. Much of the criteria is not applicable to this policy as the policy generally serves one main purpose, which is to provide affordable homes. The policy draws no reference to homes being decent or good quality therefore assessors considered that it is not possible to score this policy more positively. A possible recommendation is to like this policy to the design policies etc. and to state that affordable homes should be indistinguishable from general market homes.	--	--	--	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a pronounced negative impact as it would reduce the number of Hartlepool residents who have access to good quality homes that meet their needs across tenures in sustainable communities.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG9 Affordable Housing									
Date: 8th April 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)						
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	Assessors considered that there is no relationship between this topic and the policy.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy requires that affordable units should be indistinguishable from market units on the development which, as well as creating mixed communities, improves design outcomes.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	Assessors considered that there is no relationship between this topic and the policy.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	Assessors considered that there is no relationship between this topic and the policy.	
10. Liveability and Place.	0	0	0	<p>Social cohesion could improve more overtime but education needs to improve for those in general market and in affordable housing need.</p> <p>The perception of those in affordable need can be negative but all in society need to be aware that often those in affordable housing need are vulnerable and that those in affordable housing need are not always negative contributors to society. Good and bad people can live in general market housing and in affordable housing so often the perception is untrue.</p> <p>Recommendation – to ensure those in affordable homes are not stereotyped and singled out the design and quality of affordable homes should be equal to the design of market homes.</p>	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as an adequate supply of affordable housing promotes social cohesion.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	0	0	0	<p>The policy can assist in providing homes for everyone.</p> <p>Some elements of social cohesion are beyond the remit on the local plan, but the policy could be improved to prevent those in affordable housing need being singled out as stated above.</p>	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as an adequate supply of affordable promotes social inclusion and encourages stronger socially inclusive communities.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	Assessors considered that there is no relationship between this topic and the policy.	
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	Assessors considered that there is no relationship between this topic and the policy.	
14. Climate Change.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	Assessors considered that there is no relationship between this topic and the policy.	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy will assist in providing for future generations, assessors do not think that the policy will have negative impact upon future generations.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as an inadequate supply of affordable housing would restrict the choices of future generations..	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG9 Affordable Housing						
Date: 8th April 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)			
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Philip Timmins (Estates), Tony Dixon (Development Control)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
<p>Conclusions: The policy is positive overall and will assist in ensuring that affordable homes are provide across the borough. The policy has one main aim and therefore not all of the SA criteria are essential.</p> <p>Recommendations: A possible recommendation is to like this policy to the design policies etc. and to state that affordable homes should be indistinguishable from general market homes.</p>						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, health, safety and security, housing, built and natural environment, liveability and place, climate change and futurity.						

Policy: HSG10 Housing Market Renewal							
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Garry Hutchison (Building Control), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)				
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off			
	Timescale			Timescale			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Commentary/ explanation							
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The policy aims to support housing market renewal to address housing imbalance. The detrimental effect created by an oversupply of housing can have a significant impact on an area, the low demand for housing creates voids and as a consequence has an impact on the viability and vitality of the area. As this policy aims to address this, there will be a positive benefit on the local economy. Local centres in close proximity to sites can be strengthened. Short term inward investment through the supply chain can be a indirect benefit of development.	-	-	-
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	Housing development has the potential to lever in funding through planning obligations to secure additional education facilities to ensure sustainable development. There are economic challenges in delivering brownfield sites.	-	-	-
				Marginal negative impact if the policy wasn't in place.			

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG10 Housing Market Renewal								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Garry Hutchison (Building Control), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
3. Health.	+	+	+	Better quality housing which is the intended outcome supported by this policy. In clearing existing housing stock there is the opportunity to reconfigure the layout of housing development to include additional green space / open space. There is the opportunity to reduce levels of deprivation through the provision of better quality housing. Housing provided will be more efficient; occupants as a result will spend a lower proportion of income on energy bills.	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place has the potential not to deliver the positive benefits that redevelopment of failing housing stock has on health through the creation of better designed and healthier living environments.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	++	The policy supports HMR, which involves the clearance of poor quality housing; such areas are often vulnerable to increased crime and antisocial behaviour issues. Rebuilding such areas will both help to reduce crime in the area and reduce perception of crime associated to the area – this will be a long term outcome of implementation of the policy. The provision of new build properties as part of HMR redevelopment will improve fire standards, e.g. through the provision of escape windows.	-	-	--	Declining housing areas have a correlation with increasing crime and anti-social behaviour.
5. Housing.	++	++	++	The purpose of the policy is to promote the reuse of Brownfield land, areas which are currently experiencing market failure; this will specifically address issue with supply and demand of housing stock to meet needs and aspirations. This has the potential to address the needs of vulnerable people. Renewed housing stock will be built to current standards and building regulations. There is the opportunity to reconfigure space to include additional green / open space.	--	--	--	Negative impact on having the policy basis to secure benefits of addressing failing housing stock. For example improving the quality of housing available to meet current standards.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Redevelopment of brownfield sites can create the opportunity to encourage better highway design – e.g. reduce 'rat runs' through inner town areas. This could have a direct impact upon increasing highway safety. The policy has the potential to increase sustainable use of transport if developments are sustainably integrated into urban areas. Redevelopment of residential areas in the inner urban core of the town will help sustain local centres by increasing the population numbers in close vicinity to commercial areas.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to hinder the improvement of transport issues associated with failing market areas.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The policy supports the redevelopment of town centre areas, however dependent on how houses are redeveloped there is the possibility that the number of dwellings on sites may be reduced. However such sites where housing market failure is an issue present high numbers of voids and are not generally desirable areas where people want to live. There will always be a market for development of large housing on Greenfield sites; therefore this may have limited impact on encroachment into the countryside.	--	--	--	With the absence of the policy, there is a risk that the benefits relating to this objective will not come to fruition and the quality of the existing built environment in such areas will continue to decline.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG10 Housing Market Renewal									
Date: 23 rd March 2016				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Garry Hutchison (Building Control), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 4 th July 2017				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
				There is the potential to improve the setting of heritage assets and has the potential to improve the quality of the built environment, including the additional provision of open space. The policy could be strengthened by cross referencing to Green Infrastructure policies.					
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The redevelopment of housing market renewal sites will create new housing which better meets the needs and aspirations of the community. Town centre areas tend to have better provision of services and facilities and better infrastructure links, promoting sustainable areas. New dwellings which are better suited type of houses people want to live in will encourage new residents and help to retain existing residents, creating a diverse community.	--	--	--	The absence of the policy has the potential to risk the delivery of addressing market failure which has major potential for negative impact on vitality and sense of place.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	0	+	++	Such development enables the possibility to create new communities in the long term. In the short term there is the possibility that communities will be displaced.	-	-	--	Absence of the policy risks the continued decline of areas where housing market failure is evident, impacting upon communities.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	There is the possibility to create sustainable development, development will be on brownfield land and there is the possibility that materials can be reused and retained increasing energy efficiency.	-	-	-	Without the policy in place there is the potential that poor quality housing will fail to be addressed. Poor quality, older homes are often less energy efficient.	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Building on brownfield land, should be more energy efficient. The policy doesn't refer to climate change, but the impact of the policy should have a positive impact on the climate as new homes are more energy efficient. Possibly cross reference to energy efficiency policy.	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place may have a negative impact on the sustainable redevelopment of brownfield land.	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy supports the improvement of housing stock to the benefit of future generations.	-	-	-	There is the risk that the plan will not have the mechanism to address issues with housing market failure, which has a major social, environmental and economic impact.	
Conclusions and Recommendations									
<p>Conclusions: Overall the impact of this policy has a positive impact for sustainable development. It will support the improvement of housing stock in town centre areas, creating more sustainable communities, improving the local environment and boosting the local economy.</p> <p>Recommendations: The policy could possibly be cross referenced with energy efficiency, planning obligations, affordable housing and community facilities.</p> <p>Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':</p> <p>Absence of the policy weakens the policy position in terms of supporting Housing Market Renewal. There is the potential that without the policy in place there could be negative social, environmental and economic impacts.</p>									

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG11 Extensions to Existing Dwellings								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Garry Hutchison (Building Control), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	0	0	0	There may be an impact on the local economy in relation to builders carrying work, e.g. if all development is refused this could impact upon the viability of local businesses.	-	-	-	Without the policy in place there may be a marginal negative impact in relation to the level of work generated for local businesses which would have a direct impact on the local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	No real relationship identified, although increased space in households may improve space / environment for study, which could in turn impact upon attainment.	X	X	X	No relationship.
3. Health.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy has the potential to generate well being issues as the policy refers to outlook and parking which if not addressed can lead to tensions in communities.
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Encourages development and increasing size of existing homes. The policy refers to design and ensures that development must be appropriate. It supports improvements to existing homes and to meet the needs of occupiers.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy removes the controls on residential extensions hence increases risk of negative impact on the amenity and could have an impact on the housing in the area.
6. Transport.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy supports appropriate extensions which has the potential to reduce the demand for new development, hence has the potential to reduce encroachment of development into the countryside. The policy has the potential to help improve the built environment.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to have an adverse impact on the surrounding area as the policy aims to manage development so that it is of high quality and in keeping.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	0	0	0	The policy refers to the retention of adequate gardens which has the potential to protect ecological networks and habitats.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy increases the potential for a loss of garden space which can contribute towards ecological networks and provide habitats.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
10. Liveability and Place.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Without the development management which the policy offers, there is the potential for adverse impacts on neighbouring properties and area which can have a negative social impact.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	The policy supports further development of brownfield land and is therefore an effective use of land within the restrictions of the policy. Cross reference policy with energy efficiency policy.	-	-	-	Well managed extension development has the potential to improve energy efficiency, absence of the policy can have the reverse impact.
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Extensions present the opportunity to improve the energy efficiency of a dwelling and can lead to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.	-	-	-	Well managed extension development have the potential to improve energy efficiency, absence of the policy can have the reverse impact.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy doesn't restrict the choices of future generations. If a house is extended to its full potential occupants have the choice to move to meet needs. The policy protects outside amenity space.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy has the potential to impact on the effective extension of dwellings to meet the needs of residents.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG11 Extensions to Existing Dwellings							
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Garry Hutchison (Building Control), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)				
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
Conclusions and Recommendations							
Conclusions: The policy will have a positive impact on sustainable development. The policy supports further development on previously developed land to meet the needs of occupants.							
Recommendations: Delete first section of point 4 in the policy, so it reads “Provide reasonable outdoor space”. Cross reference the policy to the Energy Efficiency Policy.							
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:							
The absence of the policy has the potential to inhibit the effective management and development of residential developments catering for the changing needs of residents. There are strong environmental and social benefits to having such a policy in place.							

Policy: HSG12 Residential Annexes								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Garry Hutchison (Building Control), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	0	0	0	There may be an impact on the local economy in relation to builders carrying work, e.g. if all development is refused this could impact upon the viability of local businesses.	-	-	-	Without the policy in place there may be a marginal negative impact in relation to the level of work generated for local businesses which would have a direct impact on the local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	Whilst there is no real relationship identified, the provision of a residential annexe will create more space within the curtilage of a dwelling. This increased space in households may improve space / environment for study, which could in turn impact upon attainment.	X	X	X	No relationship.
3. Health.	X	X	X	Whilst there is no real relationship identified, the creation of annexes to residential properties provides additional space to accommodate a number of residential purposes. For example annexes are often built for the care of a relative, in this scenario; the policy can be related to the promotion of healthier lifestyles as care in this manner may enable independent living for longer.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy has the potential to have a negative impact on assisting care within the wider home.
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Encourages development and increasing size of existing homes to meet the needs of current occupiers. The policy refers to design and ensures that development must be appropriate. It could support meeting the needs of vulnerable residents depending on who the intended resident of an annexe may be.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy could put additional pressure on the housing market.
6. Transport.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy supports appropriate annexes which has the potential to reduce the demand for new development, hence has the potential to reduce encroachment of development into the countryside. The policy has the potential to help improve	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place increases the risk of inappropriate location, design and massing of potential development. This can have a direct impact on the sense of place of an area.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG12 Residential Annexes							
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Garry Hutchison (Building Control), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)				
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
				the built environment.			
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	Whilst no real relationship is identified there is the possibility with the building of a new annexe that there may be an impact on biodiversity and geodiversity at a very localised level. The policy could possibly be strengthened by reference to protection of adequate gardens.	X	X	X
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X
10. Liveability and Place.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	The policy supports further development of brownfield land and is therefore an effective use of land within the restrictions of the policy. Cross reference policy with energy efficiency policy.	0	0	0
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Residential annexe developments present the opportunity to ensure high quality design to ensure the energy efficiency of an annexe. Suggestion to cross reference to the energy efficiency policy.	-	-	-
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy doesn't restrict the choices of future generations. An annexe can be reverted to its original use. It allows flexible use of dwellings.	-	-	-
Conclusions and Recommendations							
<p>Conclusions: The policy will have a positive impact on sustainable development. The policy supports further development on previously developed land to meet the needs of occupants.</p> <p>Recommendations: In relation to the wording of the policy, this could be improved by either cross referencing to the residential extensions policy or repeating the wording to ensure all relevant is presented in this policy i.e. reference to the protection of garden amenity. Also the preamble of the policy should be strengthened by ensuring the description of a residential annexe is clear, i.e. kitchens are not included and will not be permitted as development should be ancillary to a main dwelling. The inclusion of kitchens has implications for building regulations.</p>							
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':							
Absence of the policy can lead to negative social impact though limiting residential annexe development, a housing option which addresses a specific need.							

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG13 Gypsy and Traveller provision								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	x	x	x	Assessors consider that there is no overall relationship but if travelling show people did locate within the borough then there is a possibility that the economy could be diversified.	X	X	X	No relationship
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	Policy states that the site should be in close proximity to services and facilities including educational establishments which may in turn help encouraging lifelong learning and increases attainment if there is better access to educational facilities.	-	-	-	Without the policy in place there is the potential that there could be a reduction in accessibility of this marginalised group.
3. Health.	+	+	+	Policy stipulates that a site/s should be located close to health facilities. There is no reference to the provision of green space etc. on site. Access to a range of facilities, including employment could improve economic and social poverty and help reduce health inequalities. Recommendation – should sites have open space and play facilities like general market housing does. As a minimum there should be green space for ball games etc. if no play facility near by then one should be created but if one is nearby then the facility would allow for better integration. Link to planning obligations policy, as residents should have option to use facilities in the borough but in doing so can place a burden on facilities and it is the burden that is mitigated against via planning obligations.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy has the potential to have a negative impact on health objectives as the policy states that there is a requirement for sites to be well placed to access services.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	If a planning application is approved then it allows for this development in one specific location rather than having the sites proliferate across the borough, that are harder to manage and do not allow for additional benefits such as play space etc. Having an approved site could reduce impact upon existing community as often the perception of travellers is poor etc. If a site is approved and managed well then perceptions could improve and communities may engage positively. It has often been reported that litter is left behind when transient travellers move on from a site, to ensure any new site is maintained and managed well then appropriate refuse facilities should be provided and they should be screened from view. This requirement should be set out in policy. Overall the policy is positive, as it will ensure all residents within the borough are catered for and having a designated sites/s could reduce the proliferation of sites across the borough which places a management burden upon the Council.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would potentially have a negative impact on this objective as the controls detailed in the policy, that assist in designing out crime and providing safety and security would not be in place.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG13 Gypsy and Traveller provision									
Date: 08/11/2016				Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 4 th July 2017				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
5. Housing.	?	?	?	Assessors considered that much of the criteria is not relevant, the policy does not refer to the quality of homes, it sets out criteria in which an application would be assessed. Assessors question whether or not members of the travelling community are deemed to be vulnerable. If so then this policy provides for the vulnerable and would be positive. The recommendations set out below could help this policy become more positive by ensuring that open space is provided on site.	--	--	--	In the absence of the policy the LPA would fail to have an appropriate policy to enable such a development to be guided sustainably. If the policy is not in place there is the risk that the LPA is failing to meet this housing need if identified.	
6. Transport.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Assessors consider that screening and landscaping is a positive as it can enhance an area and that having an approved site can remove a problem from elsewhere. The change to the policy will minimize impacts on neighbouring areas including green wedges and nature conservation sites. Assessors therefore consider that performance against this objective has improved to +.	-	--	--	Without the policy there is no protection to ensure there is no detrimental impact on the environment.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Potential negative impact on protected green spaces. The policy offers a level of protection that without the policy in place could have a negative impact on this objective.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy increases the risk of noise pollution.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Sites should have access to facilities and services, residents may be tempted to stay longer if they can tap into existing facilities. There could be an increased sense of place for travellers if they feel part of a place and community. The policy stipulates that sites should not be isolated; this should assist in ensuring there are opportunities for interaction and social cohesion.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy increases the risk of such development occurring in more isolated locations, which will have implications on this objective.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Ensuring residents are not isolated should assist in trying to increase social cohesion. The travelling community would have the chance to thrive in one area if they can live side by side, this is not often possible if travellers come and go to different location, with poor links and no routes and/or social network.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy increases the risk of such development occurring in more isolated locations, which will have implications on this objective.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
13. Waste.	x	x	x	Note recommendation on refuse collection.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy increases the risk of inappropriate waste management and thus would be detrimental to this objective.	
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HSG13 Gypsy and Traveller provision								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Ensuring that all residents are catered for when it comes to housing will provide choice for future generations. Assessors see no reason why choices for future generations would be negatively impacted upon.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will result in lack of control of such developments and ability to mitigate potential negative impacts.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy does not allocate a site for Gypsy and Travellers and/or Travelling Show people; it sets out criteria in which applications would be assessed. The policy is positive overall as it ensures that the sites are located close to services and facilities which is essential for social integration, education, employment opportunities and health. Assessors therefore consider that performance against the built and natural environment objective has improved as a result of the changes to the policy.</p> <p>Recommendations: None</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Absence of the policy has the potential to have a negative environmental and social impact should a development of this type come forward and the policy tools not be in place to allow for impacts to be mitigated.								

Policy: EMP1: Prestige Employment Site: Wynyard Business Park								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	The site will allow for a variety of types of businesses to open or continue to operate. The job opportunities could be wide ranging and at a variety of skills levels.	--	--	--	Not having a site for Prestige Employment could limit the types of business the borough is able to attract.
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to limit education and skills opportunities.
3. Health.	x	x	x	Assessors consider that there is no direct relationship between the policy and SA objective, however the positives relating to the creation of an attractive environment and thus the positive impact that there could be on mental health.	X	X	X	No relationship, however without this policy the positives relating to the creation of an attractive environment and thus the positive impact that there could be on mental health would be reduced.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	Assessors consider that there is no direct relationship between the policy and SA objective, however if the environment is of high quality is it likely to be maintained and thus attractive and not likely to give rise to crime and anti social behaviour.	X	X	X	No relationship, however if the policy were not in place then the requirement to improve the environment would be reduced which could give rise to crime and anti social behaviour.
5. Housing.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	In the absence of the policy – there is the potential that this could become an additional site. However as the housing need is intrinsically linked to jobs, removing an employment site would reduce the housing need and consequently the need for sites. Sufficient sites have already been identified to address the level of housing requirement. A reduction in need has the potential to lead to a reduction in site requirements.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: EMP1: Prestige Employment Site: Wynyard Business Park									
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
6. Transport.	-	-	-	The site is detached from the main urban area of Hartlepool and is not served by public transport or safe and secure cycling and walking links. Employees would be likely to access the jobs via car and thus increase carbon emissions. The existing transport infrastructure will be used but the policy does not mention improving the network, if anything it could make it worse due to the increase of traffic on the A689 and A19 junction. The A19 is considered to be a barrier, it is difficult to create safe and desirable walking and cycling links across the A19 so that commuters would want to use more sustainable modes of transport rather than the car.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would potentially result in transport benefits of developing the site for prestige employment not being achieved.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy would allow for development on large areas of greenfield land, which could in turn alter the landscape. However assessors noted that when they land is developer, green spaces will be created which are usable and will have benefits for physical and mental health. The policy seeks to ensure high design is achieved and seeks to protect natural environment features.	-	-	-	Without the policy in place, there is the potential that the site would remain a Greenfield site. However if development did come forward not having the policy in place would potentially affect the ability to secure adequate mitigation.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	The policy seeks to protect natural environment features.	-	-	-	Without the policy in place, there is the potential that the site would remain a Greenfield site. However if development did come forward not having the policy in place would potentially affect the ability to secure adequate mitigation.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy could have a negative impact due to the impact on the ability to achieve appropriate SuDS mitigation.	
10. Liveability and Place.	0	0	0	The policy will allow for jobs to be created but are only likely to be accessible for those with a car. There is a possibility that the design of the area could lead to a sense of place. If the design is correct and has reference to its location then people may see the buildings and environment and recognise it as being Wynyard.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will have a negative impact on future availability to jobs in the Wynyard area. Therefore this would increase the need for car use and impact upon the sense of place.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will limit economic development in this area; this could have a negative impact on worklessness.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	The link to the climate change policy is positive however due to the sites location and the amount of development on greenfield land it is considered that the policy does not allow for an efficient use of natural resourced. Sites on brownfield land would have been more efficient as would sites within or adjacent to the urban area.	+	+	+	Absence of the policy could potentially mean that the site remains undeveloped which would have a positive impact on natural resources.	
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy there is the potential that waste management could have a negative impact on the objective.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: EMP1: Prestige Employment Site: Wynyard Business Park									
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	The policy would allow for development on greenfield land which is a negative for climate change issues. However the policy does seek to protect key features such as trees, which do act as a carbon sink. This policy should be cross referenced with the climate change and flooding policy.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy could have a negative impact due to the impact on the ability to achieve appropriate SuDS mitigation and inclusion of green space within any future development.	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy will provide jobs for future generations; the assessors do not believe there will be any negative impacts upon the future generations as development here is unlikely to restrict choices for the future.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy limits access to high quality jobs in sustainable locations and potentially inhibits the LPA's ability to attract high quality businesses to the borough.	
Conclusions and Recommendations									
<p>Conclusions: The policy will allow for a wide range of job opportunities however they are only likely to be accessible to those with a car. Walking and cycling links for commuters are less desirable due to the barrier that the A19 poses. The design stipulations within the policy are welcomed and will assist in ensuring the area develops to a high standard. The change to the policy does not alter the sustainability appraisal as this is already covered by policy CC2.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>									
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':									
Absence of the policy has the potential to have a significant negative impact on the economy as this would remove the only Prestige Employment site from within the Borough and would therefore limit the LPAs ability to secure high quality businesses and jobs.									

Policy: EMP2 Queens Meadow Business Park									
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	++	++	++	The policy will lead to inward investment into Hartlepool, will encourage start up businesses and will provide a range of quality jobs over the plan period.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy has the potential to negatively impact on attracting business and resultant jobs to key retail areas over the plan period.	
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	It was considered the link to planning obligations was positive as this will help to ensure that training and use of local labour force can be achieved.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to limit education and skills opportunities.	
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship.	
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship.	
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship.	
6. Transport.	+	++	++	The policy links to other policies including the sustainable transport network and the connectivity policy. The site is served by public transport and cycle and footpaths and as the site develops out over the plan period this will mean more people can access jobs in this location via use of sustainable forms of transport.	-	--	--	Absence of the policy could potentially be redirected to a less sustainable location.	
7. Built and	+	++	++	The continued development of Queens	-	--	--	Absence of the policy could have a	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: EMP2 Queens Meadow Business Park								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
Natural Environment.				Meadow will help to improve the distinctiveness of the townscape in this part of Hartlepool and will prevent development encroaching into the countryside. The policy seeks to restrict the amount of built development on each plot which will help to ensure open space is delivered as part of the development.				detrimental impact on the future development of the business park as the policy requirements ensure the quality of the environment will not be in place.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	There is a Local Wildlife site to the south of the area and the policy seeks to protect and enhance the area to benefit the ecology of the area.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy could have a detrimental impact on the future development of the business park and the impact of such development on this objective as the policy requirements ensure mitigation of harm to the natural environment.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	-	-	-	There is a chance that new development could increase flood risk – the policy links to the climate change policy which promotes the use of SuDS which is positive. and as the site continues to develop the levels of noise and atmospheric pollution are likely to increase associated with the growth of the business park.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy could have a detrimental impact on this objective in terms of the detail of the policy aims to mitigate against detrimental impact.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy will improve the accessibility to jobs for local residents.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy presents the possibility that accessibility to jobs for local residents could be negatively impacted upon.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The additional access to jobs should help to reduce worklessness. The fire station headquarters located on the site will provide additional community facilities and meeting rooms.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy presents the possibility that accessibility to jobs for local residents could be negatively impacted upon. This can have a resultant impact on social cohesion aspects.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	++	As one of the key areas of the Enterprise Zone is the production of renewable energy manufacture this is seen as working towards reducing the use of natural resources both on the site and further afield.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could have a detrimental impact on the future development of the business park and the impact of such development on this objective as the policy requirements ensure mitigation and good design which can contribute towards energy efficiency and effectively utilising natural resources.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	The ongoing development and running of businesses will lead to the generation of additional waste. The waste will however be dealt with in the town at the recycling facilities.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy there is the potential that the impact on waste objective could worsen however given that there is already employment development on the site it is challenging to define the level of any negative impact.
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	As one of the key areas of the Enterprise Zone is the production of renewable energy manufacture this is seen as likely to have a benefit in terms of climate change and producing products which will assist in reducing emissions locally and globally.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to have a negative impact on climate change.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	This policy is considered to be beneficial both to existing and future residents in terms of jobs and the economy and also due to the positive spin offs for the environment associated with the renewables manufacture.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy risks the future development of Queens Meadow in a way which provides positive economic, environmental and social benefits.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: EMP2 Queens Meadow Business Park						
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)			
Date: 4 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Peter Nixon (Highways)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
Conclusions: The policy scored very well in economic and social terms and relatively well in environmental terms. The change to the policy does not alter the sustainability appraisal as this is already covered by policy CC2.						
Recommendations: None.						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Absence of the policy weakens the position of the LPA to secure high quality businesses to the borough in this location, this would have a significant impact on economic growth in this locality, and there would be associated environmental and social impacts.						

Policy: EMP3 General Employment Land							
Date: 8 th November 2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)				
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off			
	Timescale			Timescale			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Commentary/ explanation							
1. Economy.	++	++	++	-	-	--	Impact on management of Enterprise Zone and support via planning for continued development.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Likely that there could be a negative impact in terms of businesses supported through apprentice schemes. There is also a potential impact in relation to CPD if businesses can't support this.
3. Health.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Minor negative effect on transport, without the policy in place there would be a lack of control in relation to where development would occur having the potential to have a negative impact in terms of positive transport planning.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	-	-	--	The policy directs employment uses to discrete areas in Borough and therefore it has a direct impact on the built and natural environment. Absence of the policy would be negative as the lack of control could result in development in inappropriate locations.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	-	-	-	--	--	--	Absence of the policy will result in lack of controls which can amplify any

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: EMP3 General Employment Land								
Date: 8 th November 2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				increase the risk of flooding. Some of these industries can be noisy and may have some impact on their locality, however the policy does seek to guard against this.				negative impact on this objective.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy will improve the accessibility to jobs for local residents.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could lead to lack of support for industries in sustainable locations.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The additional access to jobs should help to reduce worklessness.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could lead to lack of support for job creation in sustainable locations.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	The policy supports the continued development of general industry on sites which already exist, which could obviously involve re-use of existing buildings, helping to minimise the demand for natural resources. This is balanced against the on-going operations and use of natural resources associated with that.	-	-	-	The policy supports efficient and effective use of business and industry in sustainable locations, absence of the policy risks this not being achieved.
13. Waste.	0	0	0	The Graythorp site and some sites in Sandgate are likely to involve the development of recycling and waste storage facilities helping to ensure waste generated from the industries can be dealt with close to source.	-	-	--	Without the policy to direct and contain this type of development, there is an increased risk of these uses spreading to other areas and an increase of conflict where bad neighbour uses occur.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	The development of new businesses on the sites will obviously have a long term implication on the use of natural resources during use and are likely to lead to an increase in terms of emissions. This is balanced by the fact that these sites are all within the urban area with relatively good access to public transport etc and involve the development of recycling facilities which will help to re-use natural resources.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy weakens the policy position in addressing climate change issues.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	It is considered that the policy will be beneficial to existing and future generations through the creation of jobs along with the positive work in renewable energy and recycling involved on some of the sites.	0	-	--	In the short term there would be a minor negative impact, however lack of control and management of these uses over a longer period of time hence a long term more severe impact.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy is considered very positive environmentally and positive from a social perspective. Given the operations involved with some sites this has helped to ensure the policy is relatively neutral/slightly positive from an environmental perspective. The change to the policy does not alter the sustainability appraisal as this is already covered by policy CC2.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Absence of the policy has a particular long term negative impact in relation to the sustainable location of jobs; there are also long term negative environmental impacts that would result from a weakened policy position in supporting the effective management of our general employment sites.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: EMP4 Specialist Industries									
Date: 08/11/2016				Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Phillip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 6 th July 2017				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	++	++	++	The policy will lead to the creation of new jobs and inward investment in specialist industries over the plan period. It is likely many of the companies will be world leaders in their fields, many of which will be linked to the port and the ability to use the port.	-	-	--	Impact on management and attracting specialist industries and support via planning for continued development. There is the potential impact on maintaining Hartlepool's competitiveness in attracting such industries.	
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	It was considered the link to planning obligations was positive as this will help to ensure that training and use of local labour force can be achieved.	-	-	-	Likely that there could be a negative impact in terms of businesses supported through apprentice schemes. There is also a potential impact in relation to CPD if businesses can't support this.	
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship	
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship	
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The policy links to other policies including the sustainable transport network and the connectivity policy. Some of the sites are served by public transport and cycle and footpaths and as the sites develops out over the plan period this will mean more people can access jobs via use of sustainable forms of transport. The policy may also lead to improvements in the foot and cycle network to improve accessibility to these locations.	-	-	-	Minor negative effect on transport, without the policy in place there would be a lack of control in relation to where development would occur having the potential to have a negative impact in terms of positive transport planning.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy includes sites all within the urban area which will ensure development does not encroach into the countryside.	-	-	--	The policy refers to the SPA and Ramsar sites. It is unclear at this stage what the impact will be on such protections as a result of Brexit. Therefore the extent of the negative impact in not having the policy is at this stage unknown.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	The policy is strongly worded to avoid adverse impacts on ecological areas near to the development sites.	-	-	--	It is unclear at this stage what the impact will be on such protections as a result of Brexit will be. Therefore the extent of the negative impact of not having the policy is at this stage unknown.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	-	-	-	The policy links to the climate change policy which ensures that development does not increase the risk of flooding. Some of these specialist industries can be noisy and may have some impact on their locality. It is considered impacts on water quality should be covered in point 1 in the policy.	--	--	--	The lack of control through the policy amplifies the impact on this objective.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy will improve the accessibility to jobs for local residents.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could lead to lack of support for industries in sustainable locations.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The additional access to jobs should help to reduce worklessness.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could lead to lack of support for job creation in sustainable locations.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	Areas such as Graythorp and Able Seaton Port are likely to involve the re-use of natural resources through reclamation. The Port still have aspirations to win contracts for the production of off shore wind farms which will have a positive environmental impact in terms of reducing	--	--	--	The policy supports efficient and effective use of business and industry in sustainable locations, absence of the policy risks this not being achieved. In addition the absence of the policy weakens the position to encourage renewable skills.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: EMP4 Specialist Industries								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				the use of fossil fuels.				
13. Waste.	0	0	0	Many of these specialist industries are involved with reducing and reusing materials and will help to minimise commercial waste and help to maximise recycling where possible. It also helps to ensure waste can be dealt with locally if needed. Some of the other industries however do create waste which needs to be dealt with.	-	-	--	The absence of the policy could potentially have a negative impact on the ability to efficiently and effectively manage waste.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Although some of the businesses will increase emissions, others are actively trying to reduce emissions through the production of renewables or re-use of materials.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy weakens the policy position in addressing climate change issues.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	It is considered that the policy will be beneficial to existing and future generations through the creation of jobs along with the positive work in renewable energy and recycling involved on some of the sites.	0	-	--	In the short term there would be a minor negative impact, however lack of control and management of these uses over a longer period of time hence a long term more severe impact.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy is considered very positive environmentally and positive from a social perspective. Given the operations involved with some sites this has helped to ensure the policy is relatively neutral/slightly positive from an environmental perspective. The change to the policy does not alter the sustainability appraisal as this is already covered by policy CC2.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Absence of the policy has a particular long term negative impact in relation to the sustainable location of jobs; there are also long term negative environmental impacts that would result from a weakened policy position in supporting the effective management of specialist employment sites. This could in turn impact on the competitiveness ability of Hartlepool in relation to specialist industries.								

Policy: Policy EMP5 Safeguarded Land for New Nuclear Power Station								
Date: 24/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Graham Megson (Ecologist), Daniel James (Development Control)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	This policy will strongly encourage economy growth through provision of jobs locally and the north east region as a whole on the assumption that the new nuclear power station is built within the Local Plan period	0	0	--	The absence of the policy will have a negative impact on the economy in the long term – this reflects that it is expected that the current power station will be in existence for the majority of the plan period.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	There is a possibility that the new nuclear power station will provide apprenticeships and training programs for workers hence contribute to education and skills at that level	0	-	--	Similar to the above, absence of the policy inhibits long term land use for nuclear energy production, a enterprise which provides jobs and requires continued training.
3. Health.	x	x	x	No evident relationship with health	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No evident relationship with safety and security	x	x	x	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: Policy EMP5 Safeguarded Land for New Nuclear Power Station									
Date: 24/03/2016				Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Graham Megson (Ecologist), Daniel James (Development Control)					
Date: 6 th July 2017				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No direct relationship with housing. However policy may lead to demand in housing for workers thereby encouraging more houses to be built in the Borough	x	x	x	No relationship identified, however if the power station is not built there may be a reduced demand for housing.	
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No direct relationship with transport, however if developer contributions are requested then transport may benefit	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	-	-	-	The new nuclear power station will be partly located within the SPA/RAMSAR site hence may have an adverse impact on its integrity and nature conservation value	0	0	++	Absence of the land will safeguard the natural environment, as this would be the only policy, which would allow the development of such a protected site.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	--	--	--	The new nuclear power station will be partly located within the SPA/RAMSAR site hence will have a significant adverse impact on its biodiversity, integrity and nature conservation value.	++	++	++	Absence of the land will safeguard the natural environment, as this would be the only policy, which would allow the development of such a protected site. This would have a significant positive impact on this objective.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No direct relationship with water, air and soil pollution. However nuclear power reduces carbon dioxide emissions and reduces reliance on non-renewable sources of energy hence indirectly contributes to improving local air quality although this is marginal.	x	x	x	No relationship identified. However without the power station there could be an increased reliance on none renewable resources and thus possible negative impacts upon air quality.	
10. Liveability and Place.	0	0	0	Neutral overall.	0	0	0	In the absence of the policy, it is expected that there would be less jobs however a positive impact on the environment, hence a neutral impact on this objective.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No direct relationship but policy will tackle wordlessness to an extent through jobs provision.	x	x	x	No relationship identified although if the power station is not built then there is a reduced opportunity to tackle worklessness.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	++	++	Less reliance on non-renewable sources of energy through nuclear energy provision will have a significant effect on this objective, however all will be dependent on the timing of building the new nuclear power station.	0	-	--	As the policy directly supports the long-term presence of nuclear energy generation, absence of the policy would prevent use of this form of energy generation in the long term in Hartlepool.	
13. Waste.	--	--	--	This policy will lead to production of radioactive waste which is highly detrimental to health. Policy does not outline how this radioactive waste will be dealt with.	++	++	++	Absence of the policy would have a direct positive on the generation of waste on this site. However it is noted that radioactive waste is beyond the scope of the policy.	
14. Climate Change.	++	++	++	Although this policy does not address the causes of climate change, it will reduce reliance on the use of non-renewable sources of energy thereby encouraging prudent use of natural resources and minimising the emissions of green house gases.	0	-	--	There would be a long-term negative impact, as absence of the policy would prevent the replacement of the existing power station.	
15. Futurity.	0	0	0	The negative impact of this policy mainly on production of radioactive waste and the integrity of the SPA/RAMSAR site somehow balances out with its positive effects outlined above hence its been scored neutral for futurity.	-	-	--	Whilst it is acknowledged that the absence of the policy would have a clear benefit on the localised natural environment, there are clear economic and social impacts on not having this policy in place, as well as wider environmental impacts in relation to climate change.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: Policy EMP5 Safeguarded Land for New Nuclear Power Station						
Date: 24/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Graham Megson (Ecologist), Daniel James (Development Control)			
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
<p>Conclusions: The policy is strongest in economy, energy efficiency and climate change. It has no direct relationship with a number of objectives including health, safety and security, housing, transport, equity, diversity, equality and participation, water, air and soil pollution. It is neutral on futurity, liveability and place. The policy will have a detrimental effect on the natural environment and biodiversity and will also result in the production of radioactive waste which is detrimental to health if not disposed of in the correct manner on site. The policy does not address the issue of radioactive waste.</p> <p>Recommendations: The policy needs to mention something on the issue of radioactive waste in the same manner it has mentioned how it will address the adverse impact of the new nuclear power station on the SPA/RAMSAR site.</p>						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
The absence of this policy would have a significant impact on the local economy towards the end of the plan period as the current power station nears the end of its ‘life’, without this policy in place; this facility would be unable to be replaced in Hartlepool.						

Policy: EMP6 Underground Storage							
Date: 20 th April 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy) and Jane Tindall (Development Control)				
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off			
	Timescale			Timescale			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Commentary/ explanation							
1. Economy.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Absence of policy, there may be a marginal negative impact as it would limit certain businesses – although acknowledged this would be a limited number due to the specialist nature of policy.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	x	x	x	-	-	-	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified last time, during the ‘policy off’ assessment it was noted that the policy specifically references health and therefore the absence of the policy if such development wasn’t uncontrolled by a specific policy.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
6. Transport.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has a potential negative on the built and natural environment, as protections would be removed, e.g. the policy restricts surface structures.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will remove the protection relating to this objective.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will remove the protection relating to this objective
10. Liveability and Place.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: EMP6 Underground Storage								
Date: 20 th April 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy) and Jane Tindall (Development Control)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	The policy allows for spaces that exist within the land to be filled up and used, so it's a form of brownfield development. If these spaces are used for waste storage then the existing landfills will fill up at a slower pace and there will be less need for overland landfill space in the future.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has a minor negative impact – accepted that there is the potential that this could increase landfill.
13. Waste.	0	0	0	If these spaces are used for waste storage then the existing landfills will fill up at a slower pace and there will be less need for overland landfill space in the future. There are no links to recycling; this policy allows for a space to store materials.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would remove the control provided by the policy on underground storage development. If a proposal was directly linked to waste, removal of such controls will impact on this.
14. Climate Change.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
15. Futurity.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified last time, during the 'policy off' assessment it was noted that all policies should have an impact on this objective. In the absence of this policy, there would be a negative impact as the mechanism to effectively manage these spaces is removed.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy is positive where expected, it may lead to job creating and it is an efficient use of land that is currently not being used. The filling of these cavities may reduce the need for landfill which is positive as landfill can often be unsightly upon the landscape.</p> <p>Recommendations: Reference Northumbria Water Limited in the final paragraph.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Not having the policy in place removes the controls within the policy to manage the development of underground storage in a sustainable manner. Thus if a proposal was put forward the policy position would be weaker in ensuring the appropriateness of the development.								

Policy: RUR1 Development in the Rural Area								
Date: 21/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	This policy is specific to the rural area and it is likely to diversify the rural area economy hence marginally contribute to the economy of the Borough as a whole.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will have a negative impact on the rural economy; whilst the policy aims to control development it supports sustainable development and diversification of rural businesses.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No direct relationship.	-	-	-	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified last time, during the 'policy off' assessment, the

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RUR1 Development in the Rural Area									
Date: 21/03/2016				Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 6 th July 2017				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
									assessors on this occasion noted that education and skills links to some rural businesses. Therefore it was noted that absence of the controls within the policy could have a negative impact on this.
3. Health.	+	+	+	Developing the rural area for tourist related/outdoor activities will increase access to the countryside and this may lead to more active lifestyles hence improving health and well being of the Hartlepool community.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would remove the controls on development within it. There are clear health benefits relates to access to the countryside etc., thus the may be a negative impact in respect on maintaining and enhancing access to the countryside.	
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No evident relationship with safety and security.	x	x	x	No direct relationship.	
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No direct relationship with housing. However policy partly encourages re-use of redundant buildings in the rural.	-	-	-	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified last time, during the 'policy off' assessment although reuse of redundant buildings is identified. On this occasion it was determined that absence of the policy would have a negative impact on sustainable housing growth in the countryside. Where necessary and justified there is the scope within the policy to support this development in the countryside.	
6. Transport.	0	0	0	Policy will assist towards creating and improving sustainable access to the rural area, however the relationship with the transport objective is weak.	0	0	0	In absence of the policy, removal of focus on creating and improving the transport / connectivity in the rural area, although identified relationship is weak.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The policy has strong links with this objective however sustainable access to the rural area and its assets will only improve marginally.	--	--	--	The focus of the policy is protecting and enhancing the built and natural environment in the rural area, absence of the policy will have a particular negative impact in relation to the location of development, design and re-use of existing buildings.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	Policy has strong links with this objective however it does not improve access to nature conservation sites.	-	-	-	Direct negative impact as the policy offers consideration of the landscape character and aims to control development. Absence of the policy weakens this position.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	Policy seeks to protect habitats and trees. These indirectly improve water quality by reducing run-off and improving percolation thereby aiding water filtration through the ground. Policy does not necessarily reduce soil and air pollution.	-	-	-	The policy aims to control development, absence of it has a direct impact on this objective.	
10. Liveability and Place.	0	0	0	Relationship with this objective is not evident but it is important to note that a beautiful countryside provides leisure and recreational opportunities for people to visit and enjoy nature and have sense of place.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy will have a negative impact on this objective. The policy aims to protect and enhance the rural area, this includes supporting farm diversification activities, thus there could be a direct impact on these.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No direct relationship.	x	x	x	No direct relationship.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	Policy protects the countryside and its habitats and landscapes, also encourages re-use of redundant buildings but does not support renewable energy production.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy has the potential to impact on natural resources as controls aren't in place to encourage reuse of existing buildings	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RUR1 Development in the Rural Area								
Date: 21/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation				Commentary/ explanation				
							etc.	
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No direct relationship.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Although this policy does not directly address the causes of climate change, it protects trees and habitats which reduce the risk of flooding and also absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere through photosynthesis thereby reducing its concentration in the atmosphere. On the other hand leisure and tourist related developments in the countryside may lead to more people travelling by car to access the countryside and this leads to more carbon emissions. Policy has therefore been scored neutral for climate change.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy removes the controls set out within it, which aims to restrict development in the countryside, reuse buildings and materials and the policy aims to improve sustainable connectivity.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	If sustainable modes of transport are not encouraged and developed to access the countryside, this could potentially be detrimental in future.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would negatively impact on the sustainable development of the countryside, not effectively manage such development would have a direct impact on the ability of future generations to enjoy the rural area.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy is strongest in objective 7: the built and natural environment because it meets nearly all the assessment criteria listed for this objective. It is strong in diversifying the rural economy and improving sense of place and well being of the Hartlepool community by increasing access to the natural environment. The policy will contribute to biodiversity, reduce water, air and soil pollution by protecting trees and habitats. The policy has no direct relationship with objectives 11 and 13. It is neutral on objectives 6, 10, 12 and 14.</p> <p>Recommendations: To make it stronger, this policy needs to be linked/cross referenced with policies on climate change, sustainable travel to reduce reliance on the car whilst accessing the countryside, green infrastructure, nature conservation, built heritage, heritage and conservation. The policy needs consistency in terminology; rural area, countryside and open countryside seem to be used interchangeably. The preamble and policy titles also need to be consistent.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
If this policy was not in place and a ‘do nothing’ approach was adopted, there could be a significantly detrimental impact on the rural area as development would not be effectively managed to ensure the overall protection and enhancement of the rural area.								

Policy: RUR2 New dwellings in the countryside								
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside) and Jane Tindall (Development Control)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation				Commentary/ explanation				
1. Economy.	+	+	+	There is the potential for some limited job creation but it is unlikely that the skills will be wide ranging. Likelihood of providing rural jobs close to those who live in the rural area is a positive for the economy. Possibility of allowing a home linked to a business may encourage new rural businesses if there is a likelihood the business owner or workers can live next to the business.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could negatively impact upon the economy as the policy supports the provision of workers dwellings where justified and viable.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RUR2 New dwellings in the countryside									
Date: 17 th March 2016				Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside) and Jane Tindall (Development Control)					
Date: 6 th July 2017				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
3. Health.	+	+	+	There could be positive benefits to health if residents live within the countryside and choose to walk/cycle around their local area.	0	0	0	Absence of the policy would have a neutral impact as it was anticipated that the numbers involved were minimal in terms of supporting those to live and work in the countryside.	
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	Policy has a link to the design policy, but specific reference should be made to safety and security just to ensure that features such as landscaping do not hamper natural surveillance.	x	x	x	No relationship identified. Although 'policy on' comments noted.	
5. Housing.	0	0	0	This policy relates to a certain type of dwelling and there is likely to be a limited number proposed and built over the plan period so it is not the aim of this policy to ensure Hartlepool residents have access to decent, good quality, affordable homes. However this policy is neither positive nor negative when considering the SA objective, thus the neutral scoring.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy will have a negative impact on being able to effectively manage this type of dwelling development in the countryside. The policy seeks the reuse of existing buildings and the need for high quality design. Not having the policy in place presents a weakened policy position when assessing such applications.	
6. Transport.	0	0	0	Positive benefits if people live and work on site. However given the lack of services and facilities in the rural area, residents are still likely to need to travel by car.	0	0	0	Neutral impact due to limited numbers.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	New development could enhance the rural area, if it is designed as per the policy. This policy controls development in the rural area, allowing some but by controlling it the proliferation of rural houses in inappropriate locations can be avoided. Access to nature and possible historic assets can be improved, if people live in the rural area they can tap into what exists around them. Localised improvements could also increase access to surrounding GI.	--	--	--	Absence of this policy removes the controls within it and presents potential negative impact on this objective.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	The policy has the potential to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment if development is carried out in accordance with the policy.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will directly to a loss or rural character, which directly links to this objective.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	0	0	0	The policy is neither positive nor negative but the assessors note the policy does have reference to flooding.	0	0	0	Neutral, see 'policy on' comment.	
10. Liveability and Place.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified last time, during the 'policy off' assessment it was noted that the policy seeks to address a genuine need, absence of the policy will have a negative impact on this, although it was accepted that the numbers involved for this type of development is minimal.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	No reference in the policy that priorities re use of existing buildings, this could be added to make the policy more environmentally friendly. Development in the rural area, do not	-	-	-	Absence of the policy (could have a detrimental impact on this objective). The policy has been updated to include reuse of existing buildings and therefore not having the policy in place could impact upon such reuse,	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RUR2 New dwellings in the countryside								
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside) and Jane Tindall (Development Control)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				reduce the demand for natural resources, it will increase it as often homes are built on greenfield land. A link to the energy efficiency and climate change policy should be included.				creating a burden on natural resources.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Development in the rural area, doe not reduce the demand for natural resources, it will increase it as often homes are built on greenfield land. Advisors note the reference to tackling flooding and the positive benefits that can be had. A link to the climate change policy should be included.	0	0	0	Assessed as a neutral impact as this would be covered by other policies within the plan.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy will help deliver what people need now and in the future, assessors saw no overall reason why choices for future generations will be restricted.	-	-	-	Whilst this is a restrictive policy, if it was not in place there would be a detrimental impact on the countryside, which would have an impact on the ability of future generations to enjoy it.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
Conclusions: Policy is a proactive policy overall, it will allow some rural dwellings where they are deemed appropriate. In doing so the policy can prevent the proliferation of homes across the rural area.								
Recommendations: specific reference should be made to safety and security just to ensure that features such as landscaping do not hamper natural surveillance. No reference in the policy that priorities re use of existing buildings, this could be added to make the policy more environmentally friendly. A link to the energy efficiency and climate change policy should be included.								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Whilst this is a restrictive policy, absence of the policy has the potential to have a detrimental impact on the countryside, as the controls and restrictive nature of the policy ensure sustainable development, focused particularly on the retention and enhancement of the countryside.								

Policy: RUR3: Farm Diversification								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	Overall a marginally positive impact as it is likely to encourage a limited number of new start-up businesses and will help to diversify the local and, particularly, rural economies	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would limit support of this type of diversification of the rural economy, potentially having a detrimental impact on the rural economy especially if farms are unable to diversify to support and maintain farming.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RUR3: Farm Diversification									
Date: 08/11/2016				Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 6 th July 2017				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
3. Health.	+	+	+	Depending on the type of farm diversification enterprise there may be opportunities to improve and increase access to the countryside, and consequently, opportunities to promote a healthier lifestyle. The policy would benefit from cross references to policies on green infrastructure, health and play activity	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could have a negative impact in this objective. It is acknowledged that this would be dependent on the type of proposed diversification.	
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	Although neutral in relation to reducing crime etc and contributing to maintaining public areas, overall no specific relationship with safety and security objectives	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
5. Housing.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
6. Transport.	0	0	0	There may be a marginally positive impact on reducing the need to travel, if a project is close to the urban area, overall the policy is considered to be neutral	0	0	0	Neutral impact. The policy does reference traffic absence would weaken the policy position, although acknowledged potential numbers are minimal.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The criteria proposed in the policy will ensure that development enhances landscape/countryside quality and character; could improve access to natural assets; encourages good design, and potentially will improve green infrastructure. However the policy would benefit from an appropriate statement that seeks to ensure that development does not have a detrimental impact on the wider landscape and setting	-	-	-	Absence of the policy, would remove the policy restrictions set out which aim to protect the built and natural environment.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	Potential to improve access to nature conservation sites and improve/enhance ecological networks through habitat creation or enhancement. A reference to relevant policies on ecological networks and local sites would be beneficial	-	-	-	Absence of the policy, would remove the policy restrictions set out which aim to protect the natural environment.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	Although neutral in relation to most aspects of pollution and local flooding, overall no relationship on the majority of appraisal criteria	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
10. Liveability and Place.	0	0	0	Depending on the type of activity the policy may have a marginally positive impact on improving access to leisure and recreational activities. However overall impact on this objective is neutral.	0	0	0	In the absence of the policy, ability to control development of this kind is limited. However the impact on the objective is neutral in line with the 'policy on' comments.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	0	0	0	No negative or positive impacts	-	-	-	By not having this policy in place, the local plan does not support rural farm diversification; therefore there is potentially a negative impact on those affected.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	Overall considered to be marginally positive as there may be opportunities for the use of renewable energy such as a wind turbine or solar panels, and through the reuse of existing buildings.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy presents a weakened policy position in relation to control of this type of development. This may link to a marginally negative impact on this objective.	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	Likely to be neutral in dealing with waste in a sustainable manner, but overall no relationship	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RUR3: Farm Diversification								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation			Commentary/ explanation					
15. Futurity.	0	0	0	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Whilst this is a restrictive policy, if it was not in place there would be a detrimental impact on the countryside, the policy would not meet the identified needs of today, which would also have an impact on the ability of future generations to enjoy it.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Overall the policy is considered to have a marginally positive impact on sustainability objectives, particularly in relation to diversifying the rural economy (and meeting a key principle in the National Planning Policy Framework), enhancing opportunities for improved access to the countryside and natural environment and consequently more opportunities for better health, and potentially providing opportunities for habitat creation and enhancement. The change to the policy has not resulted in any change to the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Not having the policy in place will have a negative impact on the rural area, economically, environmentally and socially, as it will remove the mechanism to effectively manage such development when required to support the rural area.

Policy: RUR4: Equestrian Development									
Date: 21 st March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe(Community Regeneration & Development), Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside)						
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	+	+	+	Overall the policy will have a marginally positive impact on the range of sustainable jobs and diversifying both the local and rural economy. The positive nature of the policy means that there could be a significant contribution towards the creation of new business opportunities	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will weaken the support for such business development in the rural area.	
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	Neutral in terms of the learning/ training criterion but no relationship overall.	-	-	-	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified last time, during the 'policy off' assessment, it was recognised that there is a potential link between this type of development and related education and skills provision related to equine activities. Absence of the policy has a marginal negative impact on the provision and enhancement of such skills as a result of equestrian development.	
3. Health.	0	+	+	Marginally positive in terms of providing more opportunities for a healthy lifestyle, increasing access to the countryside, and promoting the use of existing facilities. Main benefits are likely to be in the second half of the plan period.	-	-	-	There are recognised positive links between sport, physical activity and health. Absence of the policy could impact upon the likelihood of development being supported as the policy support is weakened.	
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	May be neutral in terms of crime, anti-social behaviour but no relationship overall	-	-	-	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified last time, during the 'policy off' assessment it was acknowledged that the policy outlined that development should be near housing which has an indirect link to safety and security. Absence of the policy has the potential for a negative impact in relation to this objective.	
5. Housing.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
6. Transport.	X	X	X	Two of the criteria were identified as marginally negative in that equestrian development could increase the need to travel. Such an increase in travel is unlikely to utilise sustainable modes of travel. However overall no relationship.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	The criteria identified in the policy should ensure that the policy is at least neutral in terms of impact on the built and natural environment. There may be opportunities to encourage good design, particularly if existing buildings can be re-used. While the provision of safe equine routes is a desirable objective it is likely to be difficult to achieve in practical terms on land not in the ownership or under control of the developer. The policy should acknowledge that equine routes are only likely to be provided within the confines of the development site.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will have a negative impact on the built and natural environment. Key to this policy is that development should be appropriately located and not detrimentally impact the rural area, hence without the policy ability to ensure such development in the most appropriate locations may be more challenging.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	Overall no relationship and may have a slightly negative impact on habitats and protected species if these are close to horse-riding routes.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RUR4: Equestrian Development									
Date: 21 st March 2016				Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 6 th July 2017				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control), Tony Dixon (Enforcement)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
10. Liveability and Place.	X	X	X	No relationship overall although marginally positive in terms of improving access to leisure and recreational activities.	-	-	-	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified last time, during the 'policy off' assessment it was determined that not having the policy in place would have a negative impact on this objective as it aims to address lack of provision for such activities whilst ensuring appropriate locations.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	X	X	X	It is acknowledged that equestrian development can provide helpful facilities for disabled and disadvantaged groups, particularly for children. The policy could consider encouraging developments that are able to offer such a facility.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
13. Waste.	+	+	+	Marginally positive on the basis that establishments will deal with waste sustainably and onsite.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will result in a negative impact, as the policy won't be in place to control development to ensure waste is dealt with sustainably onsite.	
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
15. Futurity.	0	0	0		-	-	-	Whilst this is a restrictive policy, if it was not in place there would be a detrimental impact on the countryside, the local would not meet the identified needs of today in relation to equestrian development, which would also have an impact on the ability of future generations to enjoy it.	
Conclusions and Recommendations									
<p>Conclusions: Some aspects of equestrian development will provide opportunities to contribute to sustainable development, including diversification of the rural economy, better opportunities for access to the natural environment. However in most cases there is a neutral impact or no specific relationship. Equestrian developments could have a negative impact on sustainable travel and some natural habitats.</p> <p>Recommendations: Consider encouraging developments that provide facilities for disadvantaged/disabled groups, and recognise that safe equine routes are likely only to be practical on land under the control of the developer.</p>									
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':									
Absence of this policy will have a detrimental impact in ensuring that equestrian development is appropriately located within the rural area to contribute towards enhancing the rural economy and provision of activities within the rural area, which are compatible with the environment.									

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RUR5: Sustainable Rural Tourism									
Date: 21 st March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development) and Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside)						
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The policy will provide opportunities for new businesses and the creation of sustainable jobs. Rural tourism projects will also help to diversify the local and rural economies.	0	0	0	Considered that the absence of the policy will have a neutral impact as development could still occur, just the reliance would be on other policies.	
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
3. Health.	+	+	+	Marginally positive overall as the policy will provide good opportunities to increase access to the countryside, and promote the use of existing facilities. Both of these aspects can lead to opportunities for healthier lifestyles.	0	0	0	In the absence of the policy it was identified that development would still happen although would not be as successfully managed without a specific policy.	
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
5. Housing.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
6. Transport.	0	0	0	Most developments within the rural area are unlikely to be accessible by public transport and could lead to an increase in the use of private transport. There should however be potential to link developments to the footpath and cycle networks. Overall the policy is considered to be neutral	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would result in lack of control over transport in relation to this type of development, having a negative impact.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Response to many of the criteria depends on the type of tourism project proposed. However overall the policy should be marginally positive as there should be opportunities to enhance the local character and distinctiveness, enhance the character and setting of historic assets, and provide an attractive environment. Sustainable tourism projects can also integrate well with the Borough's green infrastructure network. The policy criteria should ensure high standards of development in appropriate locations but consideration should be given to including in criterion d) a statement to ensure that projects are not detrimental to the wider landscape and its setting	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, the impact on this objective would be marginally negative and the policy is detailed in respect to managing development of this type. It was acknowledged that other policies in the plan would do this to some extent but not so specifically.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	0	0	0	Neutral overall but there may be opportunities for projects to create new or enhance existing habitat and therefore link to the ecological network. Cross reference should be made to the Plan's ecological network policy	-	-	-	Absence of the policy risks detrimental impact on this objective as the direct reference to protecting adjacent uses will be weakened.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy should significantly increase opportunities for improving access to culture, leisure and recreational activities.. Other criteria are mainly neutral therefore marginally positive overall.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy removes clarity set out in the policy of what could be developed on a site.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	Marginally positive on the basis that there are opportunities to provide energy efficient buildings and use renewable energy technologies. A reference to sustainable construction could be made as part of the policy criteria.	0	0	0	Considered that other areas of the Local Plan would cover this and therefore absence of the policy would have a neutral impact.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RUR5: Sustainable Rural Tourism								
Date: 21 st March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development) and Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			Commentary/ explanation
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
13. Waste.	0	0	0	Neutral overall.	0	0	0	Neutral overall.
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could lose the focus on the reuse of existing buildings, which could increase need for resources.
15. Futurity.	0	0	0	Neutral overall.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the focus of the policy encourages the reuse of derelict properties; it is a safeguarding and control policy for the rural area which aims to protect the integrity of the rural area for future generations.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Overall the policy should contribute positively to a number of aspects of sustainable development, in particular through increasing opportunities for access to the countryside, and improving access to culture, leisure and recreational activities. The policy should also help to create employment and diversify the rural economy.</p> <p>Recommendations: The policy should ensure tourism developments do not have a detrimental impact on the wider landscape and landscape setting. It is also suggested that the policy should include a cross reference to the ecological networks and refer to the use of sustainable construction methods where possible.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Not having this policy in place would have a detrimental impact on Sustainable Rural Tourism, as there would not be a succinct policy in place to support and manage such development.								

Policy: RU6 Rural Services								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			Commentary/ explanation
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The policy will help retain diversity in the local rural economy and will help maintain jobs in villages. Overall it is positive for the economy. .	-	-	-	Absence of the policy removed the steps outlined to ensure that all other alternatives have been considered before the loss of a rural service is permitted.
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	No relationship.	X	X	X	No relationship.
3. Health.	+	+	+	Elements such as protecting key facilities, which could include GPs and community centres with district nurses who visit and which promote healthy lifestyles through encouraging people to walk to locally available facilities, add up to reducing the risks to health.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy removed the steps outlined to ensure that all other alternatives have been considered before the loss of a rural service is permitted. This could include health related facilities.
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	Neutral overall.	0	0	0	Neutral overall.
5. Housing.	0	0	0	Neutral overall, although it encourages the retention of the key facilities that support existing residential communities.	0	0	0	Neutral overall. In the absence of the policy rural services could be more easily changed to residential uses, however given the numbers involved this will have a marginal impact on housing provision.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RU6 Rural Services									
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)						
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Positive overall as it will encourage more sustainable modes of travel, especially walking to key facilities within the villages and by protecting faculties within walking distance will reduce the transport barriers to accessing them.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, there is an increased risk of loss of rural services; as a result this will increase pressure on the transport network as transport is likely to be required to access services.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	Neutral overall	0	0	0	Neutral overall. However it is acknowledged that in the absence of the policy there could be a slight positive impact on the streetscape if void premises are reused more quickly.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship	X	X	X	No relationship.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship	X	X	X	No relationship.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy will help to maintain the accessibility of key services and potentially promote a sense of place.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, there is the risk that rural services are lost more easily, such services can be vital to communities and contribute positively to the sense of place of an area.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy has the potential to encourage social cohesion and stronger more socially inclusive communities by protecting key facilities.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy directly links to rural areas losing facilities more easily. Such facilities can be key in the continued development of sustainable places and inclusive communities.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	X	X	X	No relationship	X	X	X	No relationship.	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship	X	X	X	No relationship.	
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Neutral overall, although in principle the policy helps to address the causes of climate change, the actual contribution is likely to be marginal.	0	0	0	Neutral overall however policy on comment is notes, so without this policy climate change mitigation opportunities will be reduced.	
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The policy is needed to protect rural services and compliments the emerging Rural Plan.	--	--	--	The absence of the policy could result in rural services being lost without consideration being given to other viable uses of premises, which could retain a community use. This will have a detrimental impact on current and future residents of the rural area.	
Conclusions and Recommendations									
<p>Conclusions: This policy performs strongly against the futurity objective and is very positive in its overall intent, which is also reflected in its positive performance against several other objectives.</p> <p>Recommendations: None</p>									
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:									
Not having this policy in place could result in rural services being lost without all options being explored prior to a change of use of a premises being permitted. The policy offers a pragmatic approach this.									

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC1: Retail and Commercial Centre Hierarchy									
Date: 08/11/2016				Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 6 th July 2017				Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The aim of the policy is to improve and secure the viability and vitality of town and local centres. It is considered that the policy does achieve this through setting out a sequential preference for main town centre uses and the thresholds for development proposals. The policy may also facilitate the formation of new businesses and contribute to diversification of the local economy.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will remove the requirement for the residential hierarchy. As a result there may be inappropriate retail development in areas across the town, e.g. town centre uses not in the town centre without clear justification being given.	
2. Education and Skills.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
3. Health.	+	+	+	The clustering of health and health related facilities in the town centre and local centres, which are accessible by a range of transport modes, will improve access overall and in turn offer opportunities for healthier lifestyles. Greater use of existing facilities should also be helped by the policy.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to create a negative impact on where health related facilities are located in appropriate locations.	
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
5. Housing.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Town centres and local centres generally have good accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling routes, as well as by private car. For people without a car concentrating services and facilities in the town and local centres allows good accessibility. While the clustering of retail, leisure and other services within the town and local centres is likely to lead to an increase in car use this is balanced by the accessibility of those centres by other sustainable modes of transport.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could result in an unplanned and less strategic approach to the hierarchy of retail development in the town; this has a negative impact in relation to effective transport planning.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	This policy is designed to ensure the vitality and viability of town and local centres. Such vitality will contribute to the environmental quality of centres including for example fewer vacant units and unsightly premises. Successful implementation of the policy will help to protect the countryside, particularly the fringes of urban areas, by preventing the development of out of town retail and leisure centres. The policy will have a positive impact on improving accessibility to cultural and other assets and will contribute to an attractive and sustainable physical environment.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy reduced the opportunity to address the hollowing out of the town centre. The aim of the policy is to ensure that appropriate locations for retail are considered on a town centre first approach thus addressing void premises in the town centre. Absence of the policy weakens this approach and could have a detrimental impact on the built environment particularly in the town centre.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC1: Retail and Commercial Centre Hierarchy								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The sequential approach for main town centre uses will improve the accessibility of key services and will also ensure access to associated jobs by a variety of means of transport. Providing sufficient retail facilities for local people is a key aim of the policy, and a vibrant town or local centre can help to promote a sense of place.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy removes the requirement for a sequential approach to main town centre uses. A scattering effect could occur and vacant buildings in the town centre increase, impacting upon the vibrancy of the town and local centres.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Easily accessible services and facilities should help disadvantaged sections of the community, but considered to be neutral overall. The addition of village and community facilities to the scope of retail impact assessments promotes social inclusion and could assist in the retention of services within the villages.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could see a impact of decline in certain areas, as well as environmental issues associated with failing / declining areas, there can be linked social issues which can result in a downward spiral.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	There may be opportunities to minimise energy use and utilise renewable energy sources through the clustering of uses. However most types of development will use existing resources so the policy is considered to be neutral overall.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could have a negative impact on this objective, especially as the sequential approach set out in the policy encourages the reuse of empty buildings.
13. Waste.	0	0	0	Neutral overall – the clustering of facilities may facilitate methods of dealing with waste in a sustainable manner but there will be an increase in the generation of commercial waste.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will result in less control regarding waste disposal.
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship overall but here is likely to be a negative impact on the use of natural resources.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy is designed to meet the needs of all sections of the community both now and into the future.	-	-	--	In the long term to absence of the policy could see the degradation of the town centre. This would have a negative impact on the needs of society today and in the future.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy will make a positive contribution towards achieving sustainable development. The sequential approach will help to ensure that retail, culture, leisure and other key services are in locations accessible by a variety of means of transport. It will contribute to the vitality and viability of centres and in turn contribute to environmental quality through reducing instances of vacant and unsightly buildings. The change to the policy has improved the performance of the policy against the equity, diversity and equality participation objective.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Absence of this policy and the sequential approach set out within it will have significant impact on the town and local centres as there is no mechanism in place to ensure that retail and town centre uses are in the most sustainable locations.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC2: Town Centre								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The aim of the policy is to improve and maintain the vitality and viability of the town centre. A vibrant and successful town centre will encourage new businesses and help to diversify the local economy.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could result in a diluted town centre, the policy aims to support uses which will maintain and enhance the viability and vitality of the town centre thus not having the policy could have a negative impact and move away from the strategic vision for the town centre.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	Education and training centres are identified in the policy as appropriate uses in the town centre. The success of existing further education establishments in the town centre and plans for future expansion will be supported through the policy.	-	-	-	Not having the policy in place could result in educational facilities locating out of the town centre, again against the strategic vision for the town centre.
3. Health.	+	+	+	Health related facilities are an appropriate use in the town centre, and will be easily accessible.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could encourage remote locations for health facilities.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	A vibrant town centre will contribute to a feeling of safety and security with plenty of people around and fewer empty premises. Image and perception are important elements of safety and security, and the design of developments is important. There is scope all the elements of the town centre as a whole and improve connectivity between them for example by minimising the extent of vacant frontages, expanses of car parking, and the need to cross busy roads. All these elements contribute to perceptions of safety and the policy should include a stronger emphasis on the need to improve the appearance and function of the town centre as a whole. There are also opportunities to reduce the risk of crime by, for example restricting the number and location of A4 (drinking establishments) and A5 (hot food takeaways) uses.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could impact on the types of development permitted in the town centre, these has been a policy shift to support the strategic vision of the town centre. Uses supported will encourage vibrancy and improve the image. Lack of the policy could increase uses such as A4 and A5 which can be more associated with negative behaviours and impact fear of crime across the town centre area.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The policy identifies residential uses as appropriate in the town centre. The policy can have a positive impact on the objective of securing decent, good quality homes by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing residential uses in areas that are marginal or unsuitable for retail or other commercial uses • Helping to create sustainable communities in association with other types of use e.g. in the Church St area where residential can support business and workspace uses • Providing facilities for vulnerable people and those that need support • Encouraging good design as part of the overall ambition to raise quality standards for the town centre 	-	-	-	Lack of the policy, will limit the direct support of residential development in the town centre, which the aim for bringing vacant upper floors back into use and creating more sustainable communities in these locations.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC2: Town Centre									
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)						
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Accessibility of services to most sections of the local community is a positive element of the policy. Connectivity/circulation within and around the town centre should be an important consideration – both the physical connection and route, and the visual appearance of routes across the town centre. It is recommended that the policy should include reference to the need to address connectivity in and around the town centre as part of its role as the primary retail and commercial centre of Hartlepool.	-	-	-	Lack of the policy fails to recognise the role sustainable transport has to play in the town centre.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	A vibrant town centre will contribute to the environmental quality and character of the townscape and streetscape. The connectivity issues within the town centre referred to in the objective above is important – users and visitors to the town centre should be encouraged to move around by the attractiveness of the different elements of the centre. It is also important to try to create a sense of arrival in the town centre, and much can be achieved through quality design and appropriate landscaping. References within the policy to character, appearance, function and amenity will contribute to ensuring that the physical environment is attractive and sustainable	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to have a detrimental impact on the built environment of the town centre. As the policy clearly references the requirements of green infrastructure within the town centre there is also a risk to the quality of the town centre environment by not having the policy in place.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Implementation of the policy will improve accessibility of services and facilities, including retail, culture and leisure. Providing sufficient retail facilities is a key element of the policy.	-	-	-	This objective is fundamental to the aim of the policy to create a vibrant town centre; absence of the policy has the potential to weaken the outcome of development contributing positively to creating vibrant communities and spaces in the town centre.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	0	+	+	Over time as the vitality and quality of the town centre improves then opportunities for community engagement should increase, leading to better community cohesion.	0	-	-	Absence of the policy, will result in the vitality and quality of the town centre degrading over time, as a result communities will disengage with the environment.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	There may be opportunities to minimise energy use and/or use renewable energy sources as the town centre evolves, but there is also likely to be greater use of natural resources from new development - therefore neutral overall	0	0	0	Neutral overall however without the policy there is a reduced opportunity to tackle town centre vacant buildings and thus use an existing resource and negating the need to build new.	
13. Waste.	0	0	0	Neutral overall – the clustering of facilities may facilitate methods of dealing with waste in a sustainable manner but there will be an increase in the generation of commercial waste.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will result in less control over waste disposal.	
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship overall but there is likely to be a negative impact on the use of natural resources.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC2: Town Centre								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Town centres have been meeting the needs of successive generations for many years, and this policy is designed to ensure that this continues.	-	-	--	Absence of the policy has the potential in the long term to result in the degradation of the town centre, having a negative impact on opportunities for today's society and future generations.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy will provide a number of significant sustainability benefits, including good accessibility for most of Hartlepool's population to key services and facilities by a variety of means of transport. The policy presents opportunities for improving the quality of the town centre and catering for different needs over time. The changes to the policy reinforce its positive performance against objectives 1, 7 and 10.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p> <p>Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':</p> <p>Absence of the policy will result in less succinct control over the development of the town centre. As a result the viability and vibrancy of the town centre is directly affected. This has the potential to result in a downward spiral of decline.</p>								

Policy: RC3: Innovation and Skills Quarter								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	The policy seeks to support the start up of new businesses within this sector along with environmental improvements which would mean the area is more attractive to companies looking to set up a business.	0	-	-	The absence of the policy there is potential for a detrimental impact on the economy in the long term as there will not be a strategic focus on uses. However it is accepted that there will be a certain amount of organic growth, which will occur anyway.
2. Education and Skills.	++	++	++	Linkages between the college and these new start up businesses are likely to develop and will have a positive impact on students considering going to college where they can see a real likelihood of obtaining a job in the area.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to weaken the support of start up businesses around the colleges in the ISQ.
3. Health.	+	+	+	The policy supports improvements to the public realm within the I&S quarter which is likely to encourage more people to walk to work.	0	0	0	Considered that absence of the policy would have a neutral impact on health although the supported development of improved public realm was acknowledged.
4. Safety and Security.	++	++	++	Through encouraging development within the area this is likely to lead to less vacant buildings and therefore reduce the anti-social activities associated with them. Improvements to the public realm will also help. The containment of late night uses will improve safety and security.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could result in a slowed take up of empty buildings within the area as the focus on the ISQ is removed. Thus there is a negative impact on this objective due to the prevalence of empty buildings and associated issues.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC3: Innovation and Skills Quarter									
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)						
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
6. Transport.	++	++	++	The area the policy relates to is in close proximity to the public transport interchange and adjacent to the town centre and is therefore in an accessible area by a means of transport. The improvements to the public realm may also result in improvements to pedestrian linkages.	0	0	0	In the absence of the policy it is considered that there will be a neutral impact on this objective. Whilst it is acknowledge that the policy supports transport, the ISQ is already well served due to its location.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The policy seeks to protect the Church Street Conservation Area from inappropriate development. Public realm improvements may also help to enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the streetscape. Containment of late night uses reduces dead frontages during the day.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy will have a negative impact, as the policy provides a cohesive overview of development requirements in relation to heritage and the built form.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	The proposed innovation and skills quarter is in a central location meaning accessibility is improved and pollution is reduced.	0	0	0	Considered neutral as if the policy is not in place there wouldn't be such a focus on development in this area.	
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The policy will improve access to jobs, could result in elements of retail associated with the sector and will help to create a vibrant sector within a central location. The improvements to public realm could help with social cohesion. The containment of late night uses will improve liveability.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy weakens the approach to securing a clear purpose and sense of place for the area covered by the ISQ policy.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	++	++	++	The policy should help to tackle worklessness and reduce deprivation within this area of the town. Community ownership could also be encouraged through improvements to the public realm.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would have a negative impact on this objective; again it removed the development focus for the area.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	The proposed innovation and skills quarter is in a central location meaning accessibility is improved and pollution is reduced / less demand for natural resources to access jobs.	0	0	0	Considered that absence of the policy would have a neutral impact on this objective. The policy doesn't directly achieve energy efficiency however it does encourage the effective reuse of buildings.	
13. Waste.	0	0	0	Neutral overall, however the containment of late night uses will have some positive impact in the reduction of waste.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, late night uses would be acceptable across a wider area; this would have a direct impact on waste.	
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	The central location well served by public transport and cycling and walking routes is balanced against the additional business activity in the area and ongoing energy requirements to run the businesses.	-	-	-	Without the policy, there is the risk that such businesses which would be attracted to the ISQ will locate in other less sustainable locations across the Borough.	
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	It is considered the economic benefits of the policy and the environmental benefits will be beneficial to both existing and future generations.	-	-	--	In the absence of the policy, development of the area does not have strategic focus, thus could have a significant impact over the longer term as the area continues on a trajectory with no real focus. This will not help to address issues on the ground in the short, medium or long term.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC3: Innovation and Skills Quarter						
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)			
Date: 6 th July 2017			Appraisers: Leigh Dalby (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
<p>Conclusions: It is considered that the policy is very positive and sustainable policy and scores well against the range of criteria. The policy will be important in the future regeneration of that area. The change to the policy has strengthened performance against the safety and security objective.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Absence of this policy is considered to have a negative impact long term as it will offer less focus for the development of the area, preventing the achievement of an identifiable regeneration area adjacent to the town centre.						

Policy: RC4: Avenue Road/Raby Road Edge of Town Centre							
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: : Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Rob Smith (Regeneration), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)				
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off			
	Timescale			Timescale			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Commentary/ explanation							
1. Economy.	++	++	++	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact. The policy encourages a diverse local economy in the absence of which there would be an inappropriate development mix. This would be negative for the viability and vitality of the centre. The area has the potential to attract start up businesses. This potential would be at risk without the policy providing protection from drinking establishments and hot food takeaways which can be associated with anti-social behaviour and thereby deter inward investment.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the diverse mix of uses encouraged by the policy are more likely to associated with education and training opportunities than drinking establishments and hot food takeaways.
3. Health.	X	X	X	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as hot food takeaways are associated with negative health impacts such as obesity.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as drinking establishments can be associated with anti-social behaviour which increases the perception of crime.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy allows residential development.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC4: Avenue Road/Raby Road Edge of Town Centre								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: : Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Rob Smith (Regeneration), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The close proximity of this area to the town centre and its easy access by public transport mean that the policy will contribute positively to minimising transport barriers, helping to reduce the need to travel and distance travelled, and help to maximise use of the existing transport network.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that it is difficult to evaluate the impact of the absence of the policy as it is difficult to predict the change in business usage and whether the impact would be encouraging or discouraging more sustainable travel modes.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Marginally positive overall as the policy clearly considers affect of proposals on the character and appearance of the area, could potentially lead to the re-use/improvement of a listed building which is currently vacant, and seeks to re-use existing vacant buildings and the functionality of the area.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as it only permits uses provided that they do not adversely affect the character, appearance, function and amenity of the property and the surrounding area.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no impact as the policy does not address this topic.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact as drinking establishments would be allowed which can be associated with noise pollution.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The uses specified within the policy include – education and training centre which will improve access to jobs; shops which will meet the needs of local residents; various culture and leisure facilities which will improve opportunities for access by local residents and others. The policy makes reference to character and design which will contribute to creating a sense of place and promoting social cohesion.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the quality of facilities would reduce, as would access to sustainable jobs and the diversity of the retail offer would be adversely affected.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The inclusion of education and training facilities will help to tackle worklessness, while other leisure and cultural uses can help contribute towards social inclusion and community cohesion. Involvement of the local community in proposals will help to create a sense of ownership.	-	-	-	Whilst a single public house can be a community focal point, assessors considered that the absence of the policy which does not allow drinking establishments could lead to their proliferation with a negative impact on community cohesion.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	There is potential for new or re-used building to incorporate energy efficiency measures. However new development is likely to increase the demand for natural resources. Therefore neutral overall.	-	-	-	The policy encourages type of businesses which are more likely to have prudent energy use. It prevents fast food takeaways which are associated with high energy use.
13. Waste.	X	X	X	Generally no direct relationship although new development will increase the amount of commercial waste. Reference should be made in the Local Plan (not this specific policy) to the waste principles contained in the Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste DPD.	-	-	-	The policy prevents fast food takeaways which are associated with waste, especially litter, which is problematic.
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	Overall no direct relationship, although there is a potentially negative impact regarding CO2 emissions as a number of uses specified in the policy (such as restaurants, cinemas, leisure facilities) could lead to an increase in use of the private car.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the impact of the absence of the policy on climate change is difficult to assess as the mix of businesses would be difficult to predict.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as it could lead to increased employment opportunities and will promote the re-use of vacant and derelict buildings	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the impact of the absence of the policy would have a negative impact for future generations as obesity would increase and there would be reduced training and job opportunities.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC4: Avenue Road/Raby Road Edge of Town Centre							
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: : Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Rob Smith (Regeneration), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)				
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
Conclusions and Recommendations							
<p>Conclusions: Overall the policy will make a positive contribution towards sustainable development. Its proximity to the town centre means new development is easily accessible by sustainable modes of transport. There should be opportunities to improve and re-use existing buildings, and there are opportunities to involve the local community and help to create a sense of ownership and place.</p> <p>Recommendations: The Local Plan (not this specific policy) should ensure that the principles of waste disposal, recovery etc are seen as a cross-cutting theme throughout the Plan. The Local Plan (not this specific policy) should ensure that the principles of waste disposal, recovery etc are seen as a cross-cutting theme throughout the Plan.</p>							
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:							
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, education and skills, health, safety and security, housing, , built and natural environment, water, air and soil pollution, liveability and place, equity, diversity and participation, waste, and futurity.							

Policy: RC5 The Brewery and Stranton Edge of Town Centre								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Rob Smith (Regeneration), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	Apart from encouraging inward investment and diversifying the rural area, this policy should have a positive impact on all the other criteria. It should be significantly beneficial in helping to diversify the local economy. Overall marginally positive.	0	0	-	Businesses are well established in the area. However, assessors considered that the absence of the policy could result in a negative impact if a unit became available in the long term as the policy provides a framework to guide the appropriate mix of uses for a diverse local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The policy specifies education and training centres as an appropriate use for this area. Therefore marginally positive overall.	0	0	-	The policy supports a mix of uses, some of which could be associated with lifelong learning and training. The absence of the policy could have a negative impact in the longer term.
3. Health.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	0	0	-	The policy does not permit applications for hot food takeaways. These are associated with negative health outcomes, particularly regarding obesity.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	The policy will be implemented in conjunction with appropriate design policies, including Secure by Design. A positive approach, including re-use of vacant buildings, will contribute towards safer and cleaner communities and help to maintain and keep clean public space. However a note of caution – hot food takeaways and drinking establishments are identified in the policy as appropriate uses. These may have implications on safety if they lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour	0	0	-	The policy does not permit applications for hot food takeaways. These can be associated with negative safety outcomes in the context of anti-social behaviour which can impact negatively on safety.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Housing is an appropriate use in this area and there is potential to contribute positively on most of the appraisal criteria.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would be unlikely to have a discernible impact.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC5 The Brewery and Stranton Edge of Town Centre								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Rob Smith (Regeneration), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The close proximity of this area to the town centre and its easy access by public transport mean that the policy will contribute positively to minimising transport barriers, helping to reduce the need to travel and distance travelled, and help to maximise use of the existing transport network	-	-	-	The policy encourages connectivity through improved pedestrian and cycle provision.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	A significant part of this edge of centre area is a conservation area, and it also contains a listed building. While the conservation area status is mentioned in a bullet point in the policy it is suggested that the conservation should be referred to at the start of the policy statement. There should also be a cross-reference to the conservation area policy in the Local Plan. It is also suggested that the penultimate bullet point should state 'protecting and enhancing the conservation area designation' rather than respecting. It may also be appropriate to refer to the listed building and its setting. As well as connectivity to the town centre the policy could also refer to improving connectivity towards the Burn Valley green wedge with the aim of creating a continuous green infrastructure link from Burn Valley through the town centre towards the marina. The policy should also seek to protect and enhance existing green space in the area.	-	-	-	The policy only permits uses provided that they do not adversely affect the character, appearance, function and amenity of the property and the surrounding area. The policy encourages improvements to the public realm and respect for the conservation area designation. The absence of the policy would have a negative impact.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The proposed acceptable uses within the area will contribute towards improving access to jobs and key services, providing retail facilities and culture and leisure activities. The emphasis on character and design should also help create a sense of place and community cohesion.	-	-	-	The policy promotes a sense of place, for example by encouraging improvements to the environment and the overall appearance of the area.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The inclusion of education and training facilities will help to tackle worklessness, while other leisure and cultural uses can help contribute towards social inclusion and community cohesion. Involvement of the local community in proposals will help to create a sense of ownership.	-	-	-	The policy supports a positive mix of businesses and encourages community cohesion by preventing businesses from operating during anti-social hours.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	There is potential for new or re-used building to incorporate energy efficiency measures. However new development is likely to increase the demand for natural resources. Therefore neutral overall.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no discernible impact.
13. Waste.	X	X	X	Generally no direct relationship although new development will increase the amount of commercial waste. Reference should be made in the Local Plan (not this specific policy) to the waste principles contained in the Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste DPD.	0	0	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could lead to an increase in waste in the longer term through the weakening of the policy framework that prevents hot food takeaways in this location.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC5 The Brewery and Stranton Edge of Town Centre								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Rob Smith (Regeneration), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	Overall no direct relationship, although there is a potentially negative impact regarding CO2 emissions as a number of uses specified in the policy (such as restaurants, cinemas, leisure facilities) could lead to an increase in use of the private car.	0	0	-	Assessors considered that whilst the impact on the objective was neutral overall the absence of the policy could lead to an increase in Co2 emissions in the longer term through the weakening of the policy framework that prevents hot food takeaways in this location.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as it could lead to increased employment opportunities and will promote the re-use of vacant and derelict buildings	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact due to the loss of policy encouragement for the provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages and improvements to the public realm as well as the weakening of policy framework that prevents hot food takeaways in this location.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy will make a positive contribution to sustainable development. The uses proposed within the area will help to improve access to jobs and training, and the range of retail, cultural and leisure facilities have the potential to expand to meet the needs of the local community. Emphasis on design and character should assist in creating a sense of place and encourage community ownership.</p> <p>Recommendations: The policy should acknowledge at the outset the conservation area status and amend the relevant bullet point to state ‘protecting and enhancing the conservation area designation’. Also include reference to the listed building and its setting. Protection and enhancement of existing green space should be included along with the potential for creating a GI link south towards Burn Valley. The Local Plan (not this specific policy) should ensure that the principles of waste disposal, recovery etc are seen as a cross-cutting theme throughout the Plan.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, education and skills, health, safety and security, transport, built and natural environment, liveability and place, equity, diversity and participation, waste, climate change and futurity.								

Policy: RC6 East of Stranton Edge of Town Centre								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Rob Smith (Regeneration), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	Apart from encouraging inward investment and diversifying the rural area, this policy should have a positive impact on all the other criteria. However in view of its location cut off from the town centre by the A689 it is considered that opportunities for economic development will be limited.	0	-	-	Uses are well established in the area. However, assessors considered that the absence of the policy could result in a negative impact if a unit became available in the long term as the policy provides a framework to guide the appropriate mix of uses for this area.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The policy specifies education and training centres as an appropriate use for this area. Therefore marginally positive overall.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the impact of absence of the policy would be uncertain.
3. Health.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	0	0	-	The policy does not permit applications for hot food takeaways. These are associated with negative health outcomes, particularly regarding obesity.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	The policy will be implemented in conjunction with appropriate design policies, including Secure by Design. A positive approach, including re-use of	-	-	-	The policy does not permit applications for hot food takeaways. These can be associated with negative safety outcomes in the context of anti-social

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC6 East of Stranton Edge of Town Centre								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Rob Smith (Regeneration), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ Explanation				Commentary/ Explanation				
							vacant buildings, will contribute towards safer and cleaner communities and help to maintain and keep clean public space.	behaviour which can impact negatively on safety.
5. Housing.	X	X	X	0	0	0	No relationship identified.	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no discernible impact in the short term but it could have a positive impact in the medium and long term. If a unit became available then housing development would not face the obstacle of the unit having policy protection for other uses.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	0	-	-	The close proximity of this area to the town centre and its easy access by public transport mean that the policy will contribute positively to minimising transport barriers, helping to reduce the need to travel and distance travelled, and help to maximise use of the existing transport network. However compared to some of the edge of town centre sites the A689 does present a significant barrier and the policy could usefully refer to the need to improve in particular pedestrian links and crossings.	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact in the medium and long term as the policy encourages improved connectivity to the town centre.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	0	-	-	Appropriate references to design and green infrastructure should ensure that the policy contributes to enhancement of the built environment. However in view of proximity of the area to the A689 which is a main approach to the town centre the policy could be strengthened by further emphasising the need for high quality landscaping and design.	The policy only permits uses provided that they do not adversely affect the character, appearance, function and amenity of the property and the surrounding area. Assessors considered that the impact would be in the medium and long term.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	No relationship identified.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	No relationship identified.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	0	-	-	The proposed acceptable uses within the area will contribute towards improving access to jobs and key services, providing retail facilities and culture and leisure activities. The emphasis on character and design should also help create a sense of place and community cohesion	The policy promotes a sense of place, for example by encouraging improvements to the environment and the overall appearance of the area.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	0	-	-	The inclusion of education and training facilities will help to tackle worklessness, while other leisure and cultural uses can help contribute towards social inclusion and community cohesion. Involvement of the local community in proposals will help to create a sense of ownership.	The policy supports a positive mix of uses and encourages community cohesion by preventing businesses from operating during anti-social hours.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	0	0	0	There is potential for new or re-used building to incorporate energy efficiency measures. However new development is likely to increase the demand for natural resources. Therefore neutral overall.	Assessors considered that there would be no discernible impact from the loss of the policy.
13. Waste.	X	X	X	0	-	-	Generally no direct relationship although new development will increase the amount of commercial waste. Reference should be made in the Local Plan (not this specific policy) to the waste principles contained in the Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste DPD.	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy could lead to more waste generative uses.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC6 East of Stranton Edge of Town Centre								
Date: 23 rd March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Rob Smith (Regeneration), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	Overall no direct relationship, although there is a potentially negative impact regarding CO2 emissions as a number of uses specified in the policy (such as restaurants, cinemas, leisure facilities) could lead to an increase in use of the private car.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the impact of the loss of the policy would be very uncertain in this context.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as it could lead to increased employment opportunities and will promote the re-use of vacant and derelict buildings	0	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact due to the loss of policy encouragement for improvements to connectivity to the town centre as well as the weakening of policy framework that prevents hot food takeaways in this location.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
Conclusions: As with the other edge of centre policies this policy will make a contribution towards sustainable development, however opportunities may be limited due to the A689 forming a significant barrier with the town centre.								
Recommendations: As the A689 is a major approach road to the town centre the policy should include strengthened references to the need for high quality design and landscaping. The policy should also specify the need for improved connections/crossing with the town centre. The Local Plan (not this specific policy) should ensure that the principles of waste disposal, recovery etc are seen as a cross-cutting theme throughout the Plan.								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, health, safety and security, housing, built and natural environment, liveability and place, equity, diversity and participation, waste, and futurity								

Policy: Policy RC7: Lynn Street Edge of Town Centre								
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	Apart from encouraging inward investment and diversifying the rural area, this policy should have a positive impact on all the other criteria. It should be significantly beneficial in helping to diversify the local economy.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy could result in a negative impact as the policy provides a framework to guide the appropriate mix of uses for a diverse local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	0	0	0	Education is not listed among the uses appropriate for this area. Given the proposed new college development on part of the area should education use (D1) be included?	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact as the policy allows non-residential institutions which can include educational establishments.
3. Health.	0	0	0	The removal of drinking establishments from uses appropriate means that the policy should have a neutral impact overall.	-	-	-	The policy does not permit applications for hot food takeaways. These are associated with negative health outcomes, particularly regarding obesity.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	The policy will be implemented in conjunction with appropriate design policies, including Secure by Design. A positive approach, including re-use of vacant buildings, will contribute towards safer and cleaner communities and help to maintain and keep clean public space. However a note of caution – hot food takeaways and drinking establishments are identified in the policy as appropriate uses.	-	-	-	The policy does not permit applications for hot food takeaways. These can be associated with negative safety outcomes in the context of anti-social behaviour which can impact negatively on safety.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: Policy RC7: Lynn Street Edge of Town Centre									
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)						
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
				These may have implications on safety if they lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour					
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Housing, and particularly residential accommodation linked to the college, is an appropriate use in this area and there is potential to contribute positively on most of the appraisal criteria.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact due to the loss of policy support for residential development.	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Marginally positive overall due to the area's proximity to the railway station and the transport interchange.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy encourages connectivity to the town centre through improved pedestrian and cycle linkages as well as improvements to cycling facilities.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	While the policy does include references to the need for good design and impact of development on character and appearance of the surrounding area it could be strengthened so that development does not adversely affect the character and setting of the adjoining Church Street Conservation Area and any nearby listed buildings. Providing good quality pedestrian/cycle links to the town centre and marina is important given the proximity of educational establishments.	-	-	-	The policy only permits uses provided that they do not adversely affect the character, appearance, function and amenity of the property and the surrounding area.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The uses acceptable in the area will contribute to enhanced opportunities for access to leisure and cultural activities. This in turn can help to sustain a diverse community and develop a sense of place. It is noted that hot food takeaways and drinking establishments are included in the list of acceptable uses. Given the role of the nearby Church St for such uses it is queried whether these uses, particularly hot food takeaways are appropriate or necessary in this area.	-	-	-	The policy promotes a sense of place, for example by encouraging improvements to the environment and the overall appearance of the area.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The inclusion of education and training facilities will help to tackle worklessness, while other leisure and cultural uses can help contribute towards social inclusion and community cohesion. Involvement of the local community in proposals will help to create a sense of ownership.	-	-	-	The policy supports a positive mix of uses and encourages community cohesion by preventing businesses from operating during anti-social hours.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	There is potential for new or re-used building to incorporate energy efficiency measures. However new development is likely to increase the demand for natural resources. Therefore neutral overall.	0	0	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would lead to a reduction in energy efficiency in the long term. There is high energy usage within the uses permitted by the policy but the policy prevents hot food takeaways which are energy intensive.	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	Generally no direct relationship although new development will increase the amount of commercial waste. Reference should be made in the Local Plan (not this specific policy) to the waste principles contained in the Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste DPD.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy framework for the area could lead to an increase in waste generative uses.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: Policy RC7: Lynn Street Edge of Town Centre								
Date: 15/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	Overall no direct relationship, although there is a potentially negative impact regarding CO2 emissions as a number of uses specified in the policy (such as restaurants, cinemas, leisure facilities) could lead to an increase in use of the private car.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy encourages travel by sustainable travel modes.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Marginally positive as it could lead to increased employment opportunities and will promote the re-use of vacant and derelict buildings	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact due to the loss of policy encouragement for the provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages and improvements to the public realm as well as the weakening of policy framework that prevents hot food takeaways in this location.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
Conclusions: Overall the policy will make a positive contribution towards sustainable development. Its proximity to the town centre, railway station and transport interchange means new development is easily accessible by sustainable modes of transport. There should be opportunities to improve and re-use existing buildings, and there are opportunities to involve the local community and help to create a sense of ownership and place. The change to the policy (removal of drinking establishments from uses appropriate) has resulted in a neutral impact against the health objective.								
Recommendations: None								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, education and skills, health, safety and security, housing, built and natural environment, liveability and place, equity, diversity and participation, energy efficiency and natural resources, waste, climate change and futurity.								

Policy: RC8 Millhouse Edge of Town Centre Area								
Date: 22/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Fiona McCall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	This policy significantly contributes to the economy and the associated leisure uses will diversify the economy	-	-	-	The absence of the policy could result in a negative impact as the policy provides a framework to guide the appropriate mix of uses for a diverse local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	Sporting facilities, if maintained at Millhouse enables sporting skills for the community	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy could have a negative impact as the policy allows non-residential institutions which can include educational establishments.
3. Health.	+	+	+	Provided sporting and leisure facilities at Millhouse are kept running, this will give opportunities for physical activity leading to healthier lifestyles and well being. Also the policy seeks to promote cycle links and improving connectivity to the town centre thereby encouraging more physical activity by walking r cycling into town instead of using the private car	-	-	-	The policy does not permit applications for hot food takeaways. These are associated with negative health outcomes, particularly regarding obesity.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	This will depend on design of new developments and since pubs and drinking facilities will not be permitted by this policy, safety and security will be promoted	-	-	-	The policy does not permit applications for hot food takeaways. These can be associated with negative safety outcomes in the context of anti-social

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC8 Millhouse Edge of Town Centre Area								
Date: 22/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Fiona McCall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
							behaviour which can impact negatively on safety.	
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Policy will improve housing only on condition that residential development takes place on the site	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact due to the loss of policy support for residential development.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Improving cycle links and connectivity of Millhouse to the town centre will help develop a sustainable transport system near main services	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy encourages connectivity to the town centre through improved pedestrian and cycle linkages as well as improvements to cycling facilities.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy ensures high quality of design of new developments thereby improving the built environment	-	-	-	The policy only permits uses provided that they do not adversely affect the character, appearance, function and amenity of the property and the surrounding area.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	Sport and recreation development tends to bring the community together thereby promoting social cohesion. The policy will contribute to sustainable lifestyles by means of encouraging physical activity and sustainable forms of transport	-	-	-	The policy promotes a sense of place, for example by encouraging improvements to the environment and the overall appearance of the area. The policy also supports leisure uses which are important to residents of the borough as a whole.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Policy gives opportunities for people to meet and get together.	-	-	-	The policy supports a positive mix of uses and encourages community cohesion by preventing businesses from operating during anti-social hours.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	Policy will use resources in erecting any new buildings but also recycle Millhouse.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the impact of the loss of the policy would be uncertain.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	New developments will increase waste	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy framework for the area could lead to an increase in waste generative uses.
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	Policy will minimise emissions through encouraging cycling and walking and reducing reliance on the private car	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy encourages travel by sustainable travel modes.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Policy creates opportunities for employment hence ensures futurity	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact due to the loss of policy encouragement for the provision of pedestrian and cycle linkages and improvements to the public realm as well as the weakening of policy framework that prevents hot food takeaways in this location.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC8 Millhouse Edge of Town Centre Area						
Date: 22/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Fiona McCall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)			
Date: 7th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Steven Carter (Health Improvement)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
<p>Conclusions: This policy is strongest on the economy/liveability & place. It is strong on most other objectives but neutral on energy efficiency and natural resources. The policy is silent on waste regardless that new and existing developments generate waste. It has no relationship with biodiversity and water/air/soil pollution objectives.</p> <p>Recommendations: The policy will be stronger if it is linked with waste policies and cross referenced with other relevant policies in the Local Plan. The policy preamble needs to give brief explanation why A1 uses will not be allowed in this edge of town centre.</p>						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, education and skills, health, safety and security, housing, built and natural environment, liveability and place, equity, diversity and participation, waste, climate change and futurity.						

Policy: RC9 Park Road West Edge of Town Centre Area Policy										
Date: 22 nd March 2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Fiona McCall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)							
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)							
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off						
	Timescale			Timescale						
	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Commentary/ explanation										
1. Economy.	++	++	++	This policy significantly contributes to the economy and the associated leisure uses will diversify the economy			--	--	--	Absence of the policy would mean lack of control over uses within the area; this would impact on viability of the area and local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship			x	x	x	No relationship
3. Health.	0	0	0	There is a link through leisure but not strong enough to achieve the health objective			0	0	0	In the absence of the policy, it is considered that the impact on this objective would be neutral, however links with health provision being an acceptable use within areas if the town centre first approach is taken.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	This will depend on design of new developments and also policy does not allow drinking establishments.			-	-	-	In the absence of the policy there is the potential for a negative impact as the policy directly restricts hours of operation and A5 uses.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Policy supports housing			-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, there will be weakened control of business uses and therefore the potential for a detrimental impact on housing.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Policy facilitates safe parking facilities			-	-	-	In the absence of the policy there is a risk to parking and implementation of green infrastructure, the policy encourages the use of sustainable transport.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy ensures high quality of design of new developments thereby improving the built environment			-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, there will be reduced control of development which will have a direct detrimental impact on the local environment; the policy encourages high quality design.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship			x	x	x	No relationship
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship			x	x	x	No relationship
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The policy provides sufficient retail facilities for local people			--	--	--	Negative impact on the sense of place with the lack of control in the absence of the policy.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC9 Park Road West Edge of Town Centre Area Policy								
Date: 22 nd March 2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Fiona McCall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Policy gives opportunities for people to meet whilst shopping	-	-	-	Absence of the policy removes the policy support for local centres and communities.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	Policy will use resources in erecting any new buildings but will also recycle existing buildings through change of use for instance	0	0	0	The buildings can still potentially be reused; the challenge is how change is controlled in the absence of the policy.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	New developments will increase waste	-	-	-	Without the policy, controlling the uses in this area would be reduced. Development could still take place and thus waste produced therefore policy on or policy off there could still be a likely increase in waste.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Although policy does not address causes of climate change it will encourage recycling of buildings through change of use thereby encouraging prudent use of the land natural resource	0	0	0	See response to Objective 12.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Policy creates opportunities for employment hence ensures futurity	-	-	-	Absence of the policy, removes the localised focus of development needs in this location. The aim of the policy is to enhance the area and encourage businesses to enhance the area; lack of policy creates uncertainty for development over the plan period.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy is strongest on the economy/liveability & place. It is strong most other objectives but neutral on health, energy efficiency & natural resources and climate change. The policy is silent on waste regardless that new and existing developments generate waste. It has no relationship with biodiversity and water/air/soil pollution objectives.</p> <p>Recommendations: The policy will be stronger if it is linked with waste policies and cross referenced with other relevant policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:</p> <p>Absence of the policy has the potential to have a negative impact on the development of the area covered by the policy. There would be lack of certainty over acceptable use, having a negative impact economically, environmentally and socially.</p>								

Policy: RC10 West Victoria Road Edge of Town Centre Area Policy								
22/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Fiona McCall (Development Control), Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	This policy significantly contributes to the economy and the associated leisure uses will diversify the economy	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would mean lack of control over uses within the area; this would impact on viability of the area and local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	D1 use in policy could potentially be for education	x	x	x	No direct link identified.
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	This will depend on design of new developments and also policy does not allow drinking establishments	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy there is the potential for a negative impact as the policy directly restricts hours of operation and A5 uses.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC10 West Victoria Road Edge of Town Centre Area Policy								
22/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Fiona McCall (Development Control), Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			Commentary/ explanation
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Policy supports housing	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, there will be weakened control of business uses and therefore the potential for a detrimental impact on housing.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Policy facilitates safe parking facilities	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would potentially result in town centre uses opting for less sustainable locations.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy ensures high quality of design of new developments thereby improving the built environment	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, there will be reduced control of development which will have a direct detrimental impact on the local environment; the policy encourages high quality design. This is of particular importance as a conservation area covers this edge of centre area.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The policy provides sufficient retail facilities for local people.	--	--	--	Negative impact on the sense of place with the lack of control in the absence of the policy.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Policy gives opportunities for people to meet whilst shopping and creates jobs.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy removes the policy support for local centres and communities.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	Policy will use resources in erecting any new buildings but will also recycle existing buildings through change of use for instance.	0	0	0	The buildings can still potentially be reused; the challenge is how change is controlled in the absence of the policy.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	New developments will increase waste.	-	-	-	Without the policy, controlling the uses in this area would be reduced. Development could still take place and thus waste produced therefore policy on or policy off there could still be a likely increase in waste.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Although policy does not address causes of climate change it will encourage recycling of buildings through change of use thereby encouraging prudent use of the land natural resource.	0	0	0	See Objective 12 comment.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Policy creates opportunities for employment hence ensures futurity.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy, removes the localised focus of development needs in this location. The aim of the policy is to enhance the area and encourage businesses to enhance the area; lack of policy creates uncertainty for development over the plan period.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy is strongest on the economy/liveability & place. It is strong on most other objectives but neutral on health, energy efficiency & natural resources and climate change. The policy is silent on waste regardless that new and existing developments generate waste. It has no relationship with biodiversity and water/air/soil pollution objectives.</p> <p>Recommendations: The policy will be stronger if it is linked with waste policies and cross referenced with other relevant policies in the Local Plan.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Absence of the policy has the potential to have a negative impact on the development of the area covered by the policy. There would be lack of certainty over acceptable use, having a negative impact economically, environmentally and socially.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC11 York Road South Edge of Town Centre Area Policy								
Date: 22/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Fiona McCall (Development Control), Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	This policy significantly contributes to the economy and the associated leisure uses will diversify the economy	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would mean lack of control over uses within the area; this would impact on viability of the area and local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No direct link identified.
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	This will depend on design of new developments and also policy does not allow drinking establishments	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy there is the potential for a negative impact as the policy directly restricts hours of operation and A5 uses.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Policy supports housing	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, there will be weakened control of business uses and therefore the potential for a detrimental impact on housing.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Policy facilitates safe parking facilities	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would potentially result in town centre uses opting for less sustainable locations. It was noted that the policy doesn't support parking facilities; focus is on the town centre facilities for parking and transport facilities.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy ensures high quality of design of new developments thereby improving the built environment	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, there will be reduced control of development which will have a direct detrimental impact on the local environment; the policy encourages high quality design.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The policy provides sufficient retail facilities for local people	--	--	--	Negative impact on the sense of place with the lack of control in the absence of the policy.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Policy gives opportunities for people to meet whilst shopping and creates jobs	-	-	-	Absence of the policy removes the policy support for local centres and communities.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	Policy will use resources in erecting any new buildings but will also recycle existing buildings through change of use for instance	0	0	0	The buildings can still potentially be reused; the challenge is how change is controlled in the absence of the policy.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	New developments will increase waste	-	-	-	Without the policy, controlling the uses in this area would be reduced. Development could still take place and thus waste produced therefore policy on or policy off there could still be a likely increase in waste.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Although policy does not address causes of climate change it will encourage recycling of buildings through change of use thereby encouraging prudent use of the land natural resource	0	0	0	See Objective 12 comment.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Policy creates opportunities for employment hence ensures futurity	-	-	-	Absence of the policy, removes the localised focus of development needs in this location. The aim of the policy is to enhance the area and encourage businesses to enhance the area; lack of policy creates uncertainty for development over the plan period.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC11 York Road South Edge of Town Centre Area Policy							
Date: 22/03/2016			Appraisers: Nomusa Malinga (Planning Policy), Fiona McCall (Development Control), Rob Smith (Regeneration)				
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
Conclusions and Recommendations							
<p>Conclusions: This policy is strongest on the economy/liveability & place. It is strong on most other objectives but neutral on health, energy efficiency & natural resources and climate change. The policy is silent on waste regardless that new and existing developments generate waste. It has no relationship with biodiversity and water/air/soil pollution objectives.</p> <p>Recommendations: The policy will be stronger if it is linked with waste policies and cross referenced with other relevant policies in the Local Plan.</p>							
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':							
Absence of the policy has the potential to have a negative impact on the development of the area covered by the policy. There would be lack of certainty over acceptable use, having a negative impact economically, environmentally and socially.							

Policy: RC12 The Marina Retail and Leisure Park								
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	The policy is positive in terms of providing jobs and economic benefit and to help the Marina develop. The link to RC1 however is crucial to ensure it does not take business away from the town centre.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy increases the economic risk to viability of the town centre.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship.
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship.	-	-	-	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified last time, during the 'policy off' assessment it was determined that this policy does support leisure uses and therefore links to healthier lifestyles. Hence absence of the policy could have a detrimental impact on this objective.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The Marina R&L Policy does allow residential within the area, all of which would be on previously developed land and would be beneficial if delivered as part of a wider mixed use development.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could have a negative impact in relation to this objective. The policy supports residential development in this location adding to the variety of residential properties available in Hartlepool.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The area is well located adjacent to the public transport interchange. The policy links to the Green Infrastructure Policy which is important in improving the links from the Marina back towards the town centre.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will weaken policy support for improvements to connectivity between the Marina and the town centre – this is fundamental to ensure the continued sustainable development of the Marina area.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy crucially seeks to protect the water bodies at the Marina from development. This is important for the townscape/streetscape in this area. The policy also includes criteria to ensure developments do not impact on the	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to weaken the policy position to ensure that high quality design of the built environment in all developments.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC12 The Marina Retail and Leisure Park								
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	Commentary/ explanation			Commentary/ explanation				
				character, appearance, function or amenity of existing buildings.				
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	-	-	-	There are local ecological designations to the east along the coast – this may become SPA as early as next year – it is considered a link to the ecological policy would be useful to guard against harm.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy will weaken the control of development in relation to this objective.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	It is positive the policy seeks to protect the water bodies at the Marina which are crucial to the area.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will weaken the control of development in relation to protecting land and water.
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The policy will lead to the creation of additional jobs in the sectors supported by the policy. It will create additional non-food retail that can't be located in the town centre as well as a range of other tourist uses which increases access to cultural facilities.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy has the potential to impact on the achievement of the desired strategic development of the Marina area impacting on the sense of place of the area.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy will help in tackling worklessness and will help to create a mixed use community within the area.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could have a detrimental impact on the area as there will be weakened policy support to strengthen the diversification of the economy and opportunities for development with strengthen community ownership of the place.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	Whilst the area is in a central location, adjacent to the town centre and the transport interchange which will help to ensure the developments are in a sustainable location, the building and ongoing operation of an expanded Marina will have natural resource implications.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will weaken the control of development in relation to this objective.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	The expansion of uses in the Marina R&L Park will create additional waste which will need to be dealt with.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would weaken the ability to ensure that waste is appropriately screened.
14. Climate Change.	-	-	-	Additional visitors to the area associated with the expansion of the Marina R&L park along with the ongoing operation of the businesses will lead to an increase in emissions which will impact on climate change. This is minimised by the location, adjacent to the town centre and transport interchange.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will weaken the control of development in relation to this objective.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The ongoing development within the Marina will be extremely positive both for the local economy and visitor economy and will provide a range of jobs and activities in this central location.	-	-	--	Absence of the policy will have a negative impact on the development of the Marina over the long term due to the strategic nature of this policy.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC12 The Marina Retail and Leisure Park						
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)			
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
	Commentary/ explanation			Commentary/ explanation		
Conclusions and Recommendations						
<p>Conclusions The policy is extremely positive from an economic and social viewpoint. A proposed addition to the policy is suggested to improve the policy in environmental terms.</p> <p>Recommendations - It is considered a link to the ecological policy would be useful to guard against harm.</p>						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Absence of the policy will have a negative impact on the continued development of the Marina Retail and Leisure Park, the policy is a restrictive policy which aims to achieve the long-term strategic vision for the Marina area.						

Policy: RC13 West of Marina Way Retail and Leisure Park							
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)				
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off			
	Timescale			Timescale			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Commentary/ explanation			Commentary/ explanation			
1. Economy.	++	++	++	--	--	--	Absence of the policy increases the economic risk to viability of the town centre.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship
3. Health.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship
5. Housing.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship
6. Transport.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will weaken policy support for improvements to connectivity between the West of Marina Way Retail and Leisure Park and the town centre – this is fundamental to ensure the continued sustainable development of this area.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to weaken the policy position to ensure that high quality design of the built environment in all developments within this area; this is particular concern in relation to landscaping within the site.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Without the policy development in this area is still likely to occur, and the free car parking will inevitably attract car usage.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC13 West of Marina Way Retail and Leisure Park								
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The area will provide a range of jobs and employment and will improve access to retail facilities for residents and visitors helping to add to the offer within the Marina area of Hartlepool.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will weaken the control of development in relation to this objective.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	As the area has free car parking it encourages users to use their car – often this is because they may be buying bulky goods which are difficult to transport on public transport – this car use does however increase the use of natural resources.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will weaken the control of development in relation to this objective.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	Additional businesses within the area will lead to an increase in waste generation.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would weaken the ability to ensure that waste is appropriately screened.
14. Climate Change.	-	-	-	Additional visitors to the area associated with the expansion of the R&L park along with the ongoing operation of the businesses will lead to an increase in emissions which will impact on climate change. This is minimised by the location, adjacent to the town centre and transport interchange.	-	-	-	If the policy is removed, it reduces the positive approach to locating development in this location, which has the chance to be more sustainable as it is with walking distance from the town centre. It is noted that the free car parking is attractive and can lead to car usage, but developing here is more sustainable than developing on the outskirts of the town. Without this policy development may go elsewhere or the wrong type of development may go here. If development locates elsewhere there could be an increase in car trips.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	It is considered that the policy will help to guide the design and type of retail developments in the R&L park in a positive way and will help to provide jobs over the plan period.	-	-	--	Absence of the policy will have a negative impact on the development of the West of Marina Way Retail and Leisure Park over the long term due to the strategic nature of this policy.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions The policy is strong economically. Socially it is relatively neutral and environmentally there are some slight negative implications of the policy which are minimised by its location near to the public transport interchange.</p> <p>Recommendations There are no recommended changes to the policy.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Absence of the policy will have a negative impact on the continued development of the West of Marina Way Retail and Leisure Park, the policy is a restrictive policy which aims to achieve the long-term strategic vision for the Marina area.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC14 Trincomalee Wharf Retail and Leisure Park									
Date: 17 th March 2016				Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017				Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	++	++	++	The policy is likely to lead to significant inward investment and jobs into the area and will help to diversify the local economy.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy increases the economic risk to viability of the town centre.	
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The policy permits the development of education and training centres within the area.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, there could be an impact on this objective if developments coming forward were not supported.	
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship	
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship	
5. Housing.	+	+	+	As the policy promotes a mixed use area, including residential it will assist in providing housing on brownfield sites within a central area within Hartlepool. Links to the design policies and planning obligations policies will help to ensure both the quality of the dwellings is high as well as the environment surrounding the dwellings.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy, there could be an impact on this objective if developments coming forward were not supported and this could impact on the use of brownfield land.	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The area is well located in close proximity to the public transport interchange and bus stops on Marina Way. The policy links to the Green Infrastructure Policy which is important in improving the links from the Marina back towards the town centre.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will weaken policy support for improvements to connectivity between the Trincomalee Wharf Retail and Leisure Park and the town centre – this is fundamental to ensure the continued sustainable development of this area.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy is positive in that it seeks to protect the character, appearance, function and amenity of the property, any adjacent properties and the surrounding area. It also links to the design policy and requires signage to be of high quality. A reference to the adjacent Church Street conservation area and ensuring developments do not impact negatively on the heritage assets would strengthen the policy.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to weaken the policy position to ensure that high quality design of the built environment in all developments within this area; this is particular concern due to the prominent location of part of the site.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	-	-	-	As the area has free car parking it encourages users to use their car which could lead to an increase in atmospheric pollution and thus impact on air quality. This impact is minimised by the area being located near to the public transport interchange which should encourage people to use public transport.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would weaken the ability to ensure that waste is appropriately screened. There is the potential that without the policy in place air pollution could also worsen.	
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The area will provide a range of jobs and employment and will improve access to retail and other leisure and tourist facilities for residents and visitors helping to add to the offer within the Marina area of Hartlepool. New housing on Trincomalee Wharf should help to bring more vibrancy to the area.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy will weaken the control of development in relation to this objective. Ability to achieve the strategic vision for the site could be limited.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	The development of the area will lead to the use of natural resources both in terms of the construction of new buildings and related infrastructure and also in terms of the	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will weaken the control of development in relation to this objective. The policy clearly identifies the reuse and high quality	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC14 Trincomalee Wharf Retail and Leisure Park								
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Rob Smith (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside), Peter Nixon (Highways) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
				ongoing running costs of the operation and from people travelling to use the facilities. The impact is reduced by the central location adjacent to the public transport interchange and with foot and cycles linkages which the policy seeks to improve through contributions.				design in relation to resources.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	Additional businesses and residential properties within the area will lead to an increase in waste generation. The area is only a mile or so from the waste transfer station so will be dealt with close to source.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would weaken the ability to ensure that waste is appropriately screened.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Additional visitors to the area along with new residents along with the ongoing operation of the businesses and residential units will lead to an increase in emissions which will impact on climate change. This is balanced by the location, adjacent to the town centre and transport interchange along with the environmental improvements which the policy seeks.	0	0	0	Without this policy, development may locate elsewhere. The type of uses within this area are generally land hungry, such land is limited in the town centre, so sequentially development may not be able to locate in the town centre. There is a risk that the land intensive development could locate on the edge of the borough or in employment locations. This could have a negative impact as it could lead to an increase in car trips and thus carbon emissions.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The policy should be highly beneficial to existing and future generations by helping to realise the development of this vacant brownfield area for a mix of uses including new homes, businesses and leisure opportunities providing jobs and a boost to the economy whilst also improving the vibrancy of the area.	-	-	--	Absence of the policy will have a negative impact on the development of the Trincomalee Wharf Retail and Leisure Park over the long term due to the strategic nature of this policy especially as the policy tools to mitigate negative impacts will be weakened.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions The policy scores well from both an economic and a social point of view. Although there are some slight negative impacts these are minimised by the central location of the proposal.</p> <p>Recommendations - A reference to the adjacent Church Street conservation area and ensuring developments do not impact negatively on the heritage assets would strengthen the policy.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Absence of the policy will have a negative impact on the continued development of the Trincomalee Wharf Retail and Leisure Park, the policy is a restrictive policy which aims to achieve the long-term strategic vision for the wider Marina area.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC15 Tees Bay Retail and Leisure Park									
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)						
Date: 10 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control) and Peter Nixon (Highways)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	++	++	++	The policy is positive in terms of providing jobs and economic benefit, the link to RC1 however is crucial to ensure it does not take business away from the town centre.	-	-	-	Site already exists. Not having policy would cause problems in determining applications against only national policy. Developments could choose to locate outside of the Borough.	
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship	
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship	
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	The policy links to the design policy which should help to ensure that secure by design is adhered to.	-	-	-	Without policy less control over development which may still come forward on site as it is an existing site. Loss of reference to safety.	
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship	
6. Transport.	-	-	-	Although there are public transport and footpath links to the area, it is considered on the whole to be a less sustainable location than the town centre.	-	-	-	As the site already exists and is in an out of centre location, further development may go there in the future however lose the links to connectivity to the local area referenced within the policy. It was also noted that development could go to more sequentially preferable sites which benefit from the comfort of a policy.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy would help to ensure retail parks do not start to develop outside of the urban limits and further investment within Tees Bay would help to revitalise the existing shops and create a more attractive and modern environment.	-	-	-	It was considered that without the policy and the certainty it creates there could be an impact on the built and natural environment through poor design. The policy seeks improvements to the public realm as well. Also it was queried whether developers may look for out of town locations on the edge of the urban area which may not be as well served by public transport – this was considered unlikely however as the other policies would restrict this likelihood.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	-	-	-	Given the slightly less sustainable location of Tees Bay of the town centre and edge of centre travel to the shops at Tees Bay is likely to increase pollution from cars travelling to the area.	--	--	--	As site already exists it was considered previous comments still apply however it was noted that having no policy would mean there was limited ability to secure any further improvements in accessibility etc and was therefore considered less sustainable.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy is likely to lead to additional jobs and opportunities for activities in the retail and leisure sectors.	-	-	--	Over time, without policy, development at an existing retail centre may stagnate leading to less shops and facilities and poorer access to jobs	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	-	-	In longer term, without the policy, the existing centre could go into decline if new investment doesn't come forward and gradually the centre could run down and existing jobs could be lost adding to worklessness.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural	-	-	-	Given the slightly less sustainable location of Tees Bay of the town centre and edge of centre travel to the shops at Tees Bay is likely to	-	-	-	Site already exists. Without policy and links to improving connectivity would be lost and could result on a greater	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC15 Tees Bay Retail and Leisure Park								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 10 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
Resources.				increase use of natural resources to travel to the area.	--	--	--	impact on natural resources as people may continue to use the car rather than being able to use improved pedestrian and cycle linkages.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	Additional businesses will create additional waste which will need to be dealt with.	-	-	-	As site already exists there could still be applications on site – harder to control (eg link to waste storage area in policy)
14. Climate Change.	-	-	-	The additional pollution created through travel to the location will impact on CO2 emissions and therefore will have a detrimental impact on climate change.	--	--	--	As section 12 above. Also noted that as site exists developments could still locate to this site but without the benefit of parts of the policy such as hours restrictions – if units opened longer they would use more energy and have a greater impact on climate change.
15. Futurity.	0	0	0	Whilst economically and socially the policy has some positive impacts in terms of new jobs, access to leisure activities etc, these are balanced against the slight negative impacts in terms of the less sustainable location. This illustrates why this location is last on the sequential test.	--	--	--	As site already exists there are concerns that the lack of a policy would create uncertainty which would likely result in less control over development resulting in a poor quality retail estate which would likely go into decline over time and have negative impacts on jobs, the economy and the environment
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Whilst economically and socially the policy has some positive impacts in terms of new jobs, access to leisure activities etc, these are balanced against the slight negative impacts in terms of the less sustainable location. This illustrates why this location is last on the sequential test. The change to the policy has not changed the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
The do nothing option creates a great deal of uncertainty for the site and has been illustrated to be far less sustainable than the policy on approach for this site.								

Policy: RC16 Local Centres								
Date: 1 st April 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 10 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	This policy, which aims to diversify, support and protect local centres, has the potential to have a positive impact on the local community and economy. The policy is specific to local centres and protects against inappropriate development.	--	--	--	To have no local centre classification would be out of line with the hierarchy set out in national guidance. Harder to approve applications without policy. Hard to ensure quality development which respects nearby residential properties. Extremely bad for the economy as it provides no certainty to developers and jobs may not be created.
2. Education and Skills.	0	0	0	The policy has the potential to increase facilities if community facilities are provided at local centres. Discussion regarding whether D1 only relates to Community Facilities or would other uses within Use Class	-	-	-	Possible links to non-residential institutions which could provide educational benefits would be lost.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC16 Local Centres								
Date: 1 st April 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 10 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
				D1 be acceptable? D1 includes the provision of education and libraries amongst others.				
3. Health.	+	+	+	The policy supports the provision of a diverse range of services and facilities within local centres, therefore within closer proximity to residential areas. This has the potential to have an impact on reducing the need for car travel for certain goods and services. Encouraging a range of development at local centres will increase use of local centres. There is the potential to have a positive impact on health if people have the option to walk to meet their daily service needs.	-	-	-	Without policy which allocates land as a local centre, existing centres could gradually become residential. Lose opportunity to walk to local services.
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	There is the potential for the policy to indirectly increase rubbish/litter within the area, depending on the nature of shops and services. There is also the potential for an increase in anti-social behaviour (real or perceived) as people often congregate in such areas, however to counter balance this, if there are more services available at a local centre there is the potential that such areas become better used and natural surveillance increases. It is about ensuring the right mix of daytime and night-time uses, market forces often determine this. If there are less void units within a local centre, this can create a more positive perception of an area.	-	-	-	Policy links to safety through design – this would be lost without policy. Would also lose restriction on hours for businesses – existing businesses could apply for longer hours which could increase crime and anti-social behaviour.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The policy supports the use of upper floors as residential in local centres. This promotes sustainable development within these local centres. New development through the provision of planning obligations may improve linkages between such developments and local centres through investment in walking / cycling routes. This is supported by the policy which cross references to the Planning Obligations Policy.	-	-	-	Without local centre policy some units which exist may turn to residential in the future – however losing the shop make the housing less sustainable.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The policy refers to transport and connectivity from local centres into surrounding areas. Improving this connectivity encourages walking/cycling. Provision of a range of services within communities may reduce transport barriers for some people in accessing these. The policy refers directly to enhancing cycle provision.	-	-	-	If local centres were not allocated and lost over time, it makes housing areas less sustainable and also would result in additional trips to other allocated retail centres which create longer journeys.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	The policy refers to improving the character of the area through good design; the local environment, heritage and the Shop Front SPD.	-	-	-	Loss of control over design. Less attractive communities / physical environment. Policy links to improvements to the public realm which would not be achieved without policy.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	--	--	Generation of car and other trips if no local facilities and therefore an impact on air pollution. If existing businesses close over time the impact worsens over time.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC16 Local Centres								
Date: 1 st April 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development) and Ryan Cowley (Development Control)					
Date: 10 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control) and Peter Nixon (Highways)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The policy promotes local centres as spaces which have a key role within the local community. They have the potential to encourage and increase social interaction and activities and give an identity / sense of place to an area.	--	--	--	Loss of policy would result in less jobs, less local facilities, less sense of place and less social cohesion.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	++	++	++	The policy supports development of local centres, if new businesses / facilities open in local centres this could offer access to jobs within the locality. If local centres are well used, this has the potential to encourage community ownership of these spaces.	--	--	--	Less jobs and more worklessness. Could cause isolation. Also less socially inclusive communities.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	There is the potential that this policy could impact upon energy efficiency and natural resources; this is if more people access services locally reducing the need for transport.	0	-	--	Less impact in the short term as many businesses are already there. This would worsen over time as shops close and people have to access shops elsewhere by car and other means of transport which have a negative impact on natural resources.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	New development has the potential to create additional commercial waste. This is a concern with A5 uses. The policy could be strengthened by cross-referencing to the hot food takeaway policy.	-	-	0	Shops already there and therefore waste in short term. Over time they may close and there could be a reduction in waste.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Provision of local facilities/services has the potential to reduce the need to travel.	0	-	--	Without policy local facilities will reduce over time and increase the need to travel which will impact on emissions and climate change.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The policy will support the development of additional facilities/services; this increases choices for residents in localities.	--	--	--	Loss of local facilities. Less sustainable communities. More travel needed. Less jobs and social cohesion.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
Conclusions: Overall the policy is a strong positive policy, which will encourage sustainable development.								
Recommendations: The following recommendations were made:								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross reference with Hot Food Takeaway policy. • The preamble needs to be checked as some of the local centres are missing / incorrect. • Clarification on the listing of D1 uses in the policy, is this just Community Facilities or should it be all D1 uses? • Third paragraph in policy should read "...impact upon the Town Centre or the character..." • Fifth paragraph in the policy – should it be "in the vicinity of the local centre"? 								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
The policy off position is illustrated to be substantially less sustainable than the policy on option. In particular leading to less sustainable communities, increased need to travel, less jobs and less social cohesion.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC17 Late Night Uses Area								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 10 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Leigh Dalby (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	It will help to support the establishment of a range of uses which together form the night time economy, creating a large number of associated jobs over the plan period.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would be detrimental to the economy objective. The policy provides an important framework of control which supports the night time economy. The alternative of a freelance approach would be detrimental to the economy.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	-	-	-	The types of businesses that this policy support generally have links to impact on health ie drinking, takeaways etc. Suggestion that policy makes reference to liaison with Public Health team to minimise negative impact.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact the policy restricts the locations in which hot food takeaways can operate after 11.30pm and before 7.am. Hot food takeaways are associated with negative health impacts such as obesity.
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	Although these types of uses are associated with anti-social behaviour and disruption, this policy will help to ensure that these late night uses are located within this area and therefore assists with the management and policing of these incidents.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy states that proposals that have the potential to significantly exacerbate crime and fear of crime will not be supported.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no discernible impact as the area has minimal housing potential.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	It helps support the location of new development in a location that minimises the need to travel – the public transport interchange is located within the area.	x	x	x	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no discernible impact as there would still be a night time economy but with less control over it.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The policy links to the heritage policy and seeks to protect and enhance the Church Street Conservation Area through permitting only appropriate development. The link to the Shop Fronts SPD will encourage high quality design.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy seeks to protect and enhance the Church Street Conservation Area.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	0	0	0	Through locating these late night uses within one area it helps to protect predominantly residential areas from late night noise disruption. The policy will however result in noise pollution within the Church Street area late on an evening which is likely to impact on the residents living within this area.	0	-	-	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would mean that noise pollution would increase over the medium and long term.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	It will improve access to jobs within the sector, will improve access to culture, leisure and recreational facilities and will diversify the offer within the locality.	x	x	x	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have no discernible impact.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	Through linking with design and climate change policies it will help to ensure building design will be energy efficient however, additional businesses will obviously increase demand for natural resources during their operation.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC17 Late Night Uses Area								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 10 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Leigh Dalby (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
13. Waste.	-	-	-	It will generate commercial waste and the uses are generally associated with increases in littering within the vicinity.	-	-	--	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as it would be more difficult to effectively plan commercial waste management.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Whilst in a sustainable location, well served by public transport, the late night uses policy will encourage the creation of new businesses which are likely to lead to additional emissions through the operation of the business.	-	-	--	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as the increased difficulty in effective commercial waste management would not be a prudent use of resources.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	It will help to create a late night uses zone which is an important element of the economy which will serve future generations and will minimise impact on residential areas.	-	-	--	Assessors considered that the absence of the policy would have a negative impact as noise pollution and commercial waste would increase in the long term.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This policy scored very well in terms of its economic and social impacts, however it was more balanced in terms of environmental issues. The change to the policy (reference to Shop Fronts SPD) has strengthened its performance against the built and natural environment objective.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, health, safety and security, water, air and soil pollution, built and natural environment, waste, climate change and futurity								

Policy: RC18 Hot Food Takeaway								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 30 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	There is the potential for new businesses and inward investment to be supported by the policy. By limiting the number of hot food takeaways there is the potential for other daytime uses to go into units. The policy has the potential to provide new jobs, however there is no guarantee on the quality or sustainability of these jobs. The policy may prevent investment and if the only interest is from A5 businesses there is the potential that this policy could increase the prevalence of void units in an area. On a larger scale, limiting accessibility to hot food takeaways could indirectly have a cost saving to the NHS and in turn reduce levels of deprivation in an area.	-	-	-	Failing to regulate the proliferation of hot food takeaways will result in a lack of business diversity in central areas and local centres, less daytime uses of buildings, less choice and is likely to make the area less attractive to non-hot food takeaway businesses and residents..
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The policy indirectly encourages healthier eating. There are clear links between good nutrition and a balanced diet with educational attainment and being prepared to learn.	-	-	-	Allowing the proliferation of hot food takeaways will restrict the number of units available to start-up businesses which will have a detrimental impact on the Innovation and Skills Quarter. Poorer nutrition can also be

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC18 Hot Food Takeaway								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 30 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
								detrimental to learning, particularly as many local centres are in the vicinity of education sites.
3. Health.	++	++	++	The policy preamble refers to working with existing takeaways to provide guidance on healthier options – this is not reflected in the policy. The policy does directly refer to addressing health inequalities. There are strong links between takeaway prevalence, obesity and levels of deprivation.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy could result in less units available for health facilities and related uses, would not promote healthier lifestyles through good nutrition, would not assist in reducing health inequalities and is likely to discourage use of existing facilities/open-air recreation as A5 uses are often associated with increased litter and anti-social behaviour.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	++	There is the potential that the policy could have a positive impact on ASB. Takeaways often contribute to the night-time economy which can create a number of issues, areas are deserted in the day (if only night-time businesses operate), such businesses can be a magnet for people 'hanging around' and can attract ASB and increase litter. This can make people feel vulnerable about accessing such areas. Limiting prevalence of such businesses has the potential to positively impact upon the cleanliness and approachability of an area if they are replaced with suitable businesses. This policy will not improve the current situation in the short term but there is the potential that it won't worsen it further. There is the potential that there can be a positive impact over the long term. Is there a risk that closing takeaway outlets could move ASB to other locations?	-	-	--	Failing to control the number of A5 uses could result in increased litter and anti-social behaviour. This is likely to worsen with time as more A5 uses are approved/opened throughout the Borough.
5. Housing.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	A proliferation of hot food takeaways may prevent people from moving to a certain area by reducing its attractiveness however this is more closely related to objective 7.
6. Transport.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	Relationship between types of businesses permitted and the number of customers and deliveries however considered neutral overall.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	There is the potential the policy will improve streetscapes, a shift to a daytime economy will encourage more daytime users of the area. There is the potential that this will impact positively upon heritage assets in certain areas. Suggested that the policy is cross-referenced with the Shop Front SPD.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will likely result in proliferation of hot food takeaways across central areas and local centres which typically results in poor street environments, shuttered shop fronts during the day, increased litter, and can be detrimental to the historic environment, particularly in areas such as Church Street.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No direct relationship identified, however it was discussed that there could be noise associated to ASB linked to takeaways.	X	X	X	Noted that there is likely to be increased noise due to ASB associated with takeaways

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC18 Hot Food Takeaway								
Date: 08/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Malcolm Steel (Planning Policy), Leigh Taylor (Development Control), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Philip Timmins (Procurement & Property Services)					
Date: 30 th June 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	There is the possibility of an indirect link to having a positive impact on liveability. There is the potential of more job opportunities within localities if offer diversifies. There is the potential that the policy will have a positive impact on 'sense of place' and the perception of an area, in addition there is the potential to have an positive impact on social cohesion.	-	-	-	More takeaways are likely to be detrimental to an area's diversity and liveability due to the associated impacts on the appearance of the area, increased litter and anti-social behaviour which is considered to be detrimental to sense of place and community cohesion.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy has the potential to contribute towards this objective positively if health and wellbeing are improved. Many deprivation indicators are health related. The impacts associated with reducing the prevalence of hot food takeaways has the potential to contribute towards a more cohesive community.	-	-	-	More takeaways are likely to be detrimental to an area's liveability due to the associated impacts on the appearance of the area, increased litter and anti-social behaviour which is considered to be detrimental to sense of place and community cohesion and participation. The absence of this policy will also likely result in less diversity of employment (albeit there will still be jobs).
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
13. Waste.	0	0	0	There is the possibility that further development could create additional waste, however the policy seeks to limit takeaways and is therefore neutral. A reduction in prevalence of takeaway outlets could reduce the potential for litter resulting from ASB.	-	-	-	Likely to be a greater increase in waste from more hot food takeaways than there would be with other commercial uses.
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
15. Futurity.	+	+	++	The policy will potentially restrict the development of further takeaways in certain areas, however it was noted that most businesses deliver direct to homes and therefore impact on food choices is limited. The aim of the policy is to improve health of future generations and have a positive impact on health inequalities.	-	-	--	The absence of this policy will be detrimental to future generations in terms of the appearance of the built environment, liveability of the town and public health in particular. This would also restrict choices of future generations in terms of diversity of employment opportunities and access to different retail and services.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: This is a restrictive policy, which could limit development of the local economy at a localised level. However the benefits in reducing hot food takeaways have benefits for the day-time economy, prevent associated anti-social behaviour and contribute positively to long term health objectives and behaviours and will have a positive impact on the future of Hartlepool. The changes to the policy has not resulted in any changes to the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
The proliferation of hot food takeaways can be challenging for the vitality and viability of town and local centres and for public health. Failing to adequately control and mitigate against this will have a detrimental impact on public health, the built environment of the town, its diversity and the local economy.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC19 Main Town Centre Uses on Employment Land								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harison (Regeneration)					
Date: 10 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Leigh Dalby (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	0	0	0	There is the potential that the policy will support the establishment of new companies; however the policy does limit where companies can locate. The specific purpose of the policy is to protect the town centre. The policy does not encourage sustainable development of the economy but does look to stabilise the existing economy and where businesses are located.	-	-	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. It would be detrimental to the town centre if there were no restrictions on town centre uses being located on employment land.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as it would lead to the general public visiting areas, some of which are associated with heavy vehicle traffic.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the town centre is the fulcrum of the public transport network.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The policy aims to protect town centre uses, directing them towards to town centre. This could have a positive impact on the redevelopment of vacant buildings in the town centre. The reuse of existing premises and use of town centre areas should be more sustainable due to connectivity and accessibility. The policy aims to protect the urban characteristics of the town centre. The reference to the Shop Fronts SPD has strengthened performance against this objective.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy could have a positive impact on the redevelopment of vacant buildings in the town centre.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The policy relates directly to supporting, protecting and enhancing the town centre by ensuring town centre uses are not permitted in less sustainable industrial land, such an approach prevents against potential erosion of the town centre.	--	--	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as it seeks to prevent the dilution of town centre uses.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as a vibrant and vital town centre is considered to be an asset for social cohesion.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as dispersing town centre uses would not be an effective use of land.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC19 Main Town Centre Uses on Employment Land								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 10 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Leigh Dalby (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as town centre uses would generate different type of commercial waste in employment areas, thereby complicating waste collection planning.
14. Climate Change.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the dispersal of town centre uses would encourage less sustainable travel patterns.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy aims to preserve both industrial and town centre areas, encouraging sustainable development by ensuring that appropriate uses are directed to appropriate areas.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy aims to protect both industrial and town centre areas.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Overall the policy is a strong positive policy, protecting both industrial areas and town centre areas and there relevant uses. The reference to the Shop Fronts SPD has strengthened performance against the built and natural environment objective.</p> <p>Recommendations: None</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, safety and security, transport, built and natural environment, liveability and place, equity, diversity and participation, waste, climate change and futurity.								

Policy: RC20 Business Uses in the Home								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Leigh Dalby (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The policy supports business use in the home which has a direct link to employment and the economy. This policy has the potential to have a positive impact on both the local and rural economy. The policy also has the potential to link to link to reducing levels of deprivation as people may be moving into employment by establishing home businesses.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy supports business use in the home which has a direct link to employment and the economy.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	0	0	0	The addition of 'proposals for A5 uses will not be permitted' means that the policy now has a positive health impact. Overall the policy is neutral. .	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC20 Business Uses in the Home								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 7 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Leigh Dalby (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would be neutral overall. The policy allows new businesses in locations that do not reduce the need to travel for anyone visiting the business. However, home working also reduces commuting.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	0	0	0	The addition of 'proposals for A5 uses will not be permitted' means that the policy now has a positive impact. It will avoid home deliveries and reduce negative impacts on neighbours. Overall the policy is neutral.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy states that businesses operating from homes will be supporting provided that there is no significant detrimental effect on the character of the property or the surrounding area.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
10. Liveability and Place.	0	0	0	The addition of 'proposals for A5 uses will not be permitted' means that the policy now has a positive impact on liveability. It should promote social cohesion by avoiding nuisance to neighbours.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy states that businesses operating from homes will be supporting provided that there is no significant impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining or nearby properties.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No direct relationship identified as the nature of policy supports business from home which is more isolated than businesses within urban centres.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	The policy supports the efficient use of developed space if being used for both living and working. Also has the potential to reduce transport requirements.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy supports the efficient use of developed space if being used for both living and working.
13. Waste.	0	0	0	The addition of 'proposals for A5 uses will not be permitted' means that the policy now has a positive impact on waste reduction by helping to minimize commercial waste. Overall the policy is neutral.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact as the policy does not permit A5 uses.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	There is the potential that this will contribute towards a reduction in CO2 emissions.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would be neutral overall as there would be both positive and negative impacts on transport requirements.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy will not have any detrimental impacts upon future generations, it offers further choice by supporting the home to be flexible accommodating employment where appropriate. As the policy protects against significant alterations to the home therefore protecting future choices.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy is positive for the local economy and prevents negative impacts on the built environment and on liveability and place.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Overall the policy is positive supporting the flexible use of homes to promote sustainable development. The change to the policy now results in some positive impacts regarding built and natural environment, liveability and place and waste which has changed their assessments from 'no relationship' to 'neutral'.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, built and natural environment, liveability and place, waste, climate change and futurity.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC 21: Business uses in residential areas								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Tony Dixon (Planning Enforcement) and Helen Heward (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The aim of the policy is to protect the existing retail and commercial areas along with the residential areas within the borough. The policy seeks to ensure commercial development is located within appropriate locations such as the town centre.	-	-	-	Whilst you may still get commercial in these areas the policy affords greater control such as hours. Also maybe hard without policy to stop / control hot food takeaways in unsuitable areas.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship	-	-	-	May be less control over hot food takeaway type uses appearing in residential areas without policy.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	Policy should be linked to the safety and security policy.	-	-	-	Without policy harder to control development which may result in less safe and secure development.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No overall relationship between the policy and the SA objective, however assessors note that one aim of the policy is to protect existing residential areas.	-	-	-	Could potentially lose housing to commercial development. Also less control could lead to negative impacts on residential areas.
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The policy should have a positive impact upon existing residential areas as it should, ensure commercial activity is focused in areas where it is more suited, i.e. in areas with car parking, services and natural surveillance. The policy seeks to ensure that if an application is approve it must be of an acceptable design. This policy could be cross referenced with the planning obligations policy. The reference to the Shop Fronts SPD has strengthened performance against this objective.	-	-	-	Harder to control design without policy leading to potential negative impacts on the built and natural environment.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy seeks to sustain liveable places, ensuring that residential areas remain pleasant areas and do not become areas for the focus of commercial activity.	-	-	-	Seeks to protect residential amenity – without it residential amenity could be negatively impacted.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	x	x	x	This policy should be cross referenced with the energy efficiency policy.	x	x	x	No relationship
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
14. Climate Change.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: RC 21: Business uses in residential areas								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Tony Dixon (Planning Enforcement) and Helen Heward (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The assessors consider that the policy will be a benefit to existing and future generations as it will protect the residential areas. The plan as a whole allocated areas for employment and commercial activity so this policy is not seen as a barrier to economic growth.	-	-	-	Likely impact on residential amenity and possible impact on vitality and viability of local centres.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy will ensure commercial areas remain for that purpose and that residential areas remain pleasant areas to live and do not become dominated by commercial activity. The addition of ‘Proposals that involve alterations to commercial fronts must be designed in accordance with the Shop Fronts SPD’ has strengthened performance against the built and natural environment objective.</p> <p>Recommendations: None</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Policy off proposal is shown to be less sustainable than the policy on and is likely to impact negatively on residential amenity.								

Policy: LT1: Leisure and Tourism								
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Harland Deer (Economic Regeneration) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Tony Dixon (Planning Enforcement) and Helen Heward (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	This policy is a positive policy which seeks to allow appropriate inward investment development in tourism and other related recreational and leisure developments in key locations around Hartlepool.	--	--	--	Without policy less likely to attract investment as no certainty over acceptability of proposals. Sector is important for job creation and extremely likely this would be negatively impacted.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	It is considered that this policy will result in the development of further catering and hospitality businesses – as a result of strong markets in these areas, the college has developed opportunities for training in these areas and the continued development of these will continue to benefit the colleges.	-	-	-	Colleges provide tourist and leisure related courses – likely without policy there would be less investment in these sectors and therefore less jobs which is likely to impact on courses and numbers of pupils.
3. Health.	++	++	++	The policy supports the development of leisure facilities across the borough which will have strong long term health benefits.	0	-	-	Many facilities already exist but overtime they may decline without policy seeking further investment in the sector which could therefore restrict opportunities for healthy activities.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	May help to create clean public areas. Good quality design of the leisure facilities will help to minimise the fear of crime.	-	-	-	Policy helps to maintain and improve areas – without policy investment may reduce leading to maintenance issues and decline of areas.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The policy directs major leisure developments to locations well served by public transport. The policy is also likely to lead to an improvement in the provision of walkways and GI links.	-	-	-	Without policy any future proposals may look to locate in other areas which may not be as well served by public transport.
7. Built and	+	+	+	The development of well designed new				Policy helps to maintain and improve

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT1: Leisure and Tourism								
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Harland Deer (Economic Regeneration) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Tony Dixon (Planning Enforcement) and Helen Heward (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	Commentary/ explanation			Commentary/ explanation				
Natural Environment.				facilities will help to add to the quality of the townscape in key visitor locations around the town. It also seeks to protect the historic environment from inappropriate development which would be detrimental to the area.	--	--	--	areas – without policy investment may reduce leading to maintenance issues and decline of areas including conservation areas.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	++	++	++	The policy will help to improve access to nature conservation sites whilst still protecting designated areas and seeks to support green tourism in a way which minimises disturbance.	-	-	-	Some of the areas identified are adjacent to national environmental designations – without policy development would not be as well controlled and could impact on these designations.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	The policy highlights the high quality water quality at Seaton Carew.	-	-	-	Loss of reference to protected EU designated bathing waters.
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The policy will ensure access to good quality leisure and recreational facilities along with access to related jobs in the sector.	--	--	--	Policy off would lead to less development of leisure, recreation and tourism facilities, meaning far less jobs and impacting on sense of place and community cohesion.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship	-	-	-	Without policy likely less jobs and more worklessness.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	x	x	x	No relationship	x	x	x	No relationship
13. Waste.	-	-	-	Increased tourist and leisure activity in these areas will lead to additional waste and chance of littering etc.	+	+	+	If less development is attracted to the town, less development would mean less waste to be dealt with both through the facilities themselves and through visitors.
14. Climate Change.	-	-	-	The development of major leisure and tourist developments will see additional emissions which will have an impact on climate change.	+	+	+	If less development is attracted to the town, less development would likely mean visitors and therefore less car journeys which would lead to lower emissions.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	The policy supports the development of a range of uses covering the leisure and tourism sectors leading to the creation of new jobs.	--	--	--	Without policy, less inward investment meaning less attractions and facilities, less jobs, less spend in the town and likely decline of the areas.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
Conclusions: The policy is very positive both socially and economically and is balanced environmentally.								
Recommendations: There are no recommended changes to the policy.								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Economically and socially the policy off position is significantly worse. Whilst a couple of small positives are identified in terms of waste and climate change, these are countered by potential impact on designated sites adjacent to the existing areas which could be impacted by loss of control over any future developments.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT2 – Tourism Development in the Marina									
Date: 17 th March 2016				Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Harland Deer (Economic Regeneration) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 11 th July 2017				Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Tony Dixon (Planning Enforcement) and Helen Heward (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	++	++	++	This policy is a positive policy which seeks to allow appropriate inward investment development in tourism and other related recreational and leisure development at the Marina. The policy also supports a range of other uses all of which will support the economy.	--	--	--	Without policy less likely to attract investment as no certainty over acceptability of proposals. Sector is important for job creation and extremely likely this would be negatively impacted.	
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship	-	-	-	Colleges provide tourist and leisure related courses – likely without marina policy there would be less investment in these sectors and therefore less jobs which is likely to impact on courses and numbers of pupils.	
3. Health.	+	+	+	The policy supports a range of uses at the Marina and could lead to opportunities for healthier lifestyles and open air recreation.	-	-	-	Less opportunity for creation of facilities which benefit health.	
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship	0	-	-	Without policy existing facilities which the policy seeks to protect and enhance would go into decline.	
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The policy allows for residential development within the Marina which may help to utilise brownfield land and will help to ensure residents have access to a choice of types of homes in a sustainable location near to the railway station and the public transport interchange and also in vicinity to the town centre and facilities in and around the area.	-	-	-	Without a policy which identifies residential as an acceptable use, less likely to attract a developer to the site.	
6. Transport.	++	++	++	The policy supports development in an area which minimises the need to travel, and given the proximity to the railway station and interchange may encourage more sustainable forms of travel. It also encourages improvements to the cycle and foot networks within the area.	-	-	-	Without the policy the links referred to in the policy may not be implemented meaning there would likely be no improvement in connectivity in the area around the Marina.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Development of the under-used and vacant sites the policy supports will have a positive impact on the townscape at the Marina. The policy links to other policies including heritage and will therefore help to avoid an negative impact on the listed buildings within the area or on the adjacent Church Street Conservation area.	0	-	-	Without policy existing facilities which the policy seeks to protect and enhance would go into decline.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	-	-	-	There is a chance that development within the Marina could impact on the protected SPA/SSSI area to the east. Reference to impact on that and mitigation may strengthen policy.	-	-	-	Without the policy uses may come forward which could have detrimental impacts on the nearby environmental designations.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	0	0	0	Increased visitor activity within the area may lead to additional littering which could in turn cause water pollution.	0	0	0	Without policy would likely have less investment and therefore less likelihood of littering and therefore would be positive in terms of pollution of water bodies.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT2 – Tourism Development in the Marina								
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Harland Deer (Economic Regeneration) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Tony Dixon (Planning Enforcement) and Helen Heward (Development Control)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation			Commentary/ explanation					
							Positive though that the policy seeks to protect the water bodies from development.	However would lose the protection of the water bodies referenced in the policy.
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	-	-	-	The policy supports the development of a range of uses covering different sectors, all of which would lead to the creation of new jobs. It will lead to new retail to serve the local area and would support the development of recreational and leisure facilities.	Less jobs and more worklessness. Less likely to attract a range of facilities which visitors and residents could use.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	0	-	-	No relationship	Some facilities and services already exist – without the policy to promote the Marina these may decline over time having an impact on worklessness.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	0	+	+	Both the development of new buildings and facilities and the ongoing use of these will lead to an increase in the use of natural resources. A cross reference to the design and climate change policies will help to minimise this impact.	Whilst there are existing facilities, without the policy less new development is likely and therefore less traffic and less demand on natural resources.
13. Waste.	-	-	-	0	+	+	Both the development of new buildings and facilities and the ongoing use of these will lead to an increase in the amount of waste generated.	Policy off will lead to less development and therefore area will not attract as many people as existing facilities decline which will likely lead to lower waste levels.
14. Climate Change.	-	-	-	0	+	+	Both the development of new buildings and facilities and the ongoing use of these will lead to an increase in the use of natural resources and emissions which will impact on Climate Change. A cross reference to the design and climate change policies will help to minimise this impact.	Policy off will lead to less development and therefore area will not attract as many people as existing facilities decline which will likely lead to lower emission levels from travel into the area. This is factored against existing facilities being in an area well served by public transport.
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	--	--	--	The policy supports the ongoing development of the marina which will be a crucial element in the future economic success of Hartlepool and will provide a range of jobs and recreational activities which current and future generations will benefit from.	The Marina is the main tourist attraction within Hartlepool. Without policy less likely to have inward investment and associated jobs.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT2 – Tourism Development in the Marina						
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Harland Deer (Economic Regeneration) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)			
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew King (Planning Policy), Tony Dixon (Planning Enforcement) and Helen Heward (Development Control)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
Conclusions: The policy scores well on both economically and socially. Although there are slight environmental impacts, some of these can be reduced by a cross ref to the climate change and design policies.						
Recommendations: It is suggested that educational uses are added to acceptable uses. The Policy also needs to link to environmental policies to ensure that developments will not impact on nearby environmental designations.						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Economic and social impacts of policy off are severe and illustrate the policy on to be a more sustainable approach.						

Policy: LT3 Development of Seaton Carew							
Date: 14/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)				
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Peter Nixon (Highways, Traffic & Transport) and Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off			
	Timescale			Timescale			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Commentary/ explanation							
1. Economy.	++	++	++	--	--	--	Absence of policy could result in poorer economic growth from tourism. Failure to improve tourist areas (e.g. Longscar Centre and Seaton Front) will deter further investment and visitors/businesses.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	++	++	++	-	-	--	If the built/natural environment of tourist areas worsens over time/ do not improve, this will result in less use of recreational/leisure areas such as Seaton Carew Front and absence of policy likely to result in poorer access to the sports domes and park.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	0	0	0	Not improving the front will not resolve antisocial behaviour issues that may be present.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	0	0	0	Land at sports domes could potentially be allocated as housing without policy
6. Transport.	0	0	0	-	-	-	Loss of emphasis on connectivity will be detrimental to transport. Leisure and tourism allocations are sequentially preferable due to their sustainable locations. Less sustainable leisure and tourism development will increase travel and emissions.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	--	--	--	Less emphasis on protecting conservation area without policy. Failing to encourage improvements to

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT3 Development of Seaton Carew									
Date: 14/11/2016				Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Amy Waller (Housing Services) and Graham Megson (Ecologist)					
Date: 11 th July 2017				Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Peter Nixon (Highways, Traffic & Transport) and Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	-	-	-	The policy will lead to the creation of new attractions within Seaton Carew which in turn will lead to more people visiting which could put pressure on areas of ecological importance. Policy should reference need to protect those areas.	--	--	--	Less control over preservation and enhancement of nature conservation sites, protected habitats and priority species and ecological networks without policy. Less emphasis on interpretation and understanding of the SPA.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	-	-	-	Additional visitors could lead to additional littering etc which could in turn lead to additional pressures controlling the water quality. Policy should reference protection of water bodies.	-	-	-	Absence of policy will not stop development at Seaton Carew will just reduce ability to manage sustainably.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy will lead to additional development and new jobs occurring in Seaton Carew, will lead to additional commercial, recreational and tourist facilities all of which will benefit residents and will help to create and sustain a sense of place. The reference to the guidance set out within the Shop front and Commercial Design Guide reinforces the positive performance against this objective.	-	-	-	Less control over development and emphasis on maintaining character/protecting conservation area. Absence of policy could result in less sustainable development which will impact on sense of place and community cohesion.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship	0	0	0	Group felt there was a link due to impact on previous objective however not significant.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	-	-	-	The development of Seaton Carew and ongoing operation of facilities will create an additional demand for natural resources.	-	-	-	Absence of policy not likely to prevent development in Seaton Carew. Whilst it may be reduced there would be less control.	
13. Waste.	-	-	-	Additional businesses and tourist facilities will in turn lead to an increase in waste generated.	-	-	-	Absence of policy not likely to prevent development in Seaton Carew. Whilst it may be reduced there would be less control.	
14. Climate Change.	-	-	-	Improvements to the attractions and facilities at Seaton Carew associated with a seaside resort will lead to additional visitors which in turn leads to an increase in CO2 emissions and will lead to use of natural resources.	-	-	-	Absence of policy not likely to prevent development in Seaton Carew. Whilst it may be reduced there would be less control.	
15. Futurity.	++	++	++	Overall it is considered that despite some negative environmental issues the economic and social benefits of the policy will be very positive to current and future generations.	-	-	-	The absence of this policy would be detrimental to future generations as it would not encourage the sustainable growth of Seaton Carew as a tourist destination and would result in less control over development proposals.	
Conclusions and Recommendations									
<p>Conclusions: The policy does have some slight negative impacts associated with additional visitors to the area, however these are outweighed by the very positive impacts in both social and economic terms. The changes to the policy do not alter the assessment, other than to reinforce the positive performance in relation to the built and natural environment and the liveability and place objectives.</p> <p>Recommendations: None</p>									
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:									
Failing to support the sustainable growth of Seaton Carew as a tourist destination through this policy is likely to have a detrimental impact on the local economy, the built and natural environment and the protection of areas of biodiversity value in particular. Seaton Carew is an established tourist resort and a sequentially preferable location for tourist development, the absence of this policy would therefore be detrimental to ensuring tourist development is directed to the most sustainable locations.									

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT4 Tourist accommodation									
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside)						
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Peter Nixon (Highways, Traffic & Transport) and Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	++	++	++	Attracting and providing for visitors can have many benefits upon the economy, new businesses may open and existing ones may expand. Assessors assume this policy links to urban and rural locations and therefore the benefits can spread throughout the borough. Some job creation may occur although the range is limited. There are likely to be marginal improvements to economic deprivation linked to possible job creation.	-	-	-	Absence of policy encouraging tourist accommodation development may stymie growth of tourist accommodation in the town which would negatively impact visitor numbers and the local economy. Accommodation is also more likely to be in the wrong location which would restrict access to tourist areas.	
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
3. Health.	0	0	0	The policy has the potential to promote healthier lifestyle especially if accommodation is located in the rural area and visitors choose to interact with the area. The policy could be improved by linking to the GI policy and planning obligation policy, to ensure that new hotels etc provide green links so that visitors have the option to travel by sustainable modes.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	Less emphasis on high quality design may result in poorer, less safe design (i.e. Secured By Design principles). Less or poorly located accommodation may reduce numbers of guests resident in the town centre and other tourist locations, particularly on an evening, which may have otherwise reduced antisocial behaviour through natural surveillance. However, group concluded this link was significant.	
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Central locations have been prioritised for areas of accommodation development; these areas are often the most sustainable locations thus reducing the need to travel. Policy makes reference to utilising public transport systems. Improvements could be made by linking this policy to the GI policy and planning obligations policy.	-	-	--	Without policy there would be less control over location of tourist accommodation and therefore it is more likely to be in unsustainable locations that increase the need for travel. This would worsen over time as the town/tourist sector grows and would put increased pressure on transport networks.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Policy links to high quality design. Policy will not stop urban development encroaching into the countryside, although urban locations are prioritised for tourist accommodation, and often rural accommodation can be sympathetic to the rural area and thus not always classed as urban development. Policy requires development to be sympathetic. Assessors question why the coastal environment is given specific reference and consider that reference should be made to the whole environment not just coastal. Policy could be linked to the GI policy and planning obligation policy to ensure that developed are aware they have to provide more than just accommodation, improve links must also be considered.	-	-	-	Absence of policy would reduce control over design and could lead to poorer design which would negatively impact on the built environment. Poorly located accommodation could also have an impact on the vitality of tourist areas and the town centre which in turn could be detrimental to their appearance.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT4 Tourist accommodation									
Date: 17 th March 2016				Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 11 th July 2017				Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Peter Nixon (Highways, Traffic & Transport) and Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	0	0	0	The policy will not enhance biodiversity but it does seek to protect it. This policy could be linked to the ecology policy which seeks to improve biodiversity as does the NPPF or the wording could be strengthened to set out that biodiversity should be improved.	-	-	-	Absence of policy would mean less emphasis on protection of biodiversity and no provision of interpretation to increase public understanding of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar site.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	Increased travel from poorly located accommodation may increase pollution however not considered a significant link	
10. Liveability and Place.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	Poorly located accommodation will reduce access to culture, leisure and recreation. Absence of policy may result in poorer build quality which will be detrimental to sense of place and community cohesion. Link not considered significant however.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	The policy does prioritise sustainable locations such as the Town Centre, The Headland and Seaton Carew. But the policy does not draw specific reference to energy efficiency or the production of renewable energy. This policy could be linked to the energy efficiency policy and the climate change policy and reference would be made that measures to reduce the business carbon footprint will be encouraged, especially those in rural locations.	-	-	-	Absence of policy will fail to ensure sustainable, efficient and effective use of buildings and land, would not reduce demand for or encourage prudent and efficient use of natural resources (more travel likely).	
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Policy does priorities development in sustainable locations which is positive as it can help reduce the need to travel by car. The policy does not specifically help mitigate against climate change and the assessors consider that the policy could be improved or linked to the climate change and energy efficiency policy to encourage efforts that mitigate against climate change such as additional planting and landscaping etc. A possible suggestion is that development within the rural area will be encouraged to assist in mitigating against the climate impact through measures such as landscaping, tree planting, use of materials i.e permeable paving and SuDS where appropriate.	0	0	0	It is considered that the absence of the policy does have a relationship with the climate change objective, principally with respect to encouraging sustainable development, prudent use of natural resources and reduction in emissions, however it is considered not to be significant.	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy should allow the tourist accommodation offer to enhance within the borough which can benefit existing and future generations. Assessors could not envisage any negative impacts for future generations when considering the policy.	-	-	-	The absence of this policy would be detrimental to future generations as it could result in poorer design, poorer economic growth and increased transport pressures.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT4 Tourist accommodation						
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside)			
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Peter Nixon (Highways, Traffic & Transport) and Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
<p>Conclusions: overall the policy is positive, it will help improve the tourist accommodation offer across the borough, the criteria within the policy should help ensure that development is sympathetic to its surroundings. Recommendations set out below could improve the policy further.</p> <p>Recommendations: Assessors assume this policy relates to urban and rural areas, the information in the brackets in the first paragraph could be amended to include reference to rural locations. Improvements could be made by linking this policy to the GI policy and planning obligations policy. Assessors question why the coastal environment is given specific reference and consider that reference should be made to the whole environment not just coastal. This policy could be linked to the ecology policy which seeks to improve biodiversity as does the NPPF or the wording could be strengthened to set out that biodiversity should be improved. This policy could be linked to the energy efficiency policy and the climate change policy and reference would be made that measures to reduce the business carbon footprint will be encouraged, especially those in rural locations.</p>						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Doing nothing in this instance may result in less or more poorly designed and located tourist accommodation, this could have implications in terms of access to tourist facilities and transport and consequently could be detrimental to the local economy. Without appropriate control there could also be deterioration in the quality of the built and natural environment.						

Policy: LT5: Caravan sites and touring caravan sites										
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside)							
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Peter Nixon (Highways, Traffic & Transport) and Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside)							
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off						
	Timescale			Timescale						
	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Commentary/ explanation										
1. Economy.	++	++	++	Policy will have significant benefits for the economy in the urban and rural area and could lead to the creation of many new businesses and a range of jobs. The town centre could be improved if visitor numbers to the borough increase and thus the additional money spent within the borough could have positive knock on effects and reduce economic deprivation particularly through local job creation.			-	-	-	Absence of policy may stymie growth of tourist accommodation in the borough which would negatively impact visitor numbers and the local economy. Accommodation is also more likely to be in inappropriate locations which would restrict access to tourist areas.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.			x	x	x	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	0	0	0	Locating caravan sites within the rural area could allow for a healthier lifestyle. The policy could be improved by linking to the GI policy and the planning obligations policy to ensure that play and open space features are incorporated on site. If the recommendations are implemented then the policy would achieve score more positively.			-	-	-	Policy emphasises sustainable linkages and encourages tourist accommodation in appropriate locations, typically in the rural area with access to the countryside which will encourage recreation. Absence of this policy would therefore move away from this objective.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.			x	x	x	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.			x	x	x	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT5: Caravan sites and touring caravan sites								
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Peter Nixon (Highways, Traffic & Transport) and Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation				Commentary/ explanation				
6. Transport.	0	0	0	The policy draws reference to accommodating traffic but not improving it. Travel by car is likely as often caravan sites are within the rural area and thus there is a likely need to travel by car. Some visitors may choose to explore the area and facilities on foot.	-	-	-	Absence of policy would lose emphasis on ensuring accommodation is located in areas where the surrounding infrastructure is capable of supporting it.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Policy seeks additional landscaping with development which should in turn assist in enhancing the quality of the countryside. No link established with regards to heritage, but one is not essential to make this policy fit for purpose. To improve the policy, reference could be made to improving links and providing facilities and by making direct reference to the design, GI and planning obligations policies.	-	-	-	Absence of policy would remove emphasis on provision of appropriate landscaping and ensuring there is no unacceptable visual intrusion into the landscape.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	0	0	0	Policy is neutral when compared with the SA objective. The policy could be improved by linking to the natural environment and ecology policies along with the planning obligations policy.	-	-	-	Absence of policy may result in inappropriate drainage and poorer design/landscaping and siting which could be detrimental to geodiversity and biodiversity.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Absence of policy may result in inappropriate drainage which may result in water pollution. Poorly located development may encourage more and less sustainable travel and therefore increase air and noise pollution.
10. Liveability and Place.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	x	x	x	No relationship, however the policy could have more positive impacts if linked to the climate change and energy efficiency policy.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	x	x	x	No relationship, however the policy could have more positive impacts if linked to the climate change, design and energy efficiency policies.	0	0	0	Policy refers to sustainable linkages, drainage and infrastructure however relationship with climate change not considered significant.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	It is anticipated that the policy will allow the tourism offer in Hartlepool to expand but in doing so the assessors saw no reason why there would be a negative impact upon future generations.	-	-	-	Failing to encourage appropriate visitor accommodation whilst also ensuring this is in the correct location will have a detrimental impact on future generations in terms of reduced economic prosperity and environmental protection and poorer visual amenity of the area.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT5: Caravan sites and touring caravan sites						
Date: 17 th March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control) and Chris Scaife (Parks & Countryside)			
Date: 11 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Peter Nixon (Highways, Traffic & Transport) and Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
Conclusions: Overall the policy is positive where it is expected to be and will assist in providing an appropriate network of tourist accommodation across the borough.						
Recommendations: The policy could be improved to ensure that development brings additional benefits such as green links and/or play facilities on site. Cross reference should be made to the design, climate change, energy efficiency, GI, ecology and planning obligations policies.						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Doing nothing in this instance may result in less or more poorly designed and located tourist accommodation, this could have implications in terms of access to tourist facilities and transport and consequently could be detrimental to the local economy. Without appropriate control there could also be deterioration in the quality of the built and natural environment.						

Policy: LT6 Business Tourism, Events and Conferencing							
Date: 21 st April 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)				
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off			
	Timescale			Timescale			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Commentary/ explanation							
1. Economy.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Not encouraging improvements to events and conferencing facilities may discourage business tourism.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Absence of policy may result in fewer or lower quality facilities which may limit opportunities for training and learning.
3. Health.	0	0	0	0	0	0	Whilst overall the policy remains neutral, there may be opportunities to link to health if facilities developed provide space for health related events e.g road shows, awareness raising conferences etc. There may be a negligible link between development of such facilities providing jobs which has the potential to reduce poverty and health inequalities.
4. Safety and Security.	X	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	X	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT6 Business Tourism, Events and Conferencing									
Date: 21 st April 2016				Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)					
Date: 12 th July 2017				Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
6. Transport.	+	+	+	The policy supports the development of new business tourism, events and conferencing facilities, if successful these could strengthen the case to develop a wider sustainable transport network. The impact on transport would be dependent on where in the borough such development would be and the proximity to the transport network.	0	0	0	There is considered to be a relationship however not significant. The lack of such facilities may require people to travel further however teleconferencing may also reduce the need for travel.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	X	X	X	Whilst there is no direct relationship identified, impact would depend on where development is located, e.g. if the development was in the town centre the requirement for high quality design could have a positive impact on the townscape.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
10. Liveability and Place.	0	+	+	The policy supports the development of facilities and therefore will encourage usage of a diverse range of facilities providing more options for residents and businesses. This helps to create a more sustainable town if there are a greater range of facilities, reducing the need to travel. Accessibility will be increased if located in the town centre or marina.	0	-	-	Failing to encourage business tourism, events and conferencing development will not improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities and events which will make it more difficult to create and sustain a vibrant and diverse community and sense of place.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	0	0	0	The policy will have a neutral impact as this will be largely dependent on the location and use of the development. The development of facilities will provide additional space to host events, this could include training and social events which could increase participation and engagements and improve cohesion, although these are indirect impacts.	0	0	0	Potential relationship given comments above however not considered significant.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	Considered to be a relationship given relationship with transport but not considered significant.	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	Whilst no direct relationship is identified, there is the possibility that such development could increase waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	0	0	0	Given relationship with transport and sustainability of the town more generally considered to be a link with climate change but not significant.	
15. Futurity.	+	++	++	This policy contributes positively towards ensuring the choices on future generations are not limited. It will provide additional facilities, increasing choice within the borough.	-	--	--	It is considered as time progresses the lack of adequate business facilities would be detrimental to future generations and restrict choice as need becomes greater.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: LT6 Business Tourism, Events and Conferencing						
Date: 21 st April 2016			Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Helen Heward (Development Control) and Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)			
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
<p>Conclusions: Overall this is a positive policy which will support the diversification of the offer of this type of facilities. It will have a positive impact on the local economy and increase opportunities for employment, skills and training.</p> <p>Recommendations: Policy preamble to be updated to remove ‘established a reputation for having’ from the first paragraph.</p>						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Doing nothing in this instance would likely have a detrimental impact on the local economy, education and skills and access to cultural events in particular.						

Policy: HE1 Heritage Assets								
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation								
1. Economy.	++	++	++	-	-	--	The policy seeks to protect and enhance all heritage assets which will include bringing buildings back into use and providing more opportunities for economic use. This has potential to encourage new start up businesses and improve the viability and vitality of the town centre and local centres. Proposals for the Church St area in particular will have positive benefits on the local economy	The absence of this policy will likely result in a poorer built/historic environment, this will reduce the attractiveness of the town to new business and will limit tourism related growth. This will worsen over time should the built/historic environment worsen with less investment and support.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	0	0	0	There is a continuing need for skills associated with conservation and heritage work. The policy could encourage appropriate training to be provided through educational establishments	It is considered that the absence of this policy could potentially be negative in terms of reducing the need for heritage/conservation related skills however this is not considered to be a strong link.
3. Health.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Overall the policy is seen as positive as it will encourage local people to use/visit heritage assets such as Ward Jackson Park (which is a designated Historic Park & Garden) as well as green spaces associated with heritage assets in rural and other areas.	Failing to maintain and enhance heritage assets (such as Ward Jackson Park) will discourage people from using these and other green/recreation space associated with heritage assets.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	-	-	-	The policy will encourage the reuse of buildings which will have a positive impact on safety, and will also help to create safer and cleaner communities, and help with the maintenance of those areas	Absence of the policy will fail to encourage the reuse of historic buildings which can often fall into disrepair and attract anti-social behaviour and litter/waste
5. Housing.	+	+	+	0	0	0	Overall positive as the policy could encourage the provision of new housing as part of the restoration and enhancement of heritage assets	The absence of this policy would not necessarily result in less housing and could in some instances allow more (where heritage assets are demolished). The absence of this policy may reduce costs for reuse/maintenance of older properties.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE1 Heritage Assets									
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)						
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
6. Transport.	X	X	X	Overall no relationship but it should be noted that the policy could encourage more uses and people living within the town centre which in turn could reduce the need to travel and encourage more sustainable modes of transport	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The main aim of the policy is to preserve, protect and enhance heritage assets which will also have a positive impact on the wider townscapes and streetscapes of Hartlepool Interpretation is specifically mentioned as part of the Archaeology section of the policy and it may also be helpful to refer to interpretation as an element within the remainder of the policy The policy should implicitly encourage high quality design but it may be beneficial to refer to the need for good design, particularly where new developments may affect the setting of a heritage asset	--	--	--	Failing to preserve, protect and enhance heritage assets will have a significant detrimental impact on the built environment of the Borough. Loss of reference to interpretation of heritage assets without policy.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	Overall positive on the basis that heritage assets include parks and other open space which may have nature conservation interest. The policy should have a positive impact on improving access to such areas as well as the potential for linear links and walks between sites	-	-	-	Absence of this policy may reduce access to and quality of historic parks and gardens and other areas of open space associated with heritage assets that positively relates to the biodiversity objective.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship overall although it can be noted that the Town Wall is part of the Headland coastal defence and prevents flooding of nearby properties	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The policy should make a significant contribution to creating liveable places, as well as improving the cultural 'offer' and access to that offer. Many archaeological and heritage projects have strong community involvement which helps to promote community cohesion and a sense of place	--	--	--	The absence of this policy would be detrimental to the objective criteria of creating a sense of place and improving access to culture, leisure and recreational activities. This would be detrimental to social cohesion and the vitality of communities.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	As for the objective above there are good opportunities for community participation and engagement, and there is potential for job creation through training and the use of appropriate skills	-	-	-	As above, the absence of this policy could be detrimental for social cohesion, community ownership and participation.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	There is embedded energy efficiency in the use of an existing building and there will be less use of new materials, helping to reduce demand for natural resources	-	-	-	Failing to encourage improvements to heritage assets can result in poorer quality buildings/housing and poorer energy efficiency.	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	Overall no relationship although there may be opportunities to recycle some materials during heritage projects	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	Heritage projects will take a sustainable approach to flood risk management, and potentially encourage prudent use of natural resources	-	-	-	The absence of this policy would not encourage prudent use of natural resources (reuse of building and energy efficiency) which would not assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE1 Heritage Assets								
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Overall positive although the presence of some heritage assets could be seen as having an adverse impact on some types of future development. Overall however it was considered that there are more positive opportunities and outcomes	-	-	-	The absence of this policy would be detrimental to future generations through a poorer built and natural environment which can have negative implications for economic growth and liveability in particular.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy will make a positive contribution to sustainable development, particularly in enhancing Hartlepool's local distinctiveness and historic environment, helping to create a sense of place, improving access to cultural facilities, encouraging community engagement, and helping to diversify the local economy.</p> <p>Recommendations: Consideration should be given to including a reference to interpretation within the main part of the policy, and including a more positive statement on the need for good design in associated with work affecting heritage assets. Consideration could also be given towards having the archaeology section of the policy as a separate, standalone policy. It is also suggested that the policy should clarify, for the avoidance of doubt, that heritage assets include Scheduled Monuments and Historic Parks and Gardens as these are not specifically referred to in this or other heritage policies.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Failing to protect heritage assets would have a significant detrimental impact on the built and natural environment and the liveability of the town in terms of creating a sense of place and community cohesion in particular. This can also be detrimental to the local economy, health, safety and security and climate change related objectives.								

Policy: HE2: Archaeology - Policy inserted as a standalone policy following sustainability appraisal (SA) of HE1: Heritage Assets. SA is detailed below.								
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	++	++	++	The policy seeks to protect and enhance all heritage assets which will include bringing buildings back into use and providing more opportunities for economic use. This has potential to encourage new start up businesses and improve the viability and vitality of the town centre and local centres. Proposals for the Church St area in particular will have positive benefits on the local economy	0	0	0	It is considered that the protection, enhancement and promotion of archaeological heritage, whilst still important in terms of tourism and enhancing the built/natural environment, would have a less significant impact on the economy compared to other heritage assets. It is also noted that increased work and costs associated with archaeological heritage assets may deter some development. As such it is determined that the absence of the policy is neutral overall.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	There is a continuing need for skills associated with conservation and heritage work. The policy could encourage appropriate training to be provided through educational establishments	0	0	0	Similarly there is considered to be a link with education and skills though this is not significant. It is noted also that there would be a loss of emphasis on improvements to interpretation and presentation of archaeological sites to the public.
3. Health.	+	+	+	Overall the policy is seen as positive as it will encourage local people to use/visit heritage assets such as Ward Jackson Park (which is a designated Historic Park & Garden) as well as green spaces associated with heritage assets in rural and other areas.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE2: Archaeology - Policy inserted as a standalone policy following sustainability appraisal (SA) of HE1: Heritage Assets. SA is detailed below.								
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	The policy will encourage the reuse of buildings which will have a positive impact on safety, and will also help to create safer and cleaner communities, and help with the maintenance of those areas	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Overall positive as the policy could encourage the provision of new housing as part of the restoration and enhancement of heritage assets	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
6. Transport.	X	X	X	Overall no relationship but it should be noted that the policy could encourage more uses and people living within the town centre which in turn could reduce the need to travel and encourage more sustainable modes of transport	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The main aim of the policy is to preserve, protect and enhance heritage assets which will also have a positive impact on the wider townscapes and streetscapes of Hartlepool Interpretation is specifically mentioned as part of the Archaeology section of the policy and it may also be helpful to refer to interpretation as an element within the remainder of the policy The policy should implicitly encourage high quality design but it may be beneficial to refer to the need for good design, particularly where new developments may affect the setting of a heritage asset	-	-	--	The absence of this policy would fail to enhance areas of archaeological interest and would result in poorer interpretation and understanding of archaeological heritage assets. This would have a detrimental impact on character and local distinctiveness and access to cultural and heritage assets. This would likely deteriorate over time as more areas of archaeological interest are lost to unsympathetic development.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	Overall positive on the basis that heritage assets include parks and other open space which may have nature conservation interest. The policy should have a positive impact on improving access to such areas as well as the potential for linear links and walks between sites	0	0	0	It is considered there may be a relationship, particularly with respect to excavation and geodiversity however it is not considered this would be significant.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship overall although it can be noted that the Town Wall is part of the Headland coastal defence and prevents flooding of nearby properties	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The policy should make a significant contribution to creating liveable places, as well as improving the cultural ‘offer’ and access to that offer. Many archaeological and heritage projects have strong community involvement which helps to promote community cohesion and a sense of place	-	-	-	The absence of this policy would result in poorer understanding of areas of archaeological interest which will likely have a detrimental impact on sense of place, understanding of the areas history and social cohesion. It is also likely to result in fewer opportunities for culture, leisure and recreational activities as well as community participation and engagement.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	As for the objective above there are good opportunities for community participation and engagement, and there is potential for job creation through training and the use of appropriate skills	-	-	-	The absence of this policy would result in poorer understanding of areas of archaeological interest which will likely have a detrimental impact on sense of place, understanding of the area’s history and social cohesion. It is also likely to result in fewer opportunities for culture, leisure and recreational activities as well as community participation and engagement.
12. Energy	+	+	+	There is embedded energy efficiency in the	X	X	X	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE2: Archaeology - Policy inserted as a standalone policy following sustainability appraisal (SA) of HE1: Heritage Assets. SA is detailed below.							
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)				
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
Efficiency and Natural Resources.				use of an existing building and there will be less use of new materials, helping to reduce demand for natural resources			
13. Waste.	X	X	X	Overall no relationship although there may be opportunities to recycle some materials during heritage projects	X	X	X
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	Heritage projects will take a sustainable approach to flood risk management, and potentially encourage prudent use of natural resources	X	X	X
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	Overall positive although the presence of some heritage assets could be seen as having an adverse impact on some types of future development. Overall however it was considered that there are more positive opportunities and outcomes	-	-	-
Conclusions and Recommendations							
Conclusions: The policy will make a positive contribution to sustainable development, particularly in enhancing Hartlepool's local distinctiveness and historic environment, helping to create a sense of place, improving access to cultural facilities, encouraging community engagement, and helping to diversify the local economy.							
Recommendations: Consideration should be given to including a reference to interpretation within the main part of the policy, and including a more positive statement on the need for good design in associated with work affecting heritage assets. Consideration could also be given towards having the archaeology section of the policy as a separate, standalone policy. It is also suggested that the policy should clarify, for the avoidance of doubt, that heritage assets include Scheduled Monuments and Historic Parks and Gardens as these are not specifically referred to in this or other heritage policies.							
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':							
The absence of this policy would be detrimental when assessed against the appraisal objectives in terms of the understanding of the history of the Borough, sense of place, community cohesion and participation and the quality of the built and natural environment.							

Policy: HE3 Conservation Areas							
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)				
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
1. Economy.	+	+	+	The enhancement of conservation area will have a positive impact on job creation and investment. A good example is the Townscape Heritage Initiative scheme which has helped to boost the local economy through job creation and investment.	-	-	--
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	There is a continuing need for skills associated with conservation and heritage work. The policy could encourage appropriate training to be provided through educational establishments.	0	0	0

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE3 Conservation Areas								
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
3. Health.	+	+	+	The policy will contribute to opportunities for healthier lifestyles through improving access to green spaces and public areas. An example is the walkway improvements at Seaton Carew which have linked up parks and other area of open space.	-	-	-	Failing to maintain and enhance heritage assets (such as Ward Jackson Park) will discourage people from using these and other green/recreation space associated with heritage assets, including Seaton Front.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	Positive overall as the policy will contribute to creating better quality public spaces, which are kept in good order, therefore leading to cleaner communities and less anti-social behaviour and fear of crime.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will fail to encourage the reuse of historic buildings which can often fall into disrepair and attract anti-social behaviour and litter/waste
5. Housing.	+	+	+	Conservation areas can create desirable and sought after areas. The policy will also ensure good design including the protection and enhancement of open space.	-	-	-	Failing to protect the conservation areas will damage their desirability as residential areas and lower the quality of design, including protection and enhancement of open space. Whilst the absence of the policy may reduce costs when doing works to properties in the conservation area, this will likely be offset by the increased energy costs associated with failing to encourage appropriate maintenance/improvements of properties.
6. Transport.	0	0	0	Neutral overall although potentially positive impacts on reducing the need for travel through encouraging the reuse of buildings, bringing more people into an area and therefore increasing use of existing facilities.	0	0	0	Neutral overall although potentially negative impacts should fewer people choose to live in central areas and therefore have to travel further.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The policy will have a positive impact on most of the appraisal criteria, including helping to prevent encroachment in the countryside through the desire to provide a more rural setting for the village conservation areas. Consideration should be given to including a reference to interpretation of conservation areas and referring to the importance of open space in maintaining the integrity of conservation areas.	--	--	--	Failing to preserve, protect and enhance heritage assets will have a significant detrimental impact on the built environment of the Borough. Loss of reference to interpretation of heritage assets without policy.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	+	Positive overall because of presence of parks and other green space within conservation areas which can play an important role in their own right as well as contributing to a wider ecological network	-	-	-	Absence of this policy may reduce access to and quality of historic parks and gardens and other areas of open space associated with heritage assets that positively relates to the biodiversity objective. May also result in fewer trees/hedgerows that are of benefit to wildlife.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship overall although it can be noted that the Town Wall is part of the Headland coastal defence and prevents flooding of nearby properties.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE3 Conservation Areas								
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 12 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Tracy Rowe (Community Regeneration & Development), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Conservation areas will make a positive contribution to creating a liveable place. The policy will also contribute to improving access to culture and leisure and promoting a sense of place	-	-	--	The absence of this policy would be detrimental to the objective criteria of creating a sense of place and improving access to culture, leisure and recreational activities. This would be detrimental to social cohesion and the vitality of communities. With respect to Conservation Areas, these are likely to deteriorate over time without appropriate control over development.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy will have a positive impact on community cohesion and promoting participation and engagement.	-	-	-	As above, the absence of this policy could be detrimental for social cohesion, community ownership and participation.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	Positive as there will be opportunities for efficient use of buildings and land, and reducing the use of natural resources through the reuse of existing buildings.	-	-	-	Failing to encourage improvements to heritage assets can result in poorer quality buildings/housing and poorer energy efficiency.
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	Conservation area projects will take a sustainable approach to flood risk management, and potentially encourage prudent use of natural resources.	-	-	-	The absence of this policy would not encourage prudent use of natural resources (reuse of building and energy efficiency) which would not assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+		-	-	-	The absence of this policy would be detrimental to future generations through a poorer built and natural environment which can have negative implications for economic growth and liveability in particular.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy will contribute to a number of elements of sustainable development particularly in relationship to improving and enhancing the quality of the built environment.</p> <p>Recommendations: Consideration should be given to including a reference to the importance of providing interpretation of conservation areas and their features, and also to including a stronger reference to the importance of open space in maintaining the character and setting of conservation areas.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Failing to protect heritage assets would have a significant detrimental impact on the built and natural environment and the liveability of the town in terms of creating a sense of place and community cohesion in particular. This can also be detrimental to the local economy, health, safety and security and climate change related objectives.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE4 Listed Buildings and Structures									
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)						
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Jane Tindall (Development Control), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	0	0	0	Neutral overall but it should be noted that individual buildings can contribute to economic diversification and collectively on the vitality and viability of town centres.	0	0	0	Neutral overall, policy on comments are noted so without this policy then economic diversity could be hindered if heritage assets are not secured/preserved.	
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	There is a continuing need for skills associated with conservation and heritage work. The policy could encourage appropriate training to be provided through educational establishments.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will have the potential to have a detrimental impact on the education and skills objective.	
3. Health.	0	0	0	Neutral overall although it can be noted that some listed buildings are an attraction that can encourage people to get out and visit.	0	0	0	It is anticipated that absence of the policy will have a neutral impact on this objective. Although it is noted that it would be dependent on the use of the listed building.	
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	Positive on the basis that the policy will help to make buildings safer and encourage safer and cleaner areas.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would weaken the positive impact on this objective.	
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The reuse of previously developed land and buildings is an integral part of the policy and reuse can include the provision of residential accommodation e.g. Morrison Hall. Some listed buildings also provide for the need of vulnerable people such as hospitals and almshouses.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact on the ability to closely control the development of listed buildings as residential uses.	
6. Transport.	0	0	0		X	X	X	No relationship.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The policy will make a strong positive contribution towards protecting and enhancing listed buildings, as well as improving the wider townscape and streetscape.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy would weaken the policy position in relation to this objective. Key to the policy is the quality of development proposals ensuring they are appropriate for the heritage asset.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship although individual properties may house bat populations or come with larger gardens that have some nature conservation interest.	X	X	X	No relationship.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship although noted that the Town Wall is a listed structure providing coastal and flood defences.	X	X	X	No relationship.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	There will be opportunities for improving access to cultural facilities and delivering a sense of place.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy there will be a detrimental impact in relation to this objective as appropriate development of listed buildings and structures may be jeopardised, this will have a direct impact on perception of sense of place.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy will have a positive impact on community cohesion and promoting participation and engagement.	0	0	0	Considered that without the policy in place, the impact would depend on the use of the listed building or structure, in certain instances there may be justification for a negative impact.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	Positive as there will be opportunities for efficient use of buildings and land, and reducing the use of natural resources through the reuse of existing buildings. There should also be reduced demand for natural resources.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy there is the potential for a negative impact on this objective, as the policy is supportive of the reuse of buildings to assist with the long term future of heritage assets.	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship.	X	X	X	No relationship.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE4 Listed Buildings and Structures								
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology), Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Jane Tindall (Development Control), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Neutral although listed building projects will normally adopt a positive approach to flood risk management.	0	0	0	Neutral overall, however without the policy such buildings and structures may not be maintained/enhanced, if they are not utilised development may occur elsewhere and thus embodied energy is not utilised.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+		-	-	--	Absence of the policy will have a significant detrimental impact in the long term, as there will not be the detailed policy mechanisms in place to enhance listed buildings and structures supporting the long term future of these heritage assets.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The policy will make a positive contribution to the protection and enhancement of listed buildings, and a similarly positive impact on the wider environmental quality of Hartlepool.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
The absence of the policy will have a detrimental impact on listed buildings and structures in the Borough as it has the potential to ensure development is appropriate and will protect these heritage assets for future generations.								

Policy: HE5 Locally Listed Buildings and Structures								
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy) Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Jane Tindall (Development Control), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	0	0	0	Neutral overall but it should be noted that individual buildings can contribute to economic diversification and collectively on the vitality and viability of town centres.	0	0	0	Neutral overall however if these assets are not protected etc there could be negative economic impacts.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	There is a continuing need for skills associated with conservation and heritage work. The policy could encourage appropriate training to be provided through educational establishments.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy will have the potential to have a detrimental impact on the education and skills objective. See ‘policy on’ comment.
3. Health.	0	0	0	Neutral overall although it can be noted that some listed buildings are an attraction that can encourage people to get out and visit.	0	0	0	It is anticipated that absence of the policy will have a neutral impact on this objective. Although it is noted that it would be dependent on the use of the locally listed building or structure.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	Positive on the basis that the policy will help to make buildings safer and encourage safer and cleaner areas.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would weaken the positive impact on this objective.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	The reuse of previously developed land and buildings is an integral part of the policy and reuse can include the provision of residential accommodation e.g. Morrison Hall. Some listed buildings also provide for the need of vulnerable people such as hospitals and almshouses.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact on the ability to closely control the development of locally listed buildings as residential uses.
6. Transport.	0	0	0		X	X	X	No relationship.
7. Built and	++	++	++	The policy will make a strong positive	--	--	--	Absence of the policy would weaken

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE5 Locally Listed Buildings and Structures								
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy) Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Jane Tindall (Development Control), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
Natural Environment.				contribution towards protecting and enhancing listed buildings, as well as improving the wider townscape and streetscape.				the policy position in relation to this objective. Key to the policy is the quality of development proposals ensuring they are appropriate for the non-designated heritage asset.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship although individual properties may house bat populations or come with larger gardens that have some nature conservation interest.	X	X	X	No relationship.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	There will be opportunities for improving access to cultural facilities and delivering a sense of place.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy there will be a detrimental impact in relation to this objective as appropriate development of locally listed buildings and structures may be jeopardised, this will have a direct impact on perception of sense of place.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy will have a positive impact on community cohesion and promoting participation and engagement.	0	0	0	Considered that without the policy in place, the impact would depend on the use of the locally listed building or structure, in certain instances there may be justification for a negative impact.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	Positive as there will be opportunities for efficient use of buildings and land, and reducing the use of natural resources through the reuse of existing buildings. There should also be reduced demand for natural resources.	-	-	-	In the absence of the policy there is the potential for a negative impact on this objective, as the policy is supportive of the reuse of buildings to assist with the long term future of heritage assets.
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Neutral although listed building projects will normally adopt a positive approach to flood risk management.	0	0	0	Neutral overall.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+		-	-	--	Absence of the policy will have a significant detrimental impact in the long term, as there will not be the detailed policy mechanisms in place to enhance locally listed buildings and structures supporting the long term future of these heritage assets.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
Conclusions: The policy will make a positive contribution to the protection and enhancement of locally listed buildings, and a similarly positive impact on the wider environmental quality of Hartlepool.								
Recommendations: It is noted that this is the only heritage policy to refer to Article 4 Directions – are there other policies where reference to Article 4 Directions may be appropriate e.g. Conservation Areas?								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
The absence of the policy will have a detrimental impact on locally listed buildings and structures in the Borough as it has the potential to ensure development is appropriate and will protect these non-designated heritage assets for future generations.								

Policy: HE6 Historic Shopping Parades	
Date: 11 th April 2016	Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Date: 13 th July 2017				Appraisers: Jane Tindall (Development Control), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	0	0	0	Neutral overall although there should be a positive impact on the viability and vitality of town and local centres.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy will have a direct local link in relation to the continued enhancement of the quality of the local shopping parades which would negatively impact on the success of the local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	There will be a demand for specialists in restoration, sign writing etc so the policy will support training and workforce skills.	0	0	0	Absence of the policy could have a negative impact on this objective, however it was acknowledged that the number of premises across the three areas identified in the policy is limited hence the neutral impact on the objective.
3. Health.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	There will be a positive contribution towards cleaner communities and maintaining and keeping clean public areas.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would have a marginal negative impact, although it was noted that the focus of the policy is appearance on the shopping parades rather than uses.
5. Housing.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
6. Transport.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The policy is designed to improve and enhance local distinctiveness, character, townscape and streetscape.	--	--	--	Absence of the policy would have a significant negative impact on the shopping parades identified in the policy as there would be a weakened policy position in trying to protect these areas against inappropriate development.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The protection or reinstatement of traditional shop fronts will promote a sense of place and potentially retain and encourage retail facilities.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to impact on the sense of place associated with these areas. Development pressures can have a negative impact on the retention of traditional characteristics – hence loss of such features is a risk without this policy.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	0	0	0		0	0	0	Neutral, although it was acknowledged that the link to 'community ownership' is weak.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	There are potentially increased opportunities to use sustainable materials therefore reducing the use of natural resources.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could create the opposite impact to the 'policy on' comments.
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
15. Futurity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	--	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified previously, during the 'policy off' assessment it was determined that the absence of the policy could have a detrimental impact in terms of not having the policy tools in place to retain these last remaining historic shopping parades across the borough.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE6 Historic Shopping Parades						
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)			
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Jane Tindall (Development Control), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
<p>Conclusions: The policy, in combination with other heritage policies, makes a significant contribution to improving the local character and distinctiveness of Hartlepool.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Absence of the policy will restrict the Local Plan’s ability to control development in the area covered by the policy which may have a detrimental impact on the retention of the traditional aspect of these areas.						

Policy: HE7 Heritage at Risk							
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)				
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Jane Tindall (Development Control), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off			
	Timescale			Timescale			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Commentary/ explanation							
1. Economy.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Absence of the policy has the potential to intensify the situation in relation to heritage assets considered at risk. These premises, which are often void and the longer such a situation is evident there can be a detrimental impact on the local economy.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	0	0	0	Absence of the policy will have the potential to have a detrimental impact on the education and skills objective. See ‘policy on’ comment.
3. Health.	X	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
4. Safety and Security.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would weaken the positive impact on this objective, as buildings may remain at risk or be developed inappropriately. There are known safety and security risks associated with derelict buildings.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could potentially weaken policy support for positive redevelopment of heritage assets which are considered to be at risk. This could prevent buildings from being removed from the register.
6. Transport.	X	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	--	--	--	Absence of the policy has the potential impact on the successful support of policy to address heritage at risk, this has a detrimental impact on both the built and natural environment dependent on the location.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	X	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	X	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship identified.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: HE7 Heritage at Risk									
Date: 11 th April 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Peter Rowe (Tees Valley Archaeology) and Leigh Taylor (Development Control)						
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Jane Tindall (Development Control), Tracy Rowe (Community Safety & Engagement) and Fiona Riley (Planning Policy)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy will contribute positively to the creation of liveable places and promoting a sense of place.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy could result in a negative impact on 'sense of place', perceived impact is affected by derelict buildings.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Potentially there should be opportunities to increase community engagement and participation, leading to improved community cohesion.	-	-	-	Weak link, however absence of the policy could have a negative impact on this objective.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	+	+	+	Positive as there will be opportunities for efficient use of buildings and land, and reducing the use of natural resources through the reuse of existing buildings. There should also be reduced demand for natural resources.	-	-	-	Absence of the policy would have a negative impact on this objective, as the policy supports the reuse of buildings.	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
14. Climate Change.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
15. Futurity.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	-	-	--	Whilst it is acknowledged that no relationship was identified previously, during the 'policy off' assessment it was determined that absence of the policy poses a real risk to the protection and enhancement of heritage assets at risk and their ability to be enjoyed by future generations.	
Conclusions and Recommendations									
Conclusions: The policy will make a positive contribution to the heritage assets of Hartlepool by helping to secure a long term future and viable use for buildings of significance that are at risk.									
Recommendations: None.									
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':									
Absence of the policy could have a potential negative impact on the long term future of Heritage Assets assessed as at risk.									

Policy: NE1 Natural Environment									
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)						
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	+	+	++	The policy will protect existing high value wild space and provide green space which will have wildlife but also health benefits. The policy is primarily concerned with protecting what exists rather than adding more. It is not the intention of the policy to provide additional access to these green spaces. Many of these wildlife sited are in private ownership with no or few access opportunities. Increased access can cause disturbance and damage. However, some wild space areas encourage public access (eg: Nat Nature Reserve, LNRs). Ensuring that these aesthetically pleasing areas are protected and maintained should help with mental wellbeing	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact. Quality of place is an economic asset and the natural environment is an important contributor to establishing a positive sense of place.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE1 Natural Environment								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation				Commentary/ explanation				
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship identified	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact. The natural environment is an important educational resource.
3. Health.	+	+	+	Healthier lifestyles should be promoted, the more green space the more healthy activities can occur outdoors.	-	-	-	The natural environment is a resource which has important physical and mental health benefits.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	Safety and security is not the aim of this policy, therefore there is no relationship with the policy and the SA objective. The safety and security policy will ensure development is designed to have regard to safety and security.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	x	x	x	The provision of housing is not the aim of the policy therefore there is no overall relationship between the policy and the objective.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact. The policy protects assets which have recreational value, the loss of which would be harmful to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities.
6. Transport.	x	x	x	Discussion was had relating to opening up these sites, however it was considered that often having better access to these sites can cause problems. It is not for this policy to increase access, the GI and public rights of way policy can do that if appropriate.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	The policy will allow for the protection and maintenance of the key natural spaces within the borough and in doing so will ensure that there are numerous benefits that will assist in enhancing the quality and local distinctiveness of the borough. Policy seeks to protect what exists within the borough so although the policy will not directly increase access to open space, it allows open spaces to flourish and other policies can ensure increased access.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact. The policy seeks to protect the natural environment.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	++	++	++	By protecting and enhancing the natural environment within the borough then the policy directly seeks to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact. The policy seeks to enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	No relationship overall but the assessors note that protecting and enhancing natural areas within the borough could help with flood alleviation, eg: by retraining surface flood water for longer. The changes to the policy mean that it has now positive impacts such as improving the quality of controlled waters and reducing the risk of flooding.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact. The policy seeks to protect the major/principal aquifers underlying Hartlepool along with watercourses and other surface and coastal waters from over abstraction and contamination. It also requires that development have regard to bathing water quality.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The changes to the policy mean that it has now positive impacts such as improving access to Local Nature Reserves and promoting social cohesion as Local Nature Reserves can encourage volunteer groups and promote a sense of place.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact. The natural environment is an important contributor to promoting a positive sense of place.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE1 Natural Environment								
Date: 09/11/2016			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Ryan Cowley (Development Control), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harrison (Regeneration)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship overall but the assessors note the possibilities linked to sense of place. Protecting natural environments that are unique to Hartlepool and/or that people relate to an area of Hartlepool can add to a sense of place.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	Protecting and enhancing the natural environment will reduce some causes of climate change and therefore mitigate against climate increases. The natural environment performs the ecosystem service of being a carbon sink and does alleviate flooding.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact. The policy seeks to protect the natural environment which performs the ecosystem service of being a carbon sink and does alleviate flooding.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy will protect and enhance parts of the borough that add significantly to the quality of life for existing generations and will maintain and protect the environment for future generations.	-	-	-	The absence of the policy would have a detrimental impact. The policy will protect and enhance parts of the borough that add significantly to the quality of life for existing generations and will maintain and protect the environment for future generations.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: Overall the policy is significantly positive where expected, and positive where expected. The policy is fit for purpose and will assist in bringing many benefits to the borough all linked to protecting and maintaining the natural environment. The changes to the policy means that it has now have some positive impacts regarding water, air and soil pollution and liveability and place.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Assessors noted that some of the assessment text for the existing assessment was ordered incorrectly and have corrected it accordingly. Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, education and skills, health, housing, built and natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity, water, air and soil pollution, liveability and place, climate change and futurity.								

Policy: NE2 Green Infrastructure								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickleton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	There is evidence to show that there is a link between green infrastructure and decisions of companies to locate in a particular area. Green infrastructure can provide a context for inward investment, enhancing the image of an area. Poor perceptions can be a barrier and environmental improvements can improve perceptions. If green infrastructure can play a part in encouraging new investment this will lead to new businesses, more jobs and a diversified	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green infrastructure can assist in creating an environment in which people want to live and work. It creates a context for inward investment by enhancing the image of an area.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE2 Green Infrastructure								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation				Commentary/ explanation				
				economy.				
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The many different elements of green infrastructure mean that there will be enhanced opportunities for education and learning. Schools and other educational establishments can get involved in the management of green space to use as an educational resource on the local environment and develop environmental related skills.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green infrastructure can be an important educational resource for schools and colleges. .
3. Health.	++	++	++	The positive links between green infrastructure and health & well-being have been well documented. Green infrastructure can provide opportunities for exercise, reducing stress levels leading to better mental health, and contribute to better air quality and therefore reduced incidence of respiratory illness. Better footpaths and cycleways associated with green infrastructure can enhance access opportunities.	--	--	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green infrastructure can contribute to better air quality and to physical and mental health and wellbeing.
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	Neutral overall as depends to a large extent on perceptions.	0	0	0	Neutral overall when considered against all the objective criteria
5. Housing.	+	+	+	If considered at the outset as an integral part of housing development green infrastructure can contribute positively to a number of aspects of successful housing including a high quality environment, adequate formal and informal open space, and encourage good design.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green infrastructure, when properly planned from the outset, can encourage high quality design and sufficient open space in new developments.
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Green infrastructure can contribute to a sustainable transport system by potentially improving access to key services and facilities, providing alternatives to the use of the car through safe and attractive walking and cycling routes, encourage more use of existing facilities, and contribute to better air quality as a consequence of reduced car use.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green infrastructure networks can provide a context for the provision of pedestrian and cycleway linkages.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	Green infrastructure is part of a mix of factors that contribute to the quality of the built and natural environment. A good quality, well-planned green infrastructure network will enhance the Borough's townscape and streetscape, enhance the character and setting of historic and cultural assets, provide enhanced opportunities for access to natural and built assets, and provide an attractive physical environment. The policy could benefit by stressing more strongly the relationship between high quality green space and the need for complementary good design, and also to stress the need for adequate multi-functional green space as part of new developments.	--	--	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. A well planned green infrastructure network enhances the quality of the built environment.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE2 Green Infrastructure								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation				Commentary/ explanation				
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	++	++	++	- -	- -	- -	Investment in green infrastructure can lead to better management of land, supporting ecosystem services and biodiversity. Green infrastructure can help reverse habitat fragmentation and provide a range of habitats through which species can move.	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green infrastructure networks can support ecosystems and provide corridors for wildlife.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Green infrastructure can provide a number of positive benefits. It can facilitate the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which can reduce the need for hard engineering and provide a natural solution to store water and reduce flood risk; trees and other plants can remove a wide range of air borne pollutants; Trees can also reduce the leaching of pollutants to ground water helping to reduce pollution in watercourses.	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Sustainable urban drainage systems can be integrated into green infrastructure networks.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	- -	- -	- -	Green infrastructure can improve access to leisure and recreational activities, although probably can only play a minor role in improving access to key services and jobs. Green infrastructure does have the potential does have the ability to bring people together and achieve social cohesion e.g. community gardens and allotments can bring people together and improve attitudes.	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Well planned green infrastructure networks enhance the quality of place both in terms of design and also being integrated with the provision of pedestrian and cycleway linkages.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	0	0	0	As for the above objective, green infrastructure can encourage community ownership and participation depending on the type of project being undertaken. However it is unlikely to have a strong link in tackling worklessness.	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would be neutral overall.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	-	-	-	There may sometimes be instances where green infrastructure can contribute to energy efficiency in building or making efficient use of natural resources, overall the impact is considered to be neutral.	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green infrastructure can assist in making efficient use of natural resources.
13. Waste.	X	X	X	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	No relationship identified
14. Climate Change.	+	++	++	-	- -	- -	Green infrastructure can benefit climate change adaptation and mitigation in a number of ways. Trees can have benefits for local climate regulation, including cooling and sheltering. Green space in urban areas can be effective in reducing surface temperatures. Green cover can also be effective in helping to reduce surface run off. Green infrastructure is now being implemented in many countries and a contribution by Hartlepool can go towards tackling global sustainability issues.	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Sustainable urban drainage systems can be integrated into green infrastructure networks. Managing flood risk is an important aspect of mitigating the effects of climate change. Trees can have benefits for local climate regulation.
15. Futurity.	+	++	++	-	- -	- -	A well planned multi-functional green infrastructure network should be able to cater for changing needs and be responsive to different situations	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. A well planned multi-functional green infrastructure network should be able to cater for changing needs and be responsive to different situations.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE2 Green Infrastructure						
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)			
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
Commentary/ explanation						
Conclusions and Recommendations						
<p>Conclusions: This policy provides a number of significant benefits towards achieving sustainable development, particularly in enhancing the quality of the built and natural environment, creating habitats and improving biodiversity, and helping to meet the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Recommendations: Consideration should be given to strengthening the links between high quality green infrastructure and good design of new developments, and ensuring that sufficient green space is provided as part of new developments.</p>						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, education and skills, health, housing, transport, built and natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity, water, air and soil pollution, liveability and place, energy efficiency and natural resources, climate change and futurity.						

Policy: NE3 Green wedges								
Date: 31 st March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off				
	Timescale			Timescale				
	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Commentary/ explanation								
1. Economy.	+	+	++	The provision of and enhancement of green wedges will assist in making the overall Hartlepool environment more attractive which could attract investment and tourism. Some limited jobs may be created in maintenance and management, but there is not a significant link to diversify the economy and create a range of sustainable jobs. Green wedges can have benefits to physical and mental health and thus may reduce social deprivation. Benefits are likely to strengthen over time as the wedges become more established.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green wedges can assist in creating an environment in which people want to live and work. It creates a context for inward investment by enhancing the image of an area.
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The provision of and enhancement of green wedges can assist in providing spaces for learning and development. There are links to better physical and mental health which in turn can improve levels of educational attainment.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green Wedges can assist in providing spaces for learning and development.
3. Health.	+	+	++	The provision of and enhancement of green wedges can assist in improving physical and mental health, the benefits are likely to increase as the wedges flourish and become more established. Recommendation – to ensure benefits are forthcoming from an early stage then the policy should set out that the green wedges should be developed from the early stages and not developed during the final years of construction.	-	-	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green wedges can contribute to better air quality and to physical and mental health and wellbeing.
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	Often areas of green space can be prone to crime and anti social behaviour if they are not maintained and managed effectively. Although the policy will not specifically increase crime levels etc. if the spaces are	0	0	0	Neutral overall when considered against the objective criteria.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE3 Green wedges							
Date: 31 st March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)				
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off			
	Timescale			Timescale			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Commentary/ explanation				Commentary/ explanation			
							<p>not designed properly then there could be negative impacts.</p> <p>Recommendation - To ensure this policy is more positive a cross reference to the safety and security policy should be made. Reference to maintaining and developing the green wedges should also be included within the policy.</p>
5. Housing.	+	+	+	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green wedges assist in making the new residential areas and existing residential areas more desirable, bringing green spaces into the urban area and creating a green link to the countryside.
6. Transport.	+	+	++	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green infrastructure networks can assist in providing a context for the provision of pedestrian and cycleway linkages.
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	++	-	-	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green wedges provide multiple benefits including visual relief by bringing a perception of the countryside into urban areas, assisting in protecting the individual identities of settlements and providing wildlife and pedestrian and cycleway corridors.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	+	+	++	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green Wedges can support ecosystems and provide corridors for wildlife.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	++	++	++	-	-	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green wedges can assist with flood alleviation.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE3 Green wedges								
Date: 31 st March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Steven Carter (Health Improvement) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
10. Liveability and Place.	++	++	++	The enhancement of and additional green wedges will bring a multitude of benefits to residents, the wedges can provide links to services and facilities, they are a leisure destination in themselves. They assist with physical and mental health and they provide spaces for social interaction. The wedges will assist in ensuring Hartlepool is a desirable place to live.	--	--	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Green Wedges provide multiple benefits which enhance liveability and place including visual relief by bringing a perception of the countryside into urban areas, physical and mental health benefits and providing places for social interaction.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship but the assessors note that social deprivation could be improved and social cohesion could improve but overall there is not a strong enough link therefore overall when comparing the policy to the SA criteria there is deemed to be no relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship.	x	x	x	No relationship identified
14. Climate Change.	++	++	++	The green wedges that exist already act as a carbon sink and as a form of flood alleviation so they are already meeting many aims of the SA objective. Adding three more wedges to the borough will assist in achieving these aims even further.	-	-	-	Sustainable urban drainage systems can be integrated into Green wedges. Managing flood risk is an important aspect of mitigating the effects of climate change. Trees can have benefits for local climate regulation.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The enhancement of and provision of an additional three green wedges will bring many benefits to existing residents and visitors along with future generations. The wedges will not restrict future choices to any significant degree, it will not be allowable to build homes etc. on the wedges but there is sufficient land within the borough to allow home building for many more generations without the need to build on the green wedges.	-	-	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. It is important for the needs of today and the choices of future generations that Green Wedges and the multiple associated benefits they bring are protected.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: overall the policy does what it is intended to do and is positive where expected and will assist in making Hartlepool a better place to live, work and play. Some recommendations to improve the policy are set out below, if the recommendations are made then assessors consider that the policy would score more positively.</p> <p>Recommendations: Put in a positive first line to the policy i.e. the borough Council will seek to protect, maintain and increase the number of green wedges within the borough so that they remain or can serve a multifunction of benefits to the borough. Link the new green wedges to the relevant housing policy i.e High Tunstall, Wynyard and SWE. Put in a link to the safety and security policy, specifically relating the design of the new wedges Add in a requirement to maintain the new green wedges and that the wedges should be developed in the short to medium term to get some of the benefits early on in the development.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, education and skills, health, housing, transport built and natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity, water, air and soil pollution, liveability and place, climate change and futurity.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE4 Ecological Networks								
Date: 1 st April 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Graham Megson (Ecologist) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Ecological networks can assist in creating an environment in which people want to live and work. It creates a context for inward investment by enhancing the image of an area.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	Overall no links but the assessors note the slight positive as ecological sites have opportunities for learning but this policy does not draw reference to it. If it provides a location for learning it can increase educational opportunities and overall attainment.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Ecological networks can provide a resource for schools and colleges.
3. Health.	+	+	+	Indirect health and wellbeing benefits as people may choose to get involved in green spaces and ecology which improves physical activity opportunities. Policy should assist in increasing appropriate access to the countryside as the networks develop. The policy does not promote interaction but it enables it. Indirect link to improving levels of social deprivation.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Ecological networks provide physical recreation opportunities with associated physical and mental health and wellbeing benefits.
4. Safety and Security.	x	x	x	Networks are likely to run through the urban area where they are more accessible and an increase in people using the networks could increase crime/ fear of crime thus safety and security considerations are important. The safety and security policy would ensure new development has regard to this. Not essential that the policy has the cross reference but it could to make developers aware of what is essential to consider i.e. ensuring that shrubs do not hamper visibility lines etc.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
5. Housing.	+	+	+	New development should improve and enhance the ecological networks which should increase access to open space within development especially where networks go through new housing areas. Previously developed land is often richer than Greenfield land for biodiversity and this policy could therefore discourage point 1.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Ecological networks can assist in making the new residential areas and existing residential areas more desirable, bringing green spaces into the urban area and creating a green link to the countryside.
6. Transport.	x	x	x	If networks are not designed with public safety in mind and are not overlooked, then there could be an increase in crime and fear of crime. Safety and security policy covers this, but adding in the cross reference may be beneficial. Not all networks are continuous - some species will 'hop' between 'islands' of habitat but other animals will not as they require a fully connected link. HBC will aim to get a comprehensive link, but often there will be breaks so people may not use the networks for transport options. If people use the network it will reduce the need to travel by less sustainable methods. Overall no relationship but note that there may be increased cycling and walking opportunities along the network.	x	x	x	No relationship identified
7. Built and Natural	++	++	++	The policy allows for numerous benefits especially if network runs through areas of	--	--	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE4 Ecological Networks								
Date: 1 st April 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Graham Megson (Ecologist) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Date: 13 th July 2017			Appraisers: Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy), Chris Scaife (Heritage & Countryside), Sarah Scarr (Heritage & Countryside)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
Environment.				new development.				impact. There are multiple benefits from ecological networks.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	++	++	++	The policy should lead to an increase in the ecological network, which will significantly protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the borough.	--	--	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. The policy will significantly protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the borough.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	Ecological networks have a variety of habitats which allow the movement of wildlife. SUDS reduce water pollution. Developing ecological networks provides long-term wildlife benefits. The creation of ecology networks increases ecosystem services, (services provided by the natural environments i.e flood alleviation, carbon sink, air purifier.)	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Ecological networks can be integrated with flood alleviation and defence.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Possibly provide better recreation facilities. Sense of place and social cohesion could occur as local residents often get involved in nature conservation activities.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Opportunities to get involved in nature conservation activities can be positive for social cohesion
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	Sense of place and social cohesion could occur as local residents often get involved in nature conservation activities.	x	x	x	No relationship identified
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified
14. Climate Change.	+	+	+	The ecological network can offer many climate change mitigation benefits, such as acting as carbon sink and providing flood alleviation measures.	-	-	-	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. Flood alleviation measures such as SUDS can be integrated into ecological networks.
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The policy seeks to create an ecological network, the policy will allow for this without preventing the choices of future generations. Existing and future generations should benefit from the enhanced ecological network across the borough.	-	-	--	Assessors considered that the loss of the policy would have a negative impact. There are multiple benefits for current and future generations accruing from ecological networks.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: overall the policy will assist in creating a better ecological network across the borough which will bring a wide range of benefits to the borough. These include allowing wildlife to move through the wider countryside in response to changing climatic conditions and in providing ecosystem services. .</p> <p>Recommendations: Not essential that the policy is cross referenced with the safety and security policy, but it could to make developers aware of what is essential to consider i.e ensuring that structure planting etc. does not hamper 'natural' surveillance.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Not having the policy would have negative impacts for economy, education and skills, health, housing, built and natural environment, biodiversity and geodiversity, water, air and soil pollution, liveability and place, climate change and futurity.								

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE5 Playing Pitches									
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)						
Date: 14 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)						
SA objectives	Policy On						Policy Off		
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
1. Economy.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	Subject to agreements being reached between pitch owners and local schools and education establishments	-	-	-	Absence of policy could result in fewer playing fields available which would have a negative impact on physical education.	
3. Health.	+	+	+	Implementation of the policy will provide obvious benefits in terms of promoting healthier lifestyles, providing local play provision and promoting the use of existing facilities. It will not improve access to public services and health facilities.	-	-	-	The absence of this policy would limit opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles, would fail to provide quality green space and would not promote the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation or help to reduce health inequalities.	
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	Neutral overall, although it should be noted that local football matches can create their own set of problems, including anti-social behaviour compared with other types of grass sports.	0	0	0	Neutral overall, however failure to provide adequate recreational spaces may lead to increased anti-social behaviour.	
5. Housing.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
6. Transport.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Marginally positive – playing pitches form part of the green infrastructure network and can contribute to the overall landscape/townscape and environmental quality. The policy also seeks to ensure that sufficient playing pitch space is provided to serve new developments.	-	-	-	The absence of this policy will likely result in fewer green spaces that would otherwise contribute positively to the built and natural environment.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	0	0	0	Overall will not benefit or have a negative impact on biodiversity.	0	0	0	Whilst there is a relationship this is not considered to be significant.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	0	0	0	Neutral overall although there may be minor positive benefits in reducing flood risk as playing fields may be able to hold and store surface water for a time.	0	0	0	The absence of the policy may result in increased flooding through fewer green spaces however not considered a significant link.	
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	The policy will improve access to recreational facilities and there will be opportunities for communities to be involved in management and running of facilities, helping to promote social cohesion	-	-	-	Failing to protect playing pitches will reduce access to leisure and recreation activities. This would be detrimental to instilling a sense of place and community and would reduce participation and engagement.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	The policy can lead to increased opportunities for involving local communities and improving participation.	-	-	-	Failing to protect playing pitches will reduce access to leisure and recreation activities. This would be detrimental to instilling a sense of place and community and would reduce participation and engagement.	
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
13. Waste.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	X	X	X	No relationship identified.	
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Overall neutral although as noted for objective 9 there is some potential to reduce flood risk through holding surface water.	0	0	0	Overall neutral although as noted for objective 9 there is some potential for increased flood risk without policy. Ensuring adequate facilities are well located to address need will also make communities more sustainable.	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE5 Playing Pitches								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 14 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
15. Futurity.	+	+	+	The playing pitch policy, and the supporting playing pitch strategy, should be flexible enough to respond to changing needs and circumstances.	-	-	-	The failure to protect playing pitches will restrict the opportunities for leisure and recreation for future generations.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions: The playing pitch policy provides a number of sustainability benefits and meets the needs of a wide cross section of the Hartlepool community.</p> <p>Recommendations: None.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:								
Doing nothing in this instance could result in the loss of playing fields to other uses which could restrict opportunities for leisure and recreation, this would make areas less sustainable and is likely to have a detrimental impact on the physical appearance and liveability of the town, education and skills and public health in particular.								

Policy: NE6 Protection of Amenity open space								
Date: 31 st March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Graham Megson (Ecologist) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Date: 14 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
2. Education and Skills.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
3. Health.	x	x	x	No relationship overall but assessors note that there could be a possible link if land is incorporated into garden thus give more space for physical activity or if land is incorporated into a gym or nursery and thus more space for physical activity.	-	-	-	Failing to protect incidental open space will result in less opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles and for open-air recreation. Free and publicly accessible open space can help to reduce poverty and health inequalities.
4. Safety and Security.	+	++	++	<p>If pockets of unsightly land that are prone to anti social behaviour are converted to garden or within commercial curtilage then there is a potential to create cleaner and safer environments.</p> <p>Policy should allow for improvements over time, as unsightly space is removed for better uses and compensation should see improvements elsewhere in the borough.</p>	0	0	0	Not considered to be a significant link between absence of the protection of incidental open space and safety and security. Well maintained or enhanced open spaces will encourage more usage and increase natural surveillance/discourage anti-social behaviour, not emphasising protection of these spaces or their enhancement through developer contributions may therefore have implications.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE6 Protection of Amenity open space									
Date: 31 st March 2016				Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Graham Megson (Ecologist) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Date: 14 th July 2017				Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On					Policy Off			
	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation	
	S	M	L		S	M	L		
5. Housing.	+	+	+	<p>Policy only relates to green spaces.</p> <p>Often these areas of space are within the urban limits which are often deemed to be in sustainable locations.</p> <p>Policy does not specifically link to the provision of new homes, but if the land is used for home building for general market housing, affordable homes and or care homes then the policy allows for the positive link.</p> <p>Overall positive because of the typical location of spaces and the potential uses.</p>	0	0	0	<p>Neutral overall, it is considered the absence of the policy may result in less incidental open space in existing communities which could affect their sustainability and restrict access to open space however the policy does not relate directly to or reference housing.</p>	
6. Transport.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	Loss of incidental open space may require people to travel further for leisure/recreation however not considered a significant relationship to transport	
7. Built and Natural Environment.	+	+	+	Overall the policy is positive as it allows for often unsightly areas to be put to better use thus ensuring that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable.	--	--	--	The failure to protect incidental open space would be detrimental to the character and local distinctiveness of the area's townscapes and streetscapes and is likely to have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the Borough's heritage assets.	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	The absence of this policy is likely to result in less open/green space which can be of biodiversity value.	
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	x	x	x	Overall no relationship however assessors do advise that the policy is improved to restrict built development in some instances. This is common practice now and can assist in ensuring flood mitigation and/or visual amenity remains.	x	x	x	Not considered a significant link however failing to protect incidental open green space may increase flood risk	
10. Liveability and Place.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Failing to protect open space will be detrimental to an area's character, this will damage sense of place and community ownership and provide fewer opportunities for community participation and engagement and social cohesion. The absence of the policy is also likely to restrict access to leisure and recreational activities.	
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	-	-	-	Failing to protect open space will be detrimental to an area's character, this will damage sense of place and community ownership and provide fewer opportunities for community participation and engagement and social cohesion.	
12. Energy Efficiency and	+	+	+	Potential to use land more efficiently, as land may not serve a purpose at present,	0	0	0	Whilst it is acknowledged there may be a link between the efficient use of land	

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE6 Protection of Amenity open space								
Date: 31 st March 2016			Appraisers: Helen Williams (Planning Policy), Graham Megson (Ecologist) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Date: 14 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
Natural Resources.				also land is often in sustainable locations and thus using this land first could prevent land being used beyond the urban limits.				and the absence of a policy protecting incidental open space, this is not considered to be significant.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	0	0	0	Overall the policy is neutral as it all depends on what the land is re used for and if it's existing benefits are removed. The compensation element of this policy is key to ensuring that benefits are brought forward and if another parcel of land is provided or improved then there could be climate change benefits. The recommendation relating to no built development in some instance could be key to ensuring that flood alleviation measures remain in place.	0	0	0	Overall the policy is neutral as it all depends on what the land is re used for and if the existing benefits are removed. Noted that loss of incidental open space may contribute to greater flood risk and restricting access to open space for residents may increase travel and therefore emissions.
15. Futurity.	0	0	0	Policy has no real positive or negative on the future of the borough. It has the potential to put land into better use but as a whole it is considered neutral when read alongside the SA objective.	-	-	-	It is considered that the absence of this policy would be detrimental to future generations in terms of its negative impact on the built and natural environment and the restriction of choices for future generations in terms of access to spaces for recreation and leisure activities.
Conclusions and Recommendations								
<p>Conclusions Overall the policy relates to a specific aim, which is to allow underused, unsightly and/or unattractive land to be put to better use. The policy has positive relationships where it should but in many instances there is no relationship between the policy and the SA objectives. The lack of relationship is not negative and overall the policy still does what it should and should allow for benefits across the borough.</p> <p>Recommendations: add in a paragraph to state that in some instances a condition may be imposed that restricts built development.</p>								
Additional Comments following SA assessment of 'do nothing option':								
Doing nothing in this instance would likely result in the loss of areas of incidental open space to other uses which could restrict opportunities for leisure and recreation and would have a significant detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the urban area, this could contribute to making areas less sustainable and is likely to have a detrimental impact on liveability, biodiversity, public health and equity, diversity, equality and participation in particular.								

Policy: NE7 Landscaping along main transport corridors								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 14 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
1. Economy.	+	+	+	There is evidence to show that there is a link between green infrastructure and decisions of companies to locate in a particular area. Green infrastructure can provide a context for inward investment, enhancing the image of an area. Poor perceptions can be a barrier and environmental improvements	0	0	0	Link in terms of deterring investment by not investing adequately in the appearance of approaches into the town however not considered to be significant.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE7 Landscaping along main transport corridors							
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)				
Date: 14 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)				
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off		
	Timescale				Timescale		
	S	M	L		S	M	L
				can improve perceptions. If green infrastructure can play a part in encouraging new investment this will lead to new businesses, more jobs and a diversified economy.			
2. Education and Skills.	+	+	+	The many different elements of green infrastructure mean that there will be enhanced opportunities for education and learning. Schools and other educational establishments can get involved in the management of green space to use as an educational resource on the local environment and develop environmental related skills.	x	x	x
3. Health.	++	++	++	The positive links between green infrastructure and health & well-being have been well documented. Green infrastructure can provide opportunities for exercise, reducing stress levels leading to better mental health, and contribute to better air quality and therefore reduced incidence of respiratory illness. Better footpaths and cycleways associated with green infrastructure can enhance access opportunities.	0	0	0
4. Safety and Security.	0	0	0	Neutral overall as depends to a large extent on perceptions.	x	x	x
5. Housing.	+	+	+	If considered at the outset as an integral part of housing development green infrastructure can contribute positively to a number of aspects of successful housing including a high quality environment, adequate formal and informal open space, and encourage good design.	x	x	x
6. Transport.	+	+	+	Green infrastructure can contribute to a sustainable transport system by potentially improving access to key services and facilities, providing alternatives to the use of the car through safe and attractive walking and cycling routes, encourage more use of existing facilities, and contribute to better air quality as a consequence of reduced car use.	0	0	0
7. Built and Natural Environment.	++	++	++	Green infrastructure is part of a mix of factors that contribute to the quality of the built and natural environment. A good quality, well-planned green infrastructure network will enhance the Borough's townscape and streetscape, enhance the character and setting of historic and cultural assets, provide enhanced opportunities for access to natural and built assets, and provide an attractive physical environment. The policy could benefit by stressing more strongly the relationship between high quality green space and the need for complementary good design, and also to stress the need for adequate multi-functional green space as part of new developments.	-	-	-

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE7 Landscaping along main transport corridors								
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)					
Date: 14 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)					
SA objectives	Policy On			Commentary/ explanation	Policy Off			
	Timescale				Timescale			
	S	M	L		S	M	L	
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity.	++	++	++	Investment in green infrastructure can lead to better management of land, supporting ecosystem services and biodiversity. Green infrastructure can help reverse habitat fragmentation and provide a range of habitats through which species can move.	-	-	-	The policy encourages landscaping and tree planting along main routes which would be of biodiversity value and this could be lost with the absence of the policy however given its limited parameters it is not considered this impact would be significant.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution.	+	+	+	Green infrastructure can provide a number of positive benefits. It can facilitate the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which can reduce the need for hard engineering and provide a natural solution to store water and reduce flood risk; trees and other plants can remove a wide range of air borne pollutants; Trees can also reduce the leaching of pollutants to ground water helping to reduce pollution in watercourses.	-	-	-	Given the ability of trees and planting to remove air borne pollutants and reduce leaching of pollutants into the ground water, and considering that the policy relates specifically to main transport corridors, and roads in particular, that are a significant source of pollution, it is considered the absence of this policy would be detrimental to water, air and soil pollution.
10. Liveability and Place.	+	+	+	Green infrastructure can improve access to leisure and recreational activities, although probably can only play a minor role in improving access to key services and jobs. Green infrastructure does have the potential to bring people together and achieve social cohesion e.g. community gardens and allotments can bring people together and improve attitudes.	0	0	0	It is considered that the absence of the policy may have an impact on sense of place as landscaping can often provide an attractive entrance to urban areas however it is not considered to be significantly related to liveability.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation-	+	+	+	As for the above objective, green infrastructure can encourage community ownership and participation depending on the type of project being undertaken. However it is unlikely to have a strong link in tackling worklessness.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources.	0	0	0	There may sometimes be instances where green infrastructure can contribute to energy efficiency in building or making efficient use of natural resources, overall the impact is considered to be neutral.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
13. Waste.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.	x	x	x	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change.	+	++	++	Green infrastructure can benefit climate change adaptation and mitigation in a number of ways. Trees can have benefits for local climate regulation, including cooling and sheltering. Green space in urban areas can be effective in reducing surface temperatures. Green cover can also be effective in helping to reduce surface run off. Green infrastructure is now being implemented in many countries and a contribution by Hartlepool can go towards tackling global sustainability issues.	0	0	0	It is considered that there is a relationship with the climate change objective and this policy with respect to pollution and flood risk however this is not considered to be significant.
15. Futurity.	+	++	++	A well planned multi-functional green infrastructure network should be able to cater for changing needs and be responsive to different situations	-	-	-	It is considered the absence of this policy would be detrimental to future generations in terms of creating an attractive built/natural environment and entrance to the town.

Appendix 1 – Updated Sustainability Appraisal including ‘do nothing’ appraisal

Policy: NE7 Landscaping along main transport corridors						
Date: 29 th March 2016			Appraisers: Malcolm Steele (Planning Policy), Zoe Rickelton (Sports & Recreation) and Richard Harlanderson (Parks & Countryside)			
Date: 14 th July 2017			Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Jane Tindall (Development Control), Karen Kelly (Housing Services)			
SA objectives	Policy On			Policy Off		
	Timescale			Timescale		
	S	M	L	S	M	L
	Commentary/ explanation			Commentary/ explanation		
Conclusions and Recommendations						
<p>Conclusions: This policy provides a number of significant benefits towards achieving sustainable development, particularly in enhancing the quality of the built and natural environment, creating habitats and improving biodiversity, and helping to meet the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Recommendations: Consideration should be given to strengthening the links between high quality green infrastructure and good design of new developments, and ensuring that sufficient green space is provided as part of new developments.</p>						
Additional Comments following SA assessment of ‘do nothing option’:						
The absence of this policy would fail to improve the appearance of approaches into the town and could result in deterioration in the quality of the built/natural environment. This could also have negative implications for pollution and biodiversity and to a lesser extent may harm the local economy by dissuading investment.						

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

--	Move away significantly	-	Move away marginally	+	Move towards marginally	++	Move towards significantly	0	Neutral	?	Uncertain	X	No Relationship
----	-------------------------	---	----------------------	---	-------------------------	----	----------------------------	---	---------	---	-----------	---	-----------------

Policy being appraised: CC4 Alternative 1 (Brenda Road only)												
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)												
Appraised: 20 th July 2017												
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation							
		ST	MT	LT								
1. Economy. To encourage strong, diverse and stable economy.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage and support the establishment and development of inward investment companies? Will it encourage new start business? Will it provide a range of quality sustainable jobs? Will it diversify the local economy? Will it diversify the rural economy? Will it improve the viability and vitality of town and local centres? Will it reduce levels of deprivation? 	+	+	+	The policy is supportive of the renewable industry and supply chain businesses. Having a policy which is supportive of wind turbine development in certain areas may attract energy companies to locate / choose sites in Hartlepool for their turbines and create jobs in the construction and maintenance of the turbines. As this alternative option only includes one site rather than both that are considered capable of accommodating turbines, the economic benefits will be lessened, albeit still present.							
2. Education and Skills. To enable all children and young people to achieve their full potential and to maximise the education and skills levels of Hartlepool Residents.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it contribute to the development of new and improved education facilities? Will it encourage lifelong learning and training to meet the workforce needs of local contractors and other major employers from local sources? Will it increase the levels of attainment and participation in education? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.							
3. Health. To improve the health and well-being of the Hartlepool community.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to public services and health facilities? Will it provide opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles? Will it provide local play provision, parks and quality green space and increase access to the countryside? Will it promote the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation? Will it reduce poverty and health inequalities? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.							
4. Safety and Security. To create safer and cleaner community, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it create safer and cleaner communities? Will it reduce crime, violence, disorder and anti-social behaviour? Will it help to ensure residents are kept safe in the event of a fire? Will it contribute to maintaining and keeping clean public areas? Will it reduce the perception of crime and allow communities to safely access all areas? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.							

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Policy being appraised: CC4 Alternative 1 (Brenda Road only)					
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>5. Housing. To ensure Hartlepool residents have access to decent, good quality, affordable homes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote the re-use of previously developed land? Will it help to ensure the balance of supply and demand in the housing stock is met in sustainable locations? Will it help to ensure that Hartlepool residents have access to a choice of good quality housing in sustainable communities across tenures that meets their needs and aspirations? Will it encourage improvements in homes to meet and exceed the 'decent homes standard'? Will it provide increased access to open space for residents within Hartlepool? Will it meet the housing needs of vulnerable people? Will it encourage high quality design and sufficient open space in new developments? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
<p>6. Transport. To help develop high quality, integrated, accessible and safe transport system.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce the transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care? Will it support the location of new development and provision of services that reduces the need to travel? Will it reduce the incidence and severity of personal injury road crashes? Will it increase personal safety and security whilst travelling? Will it encourage more sustainable modes of travel, especially in urban areas? Will it maintain, improve and make more efficient use of the existing transport network? Will it control and maintain local air quality and seek to reduce transport emissions that contribute to climate change? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
<p>7. Built and Natural Environment. To protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of Hartlepool's rural, urban and historic environment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline? Will it prevent urban development encroaching and/or occurring in the countryside. Will it enhance the quality, character and setting of Hartlepool's designated Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, historic parks, gardens, scheduled ancient monuments, none designated heritage assets and areas of archaeological interest? Will it enhance or increase access to these natural and cultural assets? Will it be of detriment to surrounding landscape and open space? 	+	+	+	By being specific about the area that is suitable, the policy alternative helps to protect the distinctiveness of the rest of the countryside and helps to protect designated heritage assets. As this policy alternative does not include the High Volts site, this would perform better against this criteria as High Volts is the more sensitive of the two sites given its countryside location. However it is noted the evidence base stated that the landscape in both the High Volts and Brenda Road areas could accommodate additional wind turbines regardless.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Policy being appraised: CC4 Alternative 1 (Brenda Road only)					
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
	6. Will it help to ensure that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable? 7. Will it encourage high quality design? 8. Will it provide sufficient open space in new developments? 9. Will it improve Green Infrastructure within Hartlepool and adjacent Boroughs?				
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity. To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.	1. Will it preserve or enhance the quality of Nature Conservation Sites within Hartlepool? 2. Will it improve access to these nature conservation sites? 3. Will it protect habitats and priority species? 4. Will it improve or enhance ecological networks.	+	+	+	The policy alternative helps to ensure key habitats are protected from negative impacts of development. Fewer turbines will have less of an impact.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution. To improve and or retain the quality of watercourses, air quality and soil quality. To achieve sustainable use of water resources.	1. Will it help to achieve sustainable use of water resources? 2. Will it protect or improve and monitor local air quality? 3. Will it minimise atmospheric, noise, land, soil and water pollution? 4. Will it protect or improve the quality of controlled waters? 5. Will it improve infrastructure such as coastal defences? 6. Will it prevent and/or reduce the risk of local flooding?	+	+	+	The policy alternative helps to protect air quality through minimising the need for the use of fossil fuels and ultimately through helping fight climate change will help to prevent flooding. The benefits of encouraging wind turbine development will be reduced with a smaller allocation at Brenda Road only.
10. Liveability and Place. To create and sustain liveable places, promoting sustainable lifestyles and social cohesion.	1. Will it improve accessibility and quality of key services and facilities and improve access to jobs? 2. Will it provide sufficient retail facilities for local people? 3. Will it improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities? 4. Will it create and sustain a vibrant and diverse community and promote a sense of place? 5. Will it promote social cohesion?	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation- To promote strong and inclusive communities	1. Will it promote social inclusion and tackle worklessness? 2. Will it help to reduce deprivation and ensure no group of people are disadvantaged? 3. Will it encourage stronger socially inclusive communities? 4. Will it increase community cohesion? 5. Will it create community ownership, participation and engagement?	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources. To minimise energy use and support renewable	1. Will it minimise energy use through sustainable, efficient and effective use of buildings and land? 2. Will it support or promote the increasing use of renewable energy resources in environmentally acceptable locations? 3. Will it reduce demand for natural resources?	+	+	+	The policy supports the use of renewable energy generation in environmentally acceptable locations and will reduce the demand for natural resources over the plan period. However, this alternative reduces the number of sites/turbines and as such the benefits will be reduced.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Policy being appraised: CC4 Alternative 1 (Brenda Road only)					
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
energy production and encourage the prudent use of natural resources.	4. Will it encourage the prudent and efficient use of natural resources?				
13. Waste. To minimise the production of waste and to maximise opportunities for recycling.	1. Will it minimise the generation of household and commercial waste? 2. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with as close to the source as feasible? 3. Will it maximise the opportunities for recycling waste materials? 4. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with in a sustainable manner? 5. Does it make provision for an adequate supply of minerals?	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change. To address the causes of climate change and minimise emissions of greenhouse gasses.	1. Will it encourage prudent use of natural resources? 2. Will it lead to a reduction in CO ₂ e emissions? 3. Will it assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change? 4. Will it increase emphasis on the issue of climate change and global warming effects, such as rising sea levels and the impact of additional development? 5. Will it ensure that flood management takes a sustainable approach? 6. Will it reduce the risk of flooding? 7. Will it tackle global sustainability issues?	+	+	+	Through encouraging renewable energy generation the policy will promote the prudent use of natural resources and in turn will lead to reduction in emissions and will help in the fight against climate change. This alternative policy however reduces the number of turbines overall and as such will be less positive with respect to the climate change objective, albeit still moving towards overall.
15. Futurity. To ensure that development that meets the needs of today should not restrict choices and opportunities for future generations	1. Will its outcomes be detrimental to future generations? 2. Will it restrict the choices of future generations?	+	+	+	The environmental benefits the policy could result in will be beneficial to current and future generations however this alternative policy approach would lessen these benefits by reducing the scale of renewable energy development across the Borough over the plan period.
Conclusions This policy alternative to emerging policy CC4 would see the omission of the proposed additional turbines at High Volts with just a single allocation at Brenda Road for 4 turbines. Whilst this may result in a lesser impact on a number of sustainability appraisal objectives such as the built and natural environment and biodiversity, the reduction in the scale of renewable energy development across the Borough over the plan period would prevent part of the Borough that has been assessed as suitable for wind turbine development (High Volts) from being used for this purpose and ultimately lessen the effectiveness of the policy in addressing climate change and sustainability issues as well as reducing the positive impact on the local economy.					
Recommendation: Do not progress policy alternative.					

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Policy being appraised: CC4 Alternative 1 (High Volts only)					
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>1. Economy. To encourage strong, diverse and stable economy.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage and support the establishment and development of inward investment companies? Will it encourage new start business? Will it provide a range of quality sustainable jobs? Will it diversify the local economy? Will it diversify the rural economy? Will it improve the viability and vitality of town and local centres? Will it reduce levels of deprivation? 	+	+	+	The policy is supportive of the renewable industry and supply chain businesses. Having a policy which is supportive of wind turbine development in certain areas may attract energy companies to locate / choose sites in Hartlepool for their turbines and create jobs in the construction and maintenance of the turbines. As this alternative option only includes one site rather than both that are considered capable of accommodating turbines, the economic benefits will be lessened, albeit still present.
<p>2. Education and Skills. To enable all children and young people to achieve their full potential and to maximise the education and skills levels of Hartlepool Residents.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it contribute to the development of new and improved education facilities? Will it encourage lifelong learning and training to meet the workforce needs of local contractors and other major employers from local sources? Will it increase the levels of attainment and participation in education? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
<p>3. Health. To improve the health and well-being of the Hartlepool community.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to public services and health facilities? Will it provide opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles? Will it provide local play provision, parks and quality green space and increase access to the countryside? Will it promote the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation? Will it reduce poverty and health inequalities? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
<p>4. Safety and Security. To create safer and cleaner community, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it create safer and cleaner communities? Will it reduce crime, violence, disorder and anti-social behaviour? Will it help to ensure residents are kept safe in the event of a fire? Will it contribute to maintaining and keeping clean public areas? Will it reduce the perception of crime and allow communities to safely access all areas? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Policy being appraised: CC4 Alternative 1 (High Volts only)					
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>5. Housing. To ensure Hartlepool residents have access to decent, good quality, affordable homes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote the re-use of previously developed land? Will it help to ensure the balance of supply and demand in the housing stock is met in sustainable locations? Will it help to ensure that Hartlepool residents have access to a choice of good quality housing in sustainable communities across tenures that meets their needs and aspirations? Will it encourage improvements in homes to meet and exceed the 'decent homes standard'? Will it provide increased access to open space for residents within Hartlepool? Will it meet the housing needs of vulnerable people? Will it encourage high quality design and sufficient open space in new developments? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
<p>6. Transport. To help develop high quality, integrated, accessible and safe transport system.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce the transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care? Will it support the location of new development and provision of services that reduces the need to travel? Will it reduce the incidence and severity of personal injury road crashes? Will it increase personal safety and security whilst travelling? Will it encourage more sustainable modes of travel, especially in urban areas? Will it maintain, improve and make more efficient use of the existing transport network? Will it control and maintain local air quality and seek to reduce transport emissions that contribute to climate change? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
<p>7. Built and Natural Environment. To protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of Hartlepool's rural, urban and historic environment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline? Will it prevent urban development encroaching and/or occurring in the countryside. Will it enhance the quality, character and setting of Hartlepool's designated Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, historic parks, gardens, scheduled ancient monuments, none designated heritage assets and areas of archaeological interest? Will it enhance or increase access to these natural and cultural assets? Will it be of detriment to surrounding landscape and open space? 	+	+	+	By being specific about the area that is suitable, the policy alternative helps to protect the distinctiveness of the rest of the countryside and helps to protect designated heritage assets. As this policy alternative does not include the Brenda Road site, this would perform better against this criteria however this would be marginal given the location of the Brenda Road site in an industrial area. However it is noted the evidence base stated that the landscape in both the High Volts and Brenda Road areas could accommodate additional wind turbines regardless.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Policy being appraised: CC4 Alternative 1 (High Volts only)					
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
	6. Will it help to ensure that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable? 7. Will it encourage high quality design? 8. Will it provide sufficient open space in new developments? 9. Will it improve Green Infrastructure within Hartlepool and adjacent Boroughs?				
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity. To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.	1. Will it preserve or enhance the quality of Nature Conservation Sites within Hartlepool? 2. Will it improve access to these nature conservation sites? 3. Will it protect habitats and priority species? 4. Will it improve or enhance ecological networks.	+	+	+	The policy alternative helps to ensure key habitats are protected from negative impacts of development. Fewer turbines will have less of an impact, particularly with the removal of the Brenda Road site given its proximity to the Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar Site.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution. To improve and or retain the quality of watercourses, air quality and soil quality. To achieve sustainable use of water resources.	1. Will it help to achieve sustainable use of water resources? 2. Will it protect or improve and monitor local air quality? 3. Will it minimise atmospheric, noise, land, soil and water pollution? 4. Will it protect or improve the quality of controlled waters? 5. Will it improve infrastructure such as coastal defences? 6. Will it prevent and/or reduce the risk of local flooding?	+	+	+	The policy alternative helps to protect air quality through minimising the need for the use of fossil fuels and ultimately through helping fight climate change will help to prevent flooding. The benefits of encouraging wind turbine development will be reduced with a smaller allocation at High Volts only.
10. Liveability and Place. To create and sustain liveable places, promoting sustainable lifestyles and social cohesion.	1. Will it improve accessibility and quality of key services and facilities and improve access to jobs? 2. Will it provide sufficient retail facilities for local people? 3. Will it improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities? 4. Will it create and sustain a vibrant and diverse community and promote a sense of place? 5. Will it promote social cohesion?	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation- To promote strong and inclusive communities	1. Will it promote social inclusion and tackle worklessness? 2. Will it help to reduce deprivation and ensure no group of people are disadvantaged? 3. Will it encourage stronger socially inclusive communities? 4. Will it increase community cohesion? 5. Will it create community ownership, participation and engagement?	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources. To minimise energy use and support renewable	1. Will it minimise energy use through sustainable, efficient and effective use of buildings and land? 2. Will it support or promote the increasing use of renewable energy resources in environmentally acceptable locations? 3. Will it reduce demand for natural resources?	+	+	+	The policy supports the use of renewable energy generation in environmentally acceptable locations and will reduce the demand for natural resources over the plan period. However, this alternative reduces the number of sites/turbines and as such the benefits will be reduced.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Policy being appraised: CC4 Alternative 1 (High Volts only)

Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)

Appraised: 20th July 2017

Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
energy production and encourage the prudent use of natural resources.	4. Will it encourage the prudent and efficient use of natural resources?				
13. Waste. To minimise the production of waste and to maximise opportunities for recycling.	1. Will it minimise the generation of household and commercial waste? 2. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with as close to the source as feasible? 3. Will it maximise the opportunities for recycling waste materials? 4. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with in a sustainable manner? 5. Does it make provision for an adequate supply of minerals?	X	X	X	No relationship identified.
14. Climate Change. To address the causes of climate change and minimise emissions of greenhouse gasses.	1. Will it encourage prudent use of natural resources? 2. Will it lead to a reduction in CO ₂ e emissions? 3. Will it assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change? 4. Will it increase emphasis on the issue of climate change and global warming effects, such as rising sea levels and the impact of additional development? 5. Will it ensure that flood management takes a sustainable approach? 6. Will it reduce the risk of flooding? 7. Will it tackle global sustainability issues?	+	+	+	Through encouraging renewable energy generation the policy will promote the prudent use of natural resources and in turn will lead to reduction in emissions and will help in the fight against climate change. This alternative policy however reduces the number of turbines overall and as such will be less positive with respect to the climate change objective, albeit still moving towards overall.
15. Futurity. To ensure that development that meets the needs of today should not restrict choices and opportunities for future generations	1. Will its outcomes be detrimental to future generations? 2. Will it restrict the choices of future generations?	+	+	+	The environmental benefits the policy could result in will be beneficial to current and future generations however this alternative policy approach would lessen these benefits by reducing the scale of renewable energy development across the Borough over the plan period.

Conclusions

This policy alternative to emerging policy CC4 would see the omission of the proposed wind turbine allocation at Brenda Road with only a single allocation at High Volts for an additional 3 turbines. Whilst this may result in a lesser impact on a number of sustainability appraisal objectives such as the built and natural environment and biodiversity, the reduction in the scale of renewable energy development across the Borough over the plan period would prevent part of the Borough that has been assessed as suitable for wind turbine development (Brenda Road) from being used for this purpose and ultimately lessen the effectiveness of the policy in addressing climate change and sustainability issues as well as reducing the positive impact on the local economy.

Recommendation: Do not progress policy alternative.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario A (HSG1): Less housing at Wynyard, additional housing at Quarry Farm. Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside) Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>1. Economy. To encourage strong, diverse and stable economy.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage and support the establishment and development of inward investment companies? Will it encourage new start business? Will it provide a range of quality sustainable jobs? Will it diversify the local economy? Will it diversify the rural economy? Will it improve the viability and vitality of town and local centres? Will it reduce levels of deprivation? 	+	+	+	<p>The group in this instance disagreed with the original sustainability appraisal for HSG1 as it is considered new housing will ultimately be beneficial for the economy. As such it is considered scenario A moves towards this objective marginally however this is not as a result of changes to the housing allocation locations but the principle of providing housing sites to meet the housing need generally. It is considered the additional Council Tax receipts, New Homes Bonus and providing homes for workers in sustainable locations will support local businesses and the viability and vitality of town and local centres.</p>
<p>2. Education and Skills. To enable all children and young people to achieve their full potential and to maximise the education and skills levels of Hartlepool Residents.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it contribute to the development of new and improved education facilities? Will it encourage lifelong learning and training to meet the workforce needs of local contractors and other major employers from local sources? Will it increase the levels of attainment and participation in education? 	0	0	0	<p>The group again in this instance disagreed with the original appraisal assessment of 'no relationship'. Whilst the policy does not relate directly to education and skills, it was considered that there is some relationship as the provision of new housing would contribute towards the delivering new and improved education facilities, particularly through planning obligations, albeit this is not significant. This change in the assessment is again not a result of the alternative site allocations, however it should be noted that less housing at Wynyard would be detrimental to the viability and deliverability of education facilities there that would otherwise contribute to the sustainability of the area.</p>
<p>3. Health. To improve the health and well-being of the Hartlepool community.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to public services and health facilities? Will it provide opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles? Will it provide local play provision, parks and quality green space and increase access to the countryside? Will it promote the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation? Will it reduce poverty and health inequalities? 	+	+	+	<p>The provision of more housing on the western edge of the town around Quarry Farm would assist in supporting existing facilities (e.g. University Hospital of Hartlepool) however fewer housing at Wynyard will make the delivery of health and healthcare related services more difficult. Overall however it is considered the new development would be of benefit to health either way.</p>
<p>4. Safety and Security. To create safer and cleaner community, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it create safer and cleaner communities? Will it reduce crime, violence, disorder and anti-social behaviour? Will it help to ensure residents are kept safe in the event of a fire? Will it contribute to maintaining and keeping clean public areas? Will it reduce the perception of crime and allow communities to safely access all areas? 	X	X	X	<p>No relationship identified.</p>

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario A (HSG1): Less housing at Wynyard, additional housing at Quarry Farm. Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside) Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>5. Housing. To ensure Hartlepool residents have access to decent, good quality, affordable homes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote the re-use of previously developed land? Will it help to ensure the balance of supply and demand in the housing stock is met in sustainable locations? Will it help to ensure that Hartlepool residents have access to a choice of good quality housing in sustainable communities across tenures that meets their needs and aspirations? Will it encourage improvements in homes to meet and exceed the 'decent homes standard'? Will it provide increased access to open space for residents within Hartlepool? Will it meet the housing needs of vulnerable people? Will it encourage high quality design and sufficient open space in new developments? 	+	+	+	<p>The policy will allow much needed homes to be built in a variety of locations, at various sale prices, across the Borough.</p> <p>Whilst scenario A would remain positive, this would be reduced as the choice of housing would be more limited (concentrated more to the west of the town) with a greater reliance on one area of the Borough.</p> <p>It is also noted that the proposed allocations at Wynyard are likely to have better access to the countryside and will facilitate green infrastructure improvements, this may be lost/reduced should scenario A be adopted.</p> <p>Scenario A would also reduce the sustainability of development at Wynyard as the provision of highway and community infrastructure would become less viable/deliverable.</p>
<p>6. Transport. To help develop high quality, integrated, accessible and safe transport system.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce the transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care? Will it support the location of new development and provision of services that reduces the need to travel? Will it reduce the incidence and severity of personal injury road crashes? Will it increase personal safety and security whilst travelling? Will it encourage more sustainable modes of travel, especially in urban areas? Will it maintain, improve and make more efficient use of the existing transport network? Will it control and maintain local air quality and seek to reduce transport emissions that contribute to climate change? 	+	+	+	<p>Whilst it is considered scenario A would remain positive with respect to transport, it is noted that road improvements at Wynyard are likely to become less viable with fewer homes and an increased cost per dwelling for new developments.</p> <p>Scenario A would likely make the bypass of Elwick village more viable/deliverable with an increased quantum of development to the west of the town that could contribute to funding the works and reduce the cost per dwelling on new developments.</p> <p>This scenario would reduce transport barriers with respect to new residents to the west of the town accessing existing employment, education, training and healthcare in Hartlepool however would likely limit access to those facilities for Wynyard residents.</p> <p>Scenario A will increase the need to travel for Wynyard residents where community facilities and services are not deliverable and would reduce the instances of cycling/walking as residents are likely to have to travel further afield to access these.</p>
<p>7. Built and Natural Environment. To protect and enhance the</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline? 	0	0	0	<p>Scenario A would extend the town further into the open countryside and Strategic Gap allocation than is proposed which would be detrimental for the character and local</p>

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario A (HSG1): Less housing at Wynyard, additional housing at Quarry Farm. Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside) Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
quality and local distinctiveness of Hartlepool's rural, urban and historic environment.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Will it prevent urban development encroaching and/or occurring in the countryside. 3. Will it enhance the quality, character and setting of Hartlepool's designated Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, historic parks, gardens, scheduled ancient monuments, none designated heritage assets and areas of archaeological interest? 4. Will it enhance or increase access to these natural and cultural assets? 5. Will it be of detriment to surrounding landscape and open space? 6. Will it help to ensure that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable? 7. Will it encourage high quality design? 8. Will it provide sufficient open space in new developments? 9. Will it improve Green Infrastructure within Hartlepool and adjacent Boroughs? 				<p>distinctiveness of the area. This is also likely to restrict access to the countryside further.</p> <p>Land that would have been developed at Wynyard would retain its landscape character however and as such it is considered on balance that Scenario A is neutral with respect to the built and natural environment.</p>
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity. To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it preserve or enhance the quality of Nature Conservation Sites within Hartlepool? 2. Will it improve access to these nature conservation sites? 3. Will it protect habitats and priority species? 4. Will it improve or enhance ecological networks. 	-	-	-	There is the potential to increase access to nature conservation site but there is also the potential for harm to the overall objective. This option has not been assessed through the HRA process. It is also noted that there is a local wildlife site at Quarry Farm which could be detrimentally impacted by an increase in the number of houses in that location.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution. To improve and or retain the quality of watercourses, air quality and soil quality. To achieve sustainable use of water resources.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it help to achieve sustainable use of water resources? 2. Will it protect or improve and monitor local air quality? 3. Will it minimise atmospheric, noise, land, soil and water pollution? 4. Will it protect or improve the quality of controlled waters? 5. Will it improve infrastructure such as coastal defences? 6. Will it prevent and/or reduce the risk of local flooding? 	-	-	-	The policy will result in greater pressure on water resources and the potential for greater surface water runoff in a flood risk context.
10. Liveability and Place. To create and sustain liveable places, promoting sustainable lifestyles and social cohesion.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it improve accessibility and quality of key services and facilities and improve access to jobs? 2. Will it provide sufficient retail facilities for local people? 3. Will it improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities? 4. Will it create and sustain a vibrant and diverse community and promote a sense of place? 5. Will it promote social cohesion? 	-	-	-	Scenario A would reduce the sustainability credentials of Wynyard and this would have a detrimental impact in terms of improving accessibility and quality of key services and facilities, improving access to jobs, providing sufficient retail facilities for local people, improving access to culture, leisure and recreational activities, creating and sustaining a vibrant and diverse community and promoting a sense of place and community cohesion.
11. Equity, Diversity,	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it promote social inclusion and tackle worklessness? 	-	-	-	Less housing would likely result in fewer community facilities at Wynyard which

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario A (HSG1): Less housing at Wynyard, additional housing at Quarry Farm. Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside) Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
Equality and Participation- To promote strong and inclusive communities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it help to reduce deprivation and ensure no group of people are disadvantaged? Will it encourage stronger socially inclusive communities? Will it increase community cohesion? Will it create community ownership, participation and engagement? 				would have a detrimental impact on this objective, resulting in less social cohesion and community ownership and participation.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources. To minimise energy use and support renewable energy production and encourage the prudent use of natural resources.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it minimise energy use through sustainable, efficient and effective use of buildings and land? Will it support or promote the increasing use of renewable energy resources in environmentally acceptable locations? Will it reduce demand for natural resources? Will it encourage the prudent and efficient use of natural resources? 	-	-	-	Scenario A would still result in a significant amount of greenfield development. The policy would result in less travel in terms of town centre to Quarry Farm however more travel in terms of people having to leave Wynyard to access services and facilities.
13. Waste. To minimise the production of waste and to maximise opportunities for recycling.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it minimise the generation of household and commercial waste? Will it ensure that waste is dealt with as close to the source as feasible? Will it maximise the opportunities for recycling waste materials? Will it ensure that waste is dealt with in a sustainable manner? Does it make provision for an adequate supply of minerals? 	-	-	-	Scenario A still results in the generation of waste; however additional housing at Quarry Farm may be closer to where it is dealt with.
14. Climate Change. To address the causes of climate change and minimise emissions of greenhouse gasses.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage prudent use of natural resources? Will it lead to a reduction in CO₂e emissions? Will it assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change? Will it increase emphasis on the issue of climate change and global warming effects, such as rising sea levels and the impact of additional development? Will it ensure that flood management takes a sustainable approach? Will it reduce the risk of flooding? Will it tackle global sustainability issues? 	0	0	0	The policy does not specifically assist in reducing carbon emissions or mitigating against climate change. Scenario A would result in less sustainable travel at Wynyard and to/from Wynyard however this is not considered a significant link.
15. Futurity. To ensure that development that meets the needs of today should not restrict choices and opportunities for future generations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will its outcomes be detrimental to future generations? Will it restrict the choices of future generations? 	0	0	0	More housing at Quarry Farm would make the bypass of Elwick village and other planning obligations more deliverable however less housing at Wynyard will result in less community facilities and infrastructure in that area which would not foster a sustainable community.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario A (HSG1): Less housing at Wynyard, additional housing at Quarry Farm.
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)
Appraised: 20th July 2017

Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	

Conclusions
 It is considered that the detrimental impact on the sustainability of Wynyard as a settlement through the proposals in Scenario A would outweigh the benefits of improving the viability/deliverability of the bypass of Elwick village as the bypass is likely to come forward regardless with grant funding that might be available to improve deliverability irrespective of additional housing at Quarry Farm.

Recommendation: Do not progress policy alternative.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario B (HSG1) – Less housing at Wynyard, addition of Tunstall Farm (2) site. Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside) Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>1. Economy. To encourage strong, diverse and stable economy.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage and support the establishment and development of inward investment companies? Will it encourage new start business? Will it provide a range of quality sustainable jobs? Will it diversify the local economy? Will it diversify the rural economy? Will it improve the viability and vitality of town and local centres? Will it reduce levels of deprivation? 	+	+	+	<p>The group in this instance disagreed with the original sustainability appraisal for HSG1 as it is considered new housing will ultimately be beneficial for the economy. As such it is considered scenario B moves towards this objective marginally however this is not as a result of changes to the housing allocation locations but the principle of providing housing sites to meet the housing need generally. It is considered the additional Council Tax receipts, New Homes Bonus and providing homes for workers in sustainable locations will support local businesses and the viability and vitality of town and local centres.</p>
<p>2. Education and Skills. To enable all children and young people to achieve their full potential and to maximise the education and skills levels of Hartlepool Residents.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it contribute to the development of new and improved education facilities? Will it encourage lifelong learning and training to meet the workforce needs of local contractors and other major employers from local sources? Will it increase the levels of attainment and participation in education? 	0	0	0	<p>The group again in this instance disagreed with the original appraisal assessment of 'no relationship'. Whilst the policy does not relate directly to education and skills, it was considered that there is some relationship as the provision of new housing would contribute towards the delivering new and improved education facilities, particularly through planning obligations, albeit this is not significant. This change in the assessment is again not a result of the alternative site allocations, however it should be noted that less housing at Wynyard would be detrimental to the viability and deliverability of education facilities there that would otherwise contribute to the sustainability of the area.</p>
<p>3. Health. To improve the health and well-being of the Hartlepool community.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to public services and health facilities? Will it provide opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles? Will it provide local play provision, parks and quality green space and increase access to the countryside? Will it promote the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation? Will it reduce poverty and health inequalities? 	-	-	-	<p>Whilst the provision of more housing on the edge of the town would assist in supporting existing facilities, the further development of the Tunstall Farm site would have a detrimental impact on Summerhill Country Park which would have negative implications for promoting healthier lifestyles, providing parks and quality green space, increasing access to the countryside and promoting the use of existing facilities. It is considered this would outweigh any health benefits of the proposal. Furthermore, fewer houses at Wynyard will make the delivery of health and healthcare related services more difficult.</p>
<p>4. Safety and Security. To create safer and cleaner community, reducing crime</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it create safer and cleaner communities? Will it reduce crime, violence, disorder and anti-social behaviour? Will it help to ensure residents are kept safe in the event of a fire? 	X	X	X	<p>No relationship identified.</p>

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario B (HSG1) – Less housing at Wynyard, addition of Tunstall Farm (2) site. Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside) Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
and anti-social behaviour.	4. Will it contribute to maintaining and keeping clean public areas? 5. Will it reduce the perception of crime and allow communities to safely access all areas?				
5. Housing. To ensure Hartlepool residents have access to decent, good quality, affordable homes.	1. Will it promote the re-use of previously developed land? 2. Will it help to ensure the balance of supply and demand in the housing stock is met in sustainable locations? 3. Will it help to ensure that Hartlepool residents have access to a choice of good quality housing in sustainable communities across tenures that meets their needs and aspirations? 4. Will it encourage improvements in homes to meet and exceed the 'decent homes standard'? 5. Will it provide increased access to open space for residents within Hartlepool? 6. Will it meet the housing needs of vulnerable people? 7. Will it encourage high quality design and sufficient open space in new developments?	+	+	+	<p>The policy will allow much needed homes to be built in a variety of locations, at various sale prices, across the Borough.</p> <p>Whilst scenario B would remain positive, this would be reduced as the choice of housing would be more limited (concentrated more to the west of the town) with a greater reliance on one area of the Borough.</p> <p>It is also noted that the proposed allocations at Wynyard are likely to have better access to the countryside and will facilitate green infrastructure improvements, this may be lost/reduced should scenario B be adopted, whilst further development at Tunstall Farm would likely impact on access to open space at Summerhill and in the Green Wedge as a new road from Summerhill Lane to the development site would be needed which would require land from the Summerhill development.</p> <p>Scenario B would also reduce the sustainability of development at Wynyard as the provision of highway and community infrastructure would become less viable/deliverable.</p>

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario B (HSG1) – Less housing at Wynyard, addition of Tunstall Farm (2) site. Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside) Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
6. Transport. To help develop high quality, integrated, accessible and safe transport system.	1. Will it reduce the transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care?				<p>This scenario would reduce transport barriers with respect to new residents to the west of the town accessing existing employment, education, training and healthcare in Hartlepool however would likely limit access to those facilities for Wynyard residents as road improvements at Wynyard are likely to become less viable with fewer homes and an increased cost per dwelling for new developments.</p> <p>Scenario B would likely make the bypass of Elwick village more viable/deliverable with an increased quantum of development to the west of the town that could contribute to funding the works and reduce the cost per dwelling on new developments.</p> <p>However, there are significant highway safety concerns with respect to the access to the Tunstall Farm 2 site as this would likely need to be via Summerhill Lane/Catcote Road. The increased traffic would be significantly detrimental to Catcote Road given this road is already at capacity and would increase personal safety risk and reduce access for those visiting Summerhill Country Park and also of school children access the schools on Catcote road. Notwithstanding this, the land required for the access is within Council ownership and the developers do not have an option on the land which makes the site inaccessible.</p> <p>Scenario B will increase the need to travel for Wynyard residents where community facilities and services are not deliverable and would reduce the instances of cycling/walking as residents are likely to have to travel further afield to access these.</p>
	2. Will it support the location of new development and provision of services that reduces the need to travel?				
	3. Will it reduce the incidence and severity of personal injury road crashes?				
	4. Will it increase personal safety and security whilst travelling?				
	5. Will it encourage more sustainable modes of travel, especially in urban areas?	-	-	-	
	6. Will it maintain, improve and make more efficient use of the existing transport network?				
	7. Will it control and maintain local air quality and seek to reduce transport emissions that contribute to climate change?				
7. Built and Natural Environment. To protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of Hartlepool's rural, urban and historic environment.	1. Will the plan enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline?				<p>Scenario B would extend the urban area of the town into the Green Wedge and would be detrimental to the character of Summerhill Country Park (Green Infrastructure).</p> <p>The proposal would also likely have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Park Conservation Area given its proximity. This would be detrimental to the character and local distinctiveness of the area. This is also likely to restrict access to the countryside further.</p>
	2. Will it prevent urban development encroaching and/or occurring in the countryside.	--	--	--	
	3. Will it enhance the quality, character and setting of Hartlepool's designated Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, historic parks, gardens, scheduled ancient monuments, none designated heritage assets and areas of				

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario B (HSG1) – Less housing at Wynyard, addition of Tunstall Farm (2) site. Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside) Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
	<p>archaeological interest?</p> <p>4. Will it enhance or increase access to these natural and cultural assets?</p> <p>5. Will it be of detriment to surrounding landscape and open space?</p> <p>6. Will it help to ensure that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable?</p> <p>7. Will it encourage high quality design?</p> <p>8. Will it provide sufficient open space in new developments?</p> <p>9. Will it improve Green Infrastructure within Hartlepool and adjacent Boroughs?</p>				It is acknowledged however that land that would have been developed at Wynyard would retain its landscape character, though it is considered this does not outweigh the significant impacts at Summerhill.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity. To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.	<p>1. Will it preserve or enhance the quality of Nature Conservation Sites within Hartlepool?</p> <p>2. Will it improve access to these nature conservation sites?</p> <p>3. Will it protect habitats and priority species?</p> <p>4. Will it improve or enhance ecological networks.</p>	- -	- -	- -	Scenario B would likely restrict access to Summerhill which is a local wildlife site. The development itself is also likely to have a detrimental impact on the LWS near the entrance to Summerhill if access is needed across it. There is therefore harm to the overall objective. This option has not been assessed through the HRA process.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution. To improve and or retain the quality of watercourses, air quality and soil quality. To achieve sustainable use of water resources.	<p>1. Will it help to achieve sustainable use of water resources?</p> <p>2. Will it protect or improve and monitor local air quality?</p> <p>3. Will it minimise atmospheric, noise, land, soil and water pollution?</p> <p>4. Will it protect or improve the quality of controlled waters?</p> <p>5. Will it improve infrastructure such as coastal defences?</p> <p>6. Will it prevent and/or reduce the risk of local flooding?</p>	-	-	-	The policy will result in greater pressure on water resources and the potential for greater surface water runoff in a flood risk context. This is particularly an issue at Quarry Farm 2 where the area has historically suffered from flooding which may be exacerbated by further development. There would also be further impacts on the Green Wedge and Summerhill in terms of noise and disturbance through the urbanisation of the Green Wedge and land adjacent to the County Park.
10. Liveability and Place. To create and sustain liveable places, promoting sustainable lifestyles and social cohesion.	<p>1. Will it improve accessibility and quality of key services and facilities and improve access to jobs?</p> <p>2. Will it provide sufficient retail facilities for local people?</p> <p>3. Will it improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities?</p> <p>4. Will it create and sustain a vibrant and diverse community and promote a sense of place?</p> <p>5. Will it promote social cohesion?</p>	-	-	-	Scenario B would reduce the sustainability credentials of Wynyard and this would have a detrimental impact in terms of improving accessibility and quality of key services and facilities, improving access to jobs, providing sufficient retail facilities for local people, improving access to culture, leisure and recreational activities, creating and sustaining a vibrant and diverse community and promoting a sense of place and community cohesion.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation- To promote strong and inclusive communities	<p>1. Will it promote social inclusion and tackle worklessness?</p> <p>2. Will it help to reduce deprivation and ensure no group of people are disadvantaged?</p> <p>3. Will it encourage stronger socially inclusive communities?</p> <p>4. Will it increase community cohesion?</p> <p>5. Will it create community ownership, participation and engagement?</p>	-	-	-	Less housing would likely result in fewer community facilities at Wynyard which would have a detrimental impact on this objective, resulting in less social cohesion and community ownership and participation.
12. Energy	<p>1. Will it minimise energy use through</p>	-	-	-	Scenario B would still result in a

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario B (HSG1) – Less housing at Wynyard, addition of Tunstall Farm (2) site. Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside) Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
Efficiency and Natural Resources. To minimise energy use and support renewable energy production and encourage the prudent use of natural resources.	<p>sustainable, efficient and effective use of buildings and land?</p> <p>2. Will it support or promote the increasing use of renewable energy resources in environmentally acceptable locations?</p> <p>3. Will it reduce demand for natural resources?</p> <p>4. Will it encourage the prudent and efficient use of natural resources?</p>				significant amount of greenfield development. The policy would result in less travel in terms of town centre to Tunstall Farm however more travel in terms of people having to leave Wynyard to access services and facilities.
13. Waste. To minimise the production of waste and to maximise opportunities for recycling.	<p>1. Will it minimise the generation of household and commercial waste?</p> <p>2. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with as close to the source as feasible?</p> <p>3. Will it maximise the opportunities for recycling waste materials?</p> <p>4. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with in a sustainable manner?</p> <p>5. Does it make provision for an adequate supply of minerals?</p>	-	-	-	Scenario B still results in the generation of waste, however additional housing at Tunstall Farm may be closer to where it is dealt with.
14. Climate Change. To address the causes of climate change and minimise emissions of greenhouse gasses.	<p>1. Will it encourage prudent use of natural resources?</p> <p>2. Will it lead to a reduction in CO₂e emissions?</p> <p>3. Will it assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change?</p> <p>4. Will it increase emphasis on the issue of climate change and global warming effects, such as rising sea levels and the impact of additional development?</p> <p>5. Will it ensure that flood management takes a sustainable approach?</p> <p>6. Will it reduce the risk of flooding?</p> <p>7. Will it tackle global sustainability issues?</p>	0	0	0	The policy does not specifically assist in reducing carbon emissions or mitigating against climate change. Scenario B would result in less sustainable travel at Wynyard and to/from Wynyard. More housing at Tunstall Farm may increase flood risk given history of flooding in the area. Scenario B considered neutral overall with respect to climate change.
15. Futurity. To ensure that development that meets the needs of today should not restrict choices and opportunities for future generations	<p>1. Will its outcomes be detrimental to future generations?</p> <p>2. Will it restrict the choices of future generations?</p>	--	--	--	<p>More housing at Tunstall Farm may make the bypass of Elwick village and other planning obligations more deliverable however less housing at Wynyard will result in less community facilities and infrastructure in that area which would not foster a sustainable community.</p> <p>Scenario B would also result in significant impact on the Green Wedge and Summerhill Country Park and would increase highway safety risk in this area. It is considered the outcome of this option would therefore be significantly detrimental for future generations.</p>

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario B (HSG1) – Less housing at Wynyard, addition of Tunstall Farm (2) site. Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside) Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
Conclusions					
It is considered that the detrimental impact on the sustainability of Wynyard as a settlement through the proposals in Scenario B would outweigh the benefits of improving the viability/deliverability of the bypass of Elwick village as the bypass is likely to come forward regardless with grant funding that might be available to improve deliverability irrespective of additional housing at Tunstall Farm. The impact of more development at Tunstall Farm would also have a significant impact on the Burn Valley Green Wedge, The Local Wildlife Site and Summerhill Country Park which would have negative implications with respect to futurity, the built and natural environment and biodiversity in particular.					
Recommendation: Do not progress policy alternative.					

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario C (HSG1) – - Reduced quantum at High Tunstall and increase South West Extension (SWE)
Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)
Appraised: 21st July 2017

Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>1. Economy. To encourage strong, diverse and stable economy.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage and support the establishment and development of inward investment companies? Will it encourage new start business? Will it provide a range of quality sustainable jobs? Will it diversify the local economy? Will it diversify the rural economy? Will it improve the viability and vitality of town and local centres? Will it reduce levels of deprivation? 	0	0	-	<p>The SW Extension is closer to the Enterprise Zone. High Tunstall has an element of self build which will help diversify the local economy. There is a potential negative impact of only one site being developed rather than two as the benefits of new development would be restricted to only one local area. In addition this scenario would mean that the vast majority of housing was with one developer meaning they would control growth and rates of build out – a wider range of development sites means sites are less likely to stall and would be better for the economy in terms of delivery.</p> <p>Historically new development in the western area has been associated with higher council tax bands. Assessors considered that the scenario would have a negative impact in the long term.</p>
<p>2. Education and Skills. To enable all children and young people to achieve their full potential and to maximise the education and skills levels of Hartlepool Residents.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it contribute to the development of new and improved education facilities? Will it encourage lifelong learning and training to meet the workforce needs of local contractors and other major employers from local sources? Will it increase the levels of attainment and participation in education? 	0	0	0	<p>There is a relationship between the economic viability of development for both sites but it is not clear that either site has an advantage. Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral.</p>
<p>3. Health. To improve the health and well-being of the Hartlepool community.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to public services and health facilities? Will it provide opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles? Will it provide local play provision, parks and quality green space and increase access to the countryside? Will it promote the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation? Will it reduce poverty and health inequalities? 	0	-	-	<p>There would be more pressure on GP services near to the South West Extension. Existing town centre health services would also be more difficult to access from the SWE than High Tunstall.</p>
<p>4. Safety and Security. To create safer and cleaner community, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it create safer and cleaner communities? Will it reduce crime, violence, disorder and anti-social behaviour? Will it help to ensure residents are kept safe in the event of a fire? Will it contribute to maintaining and keeping clean public areas? Will it reduce the perception of crime and allow communities to safely access all areas? 	X	X	X	<p>No relationship identified.</p>

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario C (HSG1) – - Reduced quantum at High Tunstall and increase South West Extension (SWE)
Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)
Appraised: 21st July 2017

Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>5. Housing. To ensure Hartlepool residents have access to decent, good quality, affordable homes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote the re-use of previously developed land? Will it help to ensure the balance of supply and demand in the housing stock is met in sustainable locations? Will it help to ensure that Hartlepool residents have access to a choice of good quality housing in sustainable communities across tenures that meets their needs and aspirations? Will it encourage improvements in homes to meet and exceed the 'decent homes standard'? Will it provide increased access to open space for residents within Hartlepool? Will it meet the housing needs of vulnerable people? Will it encourage high quality design and sufficient open space in new developments? 	-	-	-	There is an increased risk to delivering the number of houses required to meet needs during the plan period if there is too much focus on supply from one site.
<p>6. Transport. To help develop high quality, integrated, accessible and safe transport system.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce the transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care? Will it support the location of new development and provision of services that reduces the need to travel? Will it reduce the incidence and severity of personal injury road crashes? Will it increase personal safety and security whilst travelling? Will it encourage more sustainable modes of travel, especially in urban areas? Will it maintain, improve and make more efficient use of the existing transport network? Will it control and maintain local air quality and seek to reduce transport emissions that contribute to climate change? 	0	-	-	<p>A reduction in the quantum of development at High Tunstall could threaten the delivery of a new bypass to the north of Elwick Village and a new grade separated junction at the A19 to create a "third" main access point into Hartlepool. The new grade separated junction will address highway safety issues. The scenario could result in improvements to the local road network but the increased quantum of development would also increase the pressure on the local road network. A reduced quantum of development could potentially threaten the viability of the planned link, for which the emerging Local Plan safeguards land, between the two developments.</p> <p>This scenario could also increase traffic pressure on the A689, which is congested at times. The impact of this development scenario on the A689/A19 have not been assessed; therefore there could be an infrastructure improvement requirement.</p>
<p>7. Built and Natural Environment. To protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of Hartlepool's rural, urban and historic environment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline? Will it prevent urban development encroaching and/or occurring in the countryside. Will it enhance the quality, character and setting of Hartlepool's designated Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, historic parks, gardens, scheduled ancient monuments, none designated heritage assets and areas of archaeological interest? 	0	0	0	<p>Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral. The benefits associated with the built and natural environment would be achieved in both locations. Equally the negative impact in terms of urban development encroaching on the countryside will occur with or without this scenario, albeit the distribution of the encroachment would change with more at SW Extension and less at High Tunstall.</p>

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario C (HSG1) – - Reduced quantum at High Tunstall and increase South West Extension (SWE) Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement) Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
	4. Will it enhance or increase access to these natural and cultural assets? 5. Will it be of detriment to surrounding landscape and open space? 6. Will it help to ensure that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable? 7. Will it encourage high quality design? 8. Will it provide sufficient open space in new developments? 9. Will it improve Green Infrastructure within Hartlepool and adjacent Boroughs?				
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity. To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.	1. Will it preserve or enhance the quality of Nature Conservation Sites within Hartlepool? 2. Will it improve access to these nature conservation sites? 3. Will it protect habitats and priority species? 4. Will it improve or enhance ecological networks.	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution. To improve and or retain the quality of watercourses, air quality and soil quality. To achieve sustainable use of water resources.	1. Will it help to achieve sustainable use of water resources? 2. Will it protect or improve and monitor local air quality? 3. Will it minimise atmospheric, noise, land, soil and water pollution? 4. Will it protect or improve the quality of controlled waters? 5. Will it improve infrastructure such as coastal defences? 6. Will it prevent and/or reduce the risk of local flooding?	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral
10. Liveability and Place. To create and sustain liveable places, promoting sustainable lifestyles and social cohesion.	1. Will it improve accessibility and quality of key services and facilities and improve access to jobs? 2. Will it provide sufficient retail facilities for local people? 3. Will it improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities? 4. Will it create and sustain a vibrant and diverse community and promote a sense of place? 5. Will it promote social cohesion?	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral. The benefits associated with liveability and place would still be achieved in both locations.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation- To promote strong and inclusive communities	1. Will it promote social inclusion and tackle worklessness? 2. Will it help to reduce deprivation and ensure no group of people are disadvantaged? 3. Will it encourage stronger socially inclusive communities? 4. Will it increase community cohesion? 5. Will it create community ownership, participation and engagement?	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources. To minimise	1. Will it minimise energy use through sustainable, efficient and effective use of buildings and land? 2. Will it support or promote the increasing use of renewable energy resources in	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario C (HSG1) – - Reduced quantum at High Tunstall and increase South West Extension (SWE)					
Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
energy use and support renewable energy production and encourage the prudent use of natural resources.	environmentally acceptable locations? 3. Will it reduce demand for natural resources? 4. Will it encourage the prudent and efficient use of natural resources?				
13. Waste. To minimise the production of waste and to maximise opportunities for recycling.	1. Will it minimise the generation of household and commercial waste? 2. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with as close to the source as feasible? 3. Will it maximise the opportunities for recycling waste materials? 4. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with in a sustainable manner? 5. Does it make provision for an adequate supply of minerals?	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral
14. Climate Change. To address the causes of climate change and minimise emissions of greenhouse gasses.	1. Will it encourage prudent use of natural resources? 2. Will it lead to a reduction in CO ₂ e emissions? 3. Will it assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change? 4. Will it increase emphasis on the issue of climate change and global warming effects, such as rising sea levels and the impact of additional development? 5. Will it ensure that flood management takes a sustainable approach? 6. Will it reduce the risk of flooding? 7. Will it tackle global sustainability issues?	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral. There is an area of the South West Extension for which the flood risk designation is Flood Zone 3a (high risk). However, the area is a linear corridor and is the flood risk is being mitigated through avoidance of more vulnerable (see Environment Agency classification of flood risk vulnerability) development within this area.
15. Futurity. To ensure that development that meets the needs of today should not restrict choices and opportunities for future generations	1. Will its outcomes be detrimental to future generations? 2. Will it restrict the choices of future generations?	--	--	--	The delivery of the transport infrastructure associated with the current quantum of development at High Tunstall has major benefits in the context of highway safety. Also reliance on one major housing site instead of two sites could impact on housing delivery as one developer would control a significant proportion of new housing sites.
Conclusions: Assessors considered that the alternative scenario would have marginal negative impacts for economy, health, housing and, transport and a significant negative impact for futurity but there would be no relationship or a neutral impact overall for the other SA objectives.					
Recommendations: Retain the current strategic approach to housing distribution					

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario D (HSG1) – Addition of North Burn site, removal of High Tunstall site					
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>1. Economy. To encourage strong, diverse and stable economy.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage and support the establishment and development of inward investment companies? Will it encourage new start business? Will it provide a range of quality sustainable jobs? Will it diversify the local economy? Will it diversify the rural economy? Will it improve the viability and vitality of town and local centres? Will it reduce levels of deprivation? 	0	0	0	<p>Whilst Scenario D would still generate jobs in construction and supply chain there would likely be a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre and employment sites given as a significant portion of the housing need in the Borough would be located away from the main urban area on a site with limited access and would also result in the absence of a new local centre to the west of the town at High Tunstall.</p>
<p>2. Education and Skills. To enable all children and young people to achieve their full potential and to maximise the education and skills levels of Hartlepool Residents.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it contribute to the development of new and improved education facilities? Will it encourage lifelong learning and training to meet the workforce needs of local contractors and other major employers from local sources? Will it increase the levels of attainment and participation in education? 	0	0	0	<p>Whilst there is the potential for a new school on the North Burn site, there are already schools planned for Wynyard and this scenario would result in no new school to the west of the town (at High Tunstall), where existing schools are at capacity.</p>
<p>3. Health. To improve the health and well-being of the Hartlepool community.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to public services and health facilities? Will it provide opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles? Will it provide local play provision, parks and quality green space and increase access to the countryside? Will it promote the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation? Will it reduce poverty and health inequalities? 	-	-	-	<p>Overall Scenario D would mean poorer access to services, facilities and recreation space for residents of the new housing sites given the poor access to the North Burn site both to the town centre and to Wynyard.</p>
<p>4. Safety and Security. To create safer and cleaner community, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it create safer and cleaner communities? Will it reduce crime, violence, disorder and anti-social behaviour? Will it help to ensure residents are kept safe in the event of a fire? Will it contribute to maintaining and keeping clean public areas? Will it reduce the perception of crime and allow communities to safely access all areas? 	-	-	-	<p>Already safety issues at A19 Elwick and Dalton junctions – development of High Tunstall will assist in delivering a new grade separated junction and bypass which will improve safety both within Elwick Village (reduced traffic through the village) and on the A19 through the implementation of the new grade separated junction. North Burn would not deliver this necessary improvement, only a new junction into that development.</p> <p>There could be negative implications for safety and security with Scenario D as the site only has one entry/exit which may limit access for emergency services or slow response times.</p>

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario D (HSG1) – Addition of North Burn site, removal of High Tunstall site					
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>5. Housing. To ensure Hartlepool residents have access to decent, good quality, affordable homes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote the re-use of previously developed land? Will it help to ensure the balance of supply and demand in the housing stock is met in sustainable locations? Will it help to ensure that Hartlepool residents have access to a choice of good quality housing in sustainable communities across tenures that meets their needs and aspirations? Will it encourage improvements in homes to meet and exceed the 'decent homes standard'? Will it provide increased access to open space for residents within Hartlepool? Will it meet the housing needs of vulnerable people? Will it encourage high quality design and sufficient open space in new developments? 	-	-	-	Scenario D would result in the loss of new green infrastructure/green wedge at High Tunstall however this would be counterbalanced by greater access to the countryside at North Burn. Irrespective of this, choosing a remote site away from the urban area of the town over a sustainable urban extension would fail to ensure housing need is met in sustainable locations, in sustainable communities. This would also make other housing sites to the west of the town undeliverable due to highway safety concerns as it would have a detrimental impact on the viability/deliverability of the proposed bypass of Elwick village and grade separate junction with the A19.
<p>6. Transport. To help develop high quality, integrated, accessible and safe transport system.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce the transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care? Will it support the location of new development and provision of services that reduces the need to travel? Will it reduce the incidence and severity of personal injury road crashes? Will it increase personal safety and security whilst travelling? Will it encourage more sustainable modes of travel, especially in urban areas? Will it maintain, improve and make more efficient use of the existing transport network? Will it control and maintain local air quality and seek to reduce transport emissions that contribute to climate change? 	--	--	--	Scenario D would result in housing development in less sustainable locations (North Burn) which would increase the need for travel and encourage more unsustainable modes of transport. There are significant highway infrastructure costs associated with a new junction that is required from the A19 slip road to access the North Burn site which would only be of benefit to that site. Scenario D would render the proposed bypass of Elwick village undeliverable which would have otherwise seen highway safety improvements on the A19 and at Elwick and would have reduced congestion on the A179 and A689. This would also make other housing sites to the west of the town undeliverable due to highway safety concerns.
<p>7. Built and Natural Environment. To protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of Hartlepool's rural, urban and historic environment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline? Will it prevent urban development encroaching and/or occurring in the countryside. Will it enhance the quality, character and setting of Hartlepool's designated Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, historic parks, gardens, scheduled ancient monuments, none designated heritage assets and areas of archaeological interest? Will it enhance or increase access to these natural and cultural assets? Will it be of detriment to surrounding 	-	-	-	Scenario D would result in the loss of countryside at North Burn however would retain more countryside to the west of the town (at High Tunstall). There is potential for a detrimental impact on the Schedule Ancient Monument at the North Burn site however the development may also improve access. Overall considered negative as the North Burn site is highly visible from the A19 and would be a more noticeable encroachment into the open countryside.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario D (HSG1) – Addition of North Burn site, removal of High Tunstall site					
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
	landscape and open space? 6. Will it help to ensure that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable? 7. Will it encourage high quality design? 8. Will it provide sufficient open space in new developments? 9. Will it improve Green Infrastructure within Hartlepool and adjacent Boroughs?				
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity. To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.	1. Will it preserve or enhance the quality of Nature Conservation Sites within Hartlepool? 2. Will it improve access to these nature conservation sites? 3. Will it protect habitats and priority species? 4. Will it improve or enhance ecological networks.	-	-	-	There is the potential for harm to the overall objective as the scenario comprises development in the open countryside. This option has not been assessed through the HRA process. It is noted there is a local wildlife site adjacent to North Burn that may be negatively impacted by the development however equally the development may provide greater access.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution. To improve and or retain the quality of watercourses, air quality and soil quality. To achieve sustainable use of water resources.	1. Will it help to achieve sustainable use of water resources? 2. Will it protect or improve and monitor local air quality? 3. Will it minimise atmospheric, noise, land, soil and water pollution? 4. Will it protect or improve the quality of controlled waters? 5. Will it improve infrastructure such as coastal defences? 6. Will it prevent and/or reduce the risk of local flooding?	-	-	-	The policy will result in greater pressure on water resources and the potential for greater surface water runoff in a flood risk context.
10. Liveability and Place. To create and sustain liveable places, promoting sustainable lifestyles and social cohesion.	1. Will it improve accessibility and quality of key services and facilities and improve access to jobs? 2. Will it provide sufficient retail facilities for local people? 3. Will it improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities? 4. Will it create and sustain a vibrant and diverse community and promote a sense of place? 5. Will it promote social cohesion?	-	-	-	Scenario D would result in poorer access to key services and facilities and culture, leisure and recreational activities for residents of the North Burn site and would also reduce the provision of new and improved facilities to the west of the town with the absence of the High Tunstall development. This will result in less social cohesion and a poorer sense of place in both these areas.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation- To promote strong and inclusive communities	1. Will it promote social inclusion and tackle worklessness? 2. Will it help to reduce deprivation and ensure no group of people are disadvantaged? 3. Will it encourage stronger socially inclusive communities? 4. Will it increase community cohesion? 5. Will it create community ownership, participation and engagement?	-	-	-	Given the above, it is considered Scenario D would have a detrimental impact on creating a sense of place and community, encouraging community cohesion and participation and engagement and reducing deprivation.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources. To minimise	1. Will it minimise energy use through sustainable, efficient and effective use of buildings and land? 2. Will it support or promote the increasing use of renewable energy resources in	- -	- -	- -	Scenario D would require greenfield development and a new junction and highway works for a single site only. The development of North Burn and omission of High Tunstall would also

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario D (HSG1) – Addition of North Burn site, removal of High Tunstall site					
Appraisers: Ryan Cowley (Planning Policy), Matthew King (Planning Policy), Sarah Scarr (Heritage and Countryside)					
Appraised: 20 th July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
energy use and support renewable energy production and encourage the prudent use of natural resources.	environmentally acceptable locations? 3. Will it reduce demand for natural resources? 4. Will it encourage the prudent and efficient use of natural resources?				harm the viability of the Elwick bypass which serves a number of developments. This is not considered an efficient or sustainable use of land and given the relatively remote location of the development this would encourage greater car use and increase demand on natural resources.
13. Waste. To minimise the production of waste and to maximise opportunities for recycling.	1. Will it minimise the generation of household and commercial waste? 2. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with as close to the source as feasible? 3. Will it maximise the opportunities for recycling waste materials? 4. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with in a sustainable manner? 5. Does it make provision for an adequate supply of minerals?	-	-	-	Scenario D still results in the generation of waste, however given the relatively remote location of North Burn this may increase the distance between the source of the waste and the location where it is dealt with.
14. Climate Change. To address the causes of climate change and minimise emissions of greenhouse gasses.	1. Will it encourage prudent use of natural resources? 2. Will it lead to a reduction in CO ₂ e emissions? 3. Will it assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change? 4. Will it increase emphasis on the issue of climate change and global warming effects, such as rising sea levels and the impact of additional development? 5. Will it ensure that flood management takes a sustainable approach? 6. Will it reduce the risk of flooding? 7. Will it tackle global sustainability issues?	-	-	-	It is considered that the North Burn site is in an unsustainable location, particularly when compared to High Tunstall. The limited access and relative remoteness of the site will increase the need for travel and encourage less sustainable forms of travel which will increase CO ₂ emissions. This would not constitute the prudent use of natural resources or help to mitigate climate change.
15. Futurity. To ensure that development that meets the needs of today should not restrict choices and opportunities for future generations	1. Will its outcomes be detrimental to future generations? 2. Will it restrict the choices of future generations?	--	--	--	North Burn is considered to be an unsustainable location for new housing, particularly when compared to High Tunstall. Given the impact of the proposal on the viability of the town centre, the deliverability of the Elwick bypass and other housing sites it supports, the associated increased energy use and climate change impacts, restrictions on access to the site and implications for safety and security and potential impact on education will all have detrimental impacts on future generations.
Conclusions					
North Burn is considered to be an unsustainable location for new housing, particularly when compared to High Tunstall. Given the impact of the proposal on the viability of the town centre, the deliverability of the Elwick bypass and other housing sites it supports, the associated increased energy use and climate change impacts, restrictions on access to the site and implications for safety and security and potential impact on education will all have detrimental impacts on future generations and as such it is considered this would not be a suitable alternative to HSG1.					
Recommendation: Do not progress policy alternative.					

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario E (HSG1) - More housing in the Villages, reduction in housing numbers at Wynyard.					
Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>1. Economy. To encourage strong, diverse and stable economy.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage and support the establishment and development of inward investment companies? Will it encourage new start business? Will it provide a range of quality sustainable jobs? Will it diversify the local economy? Will it diversify the rural economy? Will it improve the viability and vitality of town and local centres? Will it reduce levels of deprivation? 	0	-	-	<p>In terms of the economy, there could be a negative impact on the local economy through a reduction in Council Tax revenue; traditionally Wynyard has higher tax bands. The provision of sites in the villages provides opportunities for smaller villages to be developed by local builders. Additional provision in the villages would support businesses in the villages, however as a consequence a reduction in numbers could have an impact on the deliverability of facilities at Wynyard – impacting on the sustainability of the settlement over the long term.</p>
<p>2. Education and Skills. To enable all children and young people to achieve their full potential and to maximise the education and skills levels of Hartlepool Residents.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it contribute to the development of new and improved education facilities? Will it encourage lifelong learning and training to meet the workforce needs of local contractors and other major employers from local sources? Will it increase the levels of attainment and participation in education? 	0	0	-	<p>Pressure on education facilities in the village. Long term potential risk at Wynyard if the quantum of housing is not sufficient to deliver the primary school on the site.</p>
<p>3. Health. To improve the health and well-being of the Hartlepool community.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to public services and health facilities? Will it provide opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles? Will it provide local play provision, parks and quality green space and increase access to the countryside? Will it promote the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation? Will it reduce poverty and health inequalities? 	0	0	-	<p>Potential for health services to be delivered at Wynyard, providing new services in the developing community. Increased travel from the villages to access services. However, increased access to the countryside at the villages can promote physical and mental health and wellbeing. Long term there is a negative impact on sustainability of delivery of health services.</p>
<p>4. Safety and Security. To create safer and cleaner community, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it create safer and cleaner communities? Will it reduce crime, violence, disorder and anti-social behaviour? Will it help to ensure residents are kept safe in the event of a fire? Will it contribute to maintaining and keeping clean public areas? Will it reduce the perception of crime and allow communities to safely access all areas? 	X	X	X	<p>No relationship identified.</p>

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario E (HSG1) - More housing in the Villages, reduction in housing numbers at Wynyard.					
Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>5. Housing. To ensure Hartlepool residents have access to decent, good quality, affordable homes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote the re-use of previously developed land? Will it help to ensure the balance of supply and demand in the housing stock is met in sustainable locations? Will it help to ensure that Hartlepool residents have access to a choice of good quality housing in sustainable communities across tenures that meets their needs and aspirations? Will it encourage improvements in homes to meet and exceed the 'decent homes standard'? Will it provide increased access to open space for residents within Hartlepool? Will it meet the housing needs of vulnerable people? Will it encourage high quality design and sufficient open space in new developments? 	-	-	-	<p>Wynyard will deliver to meet a demand for homes in this location, including executive homes. This adds an additional choice of types and location of development across the borough.</p> <p>Further developments of the villages would increase the supply in the villages and help to address further need in the villages.</p> <p>There is already a level of development allocated in the villages as part of the local plan; it is a fine balance between development of additional dwellings to meet need and overdevelopment of the village, eroding the character of the village – this impacts upon the choice of different dwellings across the Borough. Therefore the alternative created a negative impact on this objective.</p>
<p>6. Transport. To help develop high quality, integrated, accessible and safe transport system.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce the transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care? Will it support the location of new development and provision of services that reduces the need to travel? Will it reduce the incidence and severity of personal injury road crashes? Will it increase personal safety and security whilst travelling? Will it encourage more sustainable modes of travel, especially in urban areas? Will it maintain, improve and make more efficient use of the existing transport network? Will it control and maintain local air quality and seek to reduce transport emissions that contribute to climate change? 	0	0	0	<p>This alternative scenario would increase the issues around highway infrastructure for the villages. This is balanced against the reduction of pressure at Wynyard which could impact on the planned improvements to the junctions. Wynyard is also investing in cycle provision of a sustainable cycle link between Wynyard and Hartlepool. It is accepted that both routes have the potential to create commuting traffic as there is limited employment opportunities within the immediate vicinity of the site. As a result both options would require a level of infrastructure investment.</p>
<p>7. Built and Natural Environment. To protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of Hartlepool's rural, urban and historic environment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline? Will it prevent urban development encroaching and/or occurring in the countryside. Will it enhance the quality, character and setting of Hartlepool's designated Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, historic parks, gardens, scheduled ancient monuments, none designated heritage assets and areas of archaeological interest? Will it enhance or increase access to these natural and cultural assets? Will it be of detriment to surrounding 	0	-	-	<p>Elwick and Greatham villages both have Conservation Areas within them, these heritage assets include listed buildings and locally listed buildings. The Quality of Place chapter ensures that high quality design is integral to all developments. The additional development of the villages, does risk the changing nature of the village character over the long term. Although it does depend on the design with regard to the development of Wynyard, impact on the character is considered less of an issue as the development is planned to a certain size from the outset which has landscaping 'built in' rather than the erosion of the village character as a</p>

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario E (HSG1) - More housing in the Villages, reduction in housing numbers at Wynyard.					
Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
	landscape and open space? 6. Will it help to ensure that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable? 7. Will it encourage high quality design? 8. Will it provide sufficient open space in new developments? 9. Will it improve Green Infrastructure within Hartlepool and adjacent Boroughs?				potential result of overdevelopment.
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity. To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.	1. Will it preserve or enhance the quality of Nature Conservation Sites within Hartlepool? 2. Will it improve access to these nature conservation sites? 3. Will it protect habitats and priority species? 4. Will it improve or enhance ecological networks.	0	0	0	Consideration was given that there were potential negative impacts on this objective from the proposed allocation and the alternative scenario. Whilst Wynyard has ecological issues on the existing woodland and farmland, the alternative of additional development in the village would have to be screened for ecological impacts, e.g., impact on the SPA. Appropriate mitigation would be required in both cases.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution. To improve and or retain the quality of watercourses, air quality and soil quality. To achieve sustainable use of water resources.	1. Will it help to achieve sustainable use of water resources? 2. Will it protect or improve and monitor local air quality? 3. Will it minimise atmospheric, noise, land, soil and water pollution? 4. Will it protect or improve the quality of controlled waters? 5. Will it improve infrastructure such as coastal defences? 6. Will it prevent and/or reduce the risk of local flooding?	0	0	0	Considered that there is the potential for there to be issues with water resources across both sites. In addition creation of new dwellings would have noise and air population implications on surrounding countryside / villages in both development options.
10. Liveability and Place. To create and sustain liveable places, promoting sustainable lifestyles and social cohesion.	1. Will it improve accessibility and quality of key services and facilities and improve access to jobs? 2. Will it provide sufficient retail facilities for local people? 3. Will it improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities? 4. Will it create and sustain a vibrant and diverse community and promote a sense of place? 5. Will it promote social cohesion?	-	-	-	In Wynyard, the improved infrastructure will meet demands created by the development and have a positive impact on the wider connectivity. Limited extension to the villages could extend the facilities available in the villages; however the scope of this is largely reliant on the viability of schemes. Impact on the sense of place if the villages are under too much development pressure. This is unlikely to improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities in the villages but may place additional demands upon them if they are not improved / developed in tandem.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation- To promote strong and inclusive communities	1. Will it promote social inclusion and tackle worklessness? 2. Will it help to reduce deprivation and ensure no group of people are disadvantaged? 3. Will it encourage stronger socially inclusive communities? 4. Will it increase community cohesion?	0	0	0	Development in both locations has the potential to improve facilities available. Development of such facilities can have a positive impact on community cohesion and ownership. Such developments would be required to pay planning obligations towards such facilities. In addition, both

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario E (HSG1) - More housing in the Villages, reduction in housing numbers at Wynyard. Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement) Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
	5. Will it create community ownership, participation and engagement?				developments will contribute towards the development of affordable housing; Wynyard through an offsite contribution which will improve affordable housing provision in the urban area and development in the villages could include onsite affordable housing.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources. To minimise energy use and support renewable energy production and encourage the prudent use of natural resources.	1. Will it minimise energy use through sustainable, efficient and effective use of buildings and land? 2. Will it support or promote the increasing use of renewable energy resources in environmentally acceptable locations? 3. Will it reduce demand for natural resources? 4. Will it encourage the prudent and efficient use of natural resources?	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral.
13. Waste. To minimise the production of waste and to maximise opportunities for recycling.	1. Will it minimise the generation of household and commercial waste? 2. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with as close to the source as feasible? 3. Will it maximise the opportunities for recycling waste materials? 4. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with in a sustainable manner? 5. Does it make provision for an adequate supply of minerals?	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral.
14. Climate Change. To address the causes of climate change and minimise emissions of greenhouse gasses.	1. Will it encourage prudent use of natural resources? 2. Will it lead to a reduction in CO ₂ emissions? 3. Will it assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change? 4. Will it increase emphasis on the issue of climate change and global warming effects, such as rising sea levels and the impact of additional development? 5. Will it ensure that flood management takes a sustainable approach? 6. Will it reduce the risk of flooding? 7. Will it tackle global sustainability issues?	+	+	+	Considered that there would be a slightly improved impact on the Climate Change objective if development was undertaken in the villages. This is due to the closer proximity to services of this location, e.g. wider variety of employment location and retail facilities (supermarkets), it was considered that this would have a positive impact on CO ₂ reduction through reduced length of car journeys to access essential services / amenities, although this may be mitigated if additional services, employment, retail etc were created near to Wynyard.
15. Futurity. To ensure that development that meets the needs of today should not restrict choices and opportunities for future generations	1. Will its outcomes be detrimental to future generations? 2. Will it restrict the choices of future generations?	0	0	-	The villages are developing incrementally at present, increasing this level of development within village locations could lead to overdevelopment issues. This would erode the nature of the villages and limit the choices of future generations to experience villages as they are experienced today.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Alternative Growth Scenario E (HSG1) - More housing in the Villages, reduction in housing numbers at Wynyard. Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement) Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>Conclusions: Overall, this alternative scenario presents a weaker case in terms of sustainability. Development of the villages is finely balanced, allowing incremental growth to support the services within the villages whilst also ensuring that the villages grow and develop in an appropriate manner without impacting on the strategic gap. A reduction in the level of housing development, whilst could reduce the pressure on the local road infrastructure also has the potential impact on the development of this infrastructure and community facilities which will make the development of additional dwellings more sustainable.</p> <p>Recommendations: Retain the current strategic approach to housing distribution.</p>					

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Hartlepool Local Plan – Draft 2016					
Scenario being appraised: Scenario E – No development in villages and extension to upper Warren					
Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>1. Economy. To encourage strong, diverse and stable economy.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage and support the establishment and development of inward investment companies? Will it encourage new start business? Will it provide a range of quality sustainable jobs? Will it diversify the local economy? Will it diversify the rural economy? Will it improve the viability and vitality of town and local centres? Will it reduce levels of deprivation? 	-	-	-	There would be a negative impact on the local economy in the villages if there is no further residential development.
<p>2. Education and Skills. To enable all children and young people to achieve their full potential and to maximise the education and skills levels of Hartlepool Residents.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it contribute to the development of new and improved education facilities? Will it encourage lifelong learning and training to meet the workforce needs of local contractors and other major employers from local sources? Will it increase the levels of attainment and participation in education? 	-	-	-	There would be a negative impact in the medium and long term on village schools if there is no further residential development in the villages, particularly as there is an older demographic profile in the villages.
<p>3. Health. To improve the health and well-being of the Hartlepool community.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to public services and health facilities? Will it provide opportunities to promote healthier lifestyles? Will it provide local play provision, parks and quality green space and increase access to the countryside? Will it promote the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation? Will it reduce poverty and health inequalities? 	-	-	-	There would be better access to healthcare facilities at Upper Warren but decreased access to the countryside at the villages which can promote physical and mental health and wellbeing. There would also be a loss of the promotion of the use of existing facilities and open-air recreation that would occur through new residential development in the villages. Overall the impact would be negative.
<p>4. Safety and Security. To create safer and cleaner community, reducing crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it create safer and cleaner communities? Will it reduce crime, violence, disorder and anti-social behaviour? Will it help to ensure residents are kept safe in the event of a fire? Will it contribute to maintaining and keeping clean public areas? Will it reduce the perception of crime and allow communities to safely access all areas? 	X	X	X	No relationship identified.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Hartlepool Local Plan – Draft 2016					
Scenario being appraised: Scenario E – No development in villages and extension to upper Warren					
Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
<p>5. Housing. To ensure Hartlepool residents have access to decent, good quality, affordable homes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote the re-use of previously developed land? Will it help to ensure the balance of supply and demand in the housing stock is met in sustainable locations? Will it help to ensure that Hartlepool residents have access to a choice of good quality housing in sustainable communities across tenures that meets their needs and aspirations? Will it encourage improvements in homes to meet and exceed the 'decent homes standard'? Will it provide increased access to open space for residents within Hartlepool? Will it meet the housing needs of vulnerable people? Will it encourage high quality design and sufficient open space in new developments? 	-	-	-	There would be a reduction in the choices available to Hartlepool residents if there were no further residential development in the villages. Allocating further residential development at Upper Warren would not significantly improve choice as there is an existing development at this location and there are other extensions to the main urban settlement which have been allocated. This scenario would not balance supply and demand in the housing stock in sustainable locations as too high a proportion of the newly available stock would be being provided on the urban edge without new stock being made available in the villages for a balanced approach.
<p>6. Transport. To help develop high quality, integrated, accessible and safe transport system.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce the transport barriers to accessing employment, education and training and health care? Will it support the location of new development and provision of services that reduces the need to travel? Will it reduce the incidence and severity of personal injury road crashes? Will it increase personal safety and security whilst travelling? Will it encourage more sustainable modes of travel, especially in urban areas? Will it maintain, improve and make more efficient use of the existing transport network? Will it control and maintain local air quality and seek to reduce transport emissions that contribute to climate change? 	0	0	0	Some residential development in the villages of an appropriate scale can act as a catalyst to improvements in the local road network but development at Upper Warren would reduce the need to travel as it is closer to existing facilities. Overall the impact would be neutral.
<p>7. Built and Natural Environment. To protect and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of Hartlepool's rural, urban and historic environment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will the plan enhance the quality, character and local distinctiveness of the area's landscapes, open space, townscapes, streetscapes, countryside and coastline? Will it prevent urban development encroaching and/or occurring in the countryside. Will it enhance the quality, character and setting of Hartlepool's designated Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, historic parks, gardens, scheduled ancient monuments, none designated heritage assets and areas of archaeological interest? Will it enhance or increase access to these natural and cultural assets? Will it be of detriment to surrounding landscape and open space? 	-	-	-	Residential development at Upper Warren would significantly encroach on the strategic gap between the urban edge and Hart village. The impact of new residential development of an appropriate scale at the villages is relatively modest and assessors noted that the allocations at Hart village are to the west of the village so do not impact on the strategic gap. The residential allocation at Elwick village will have an impact on the setting of Elwick Conservation Area but this is considered to be a modest impact.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Hartlepool Local Plan – Draft 2016					
Scenario being appraised: Scenario E – No development in villages and extension to upper Warren					
Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
	6. Will it help to ensure that the physical environment is attractive, responsive, flexible and sustainable? 7. Will it encourage high quality design? 8. Will it provide sufficient open space in new developments? 9. Will it improve Green Infrastructure within Hartlepool and adjacent Boroughs?				
8. Biodiversity and Geodiversity. To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment.	1. Will it preserve or enhance the quality of Nature Conservation Sites within Hartlepool? 2. Will it improve access to these nature conservation sites? 3. Will it protect habitats and priority species? 4. Will it improve or enhance ecological networks.	0	0	0	New residential development at Hart village and at Upper Warren would need to consider the impact on the coastal Special Protection Area as both are within 6km of it. The principle impact is on migratory birds through dog walking.
9. Water, Air and Soil Pollution. To improve and or retain the quality of watercourses, air quality and soil quality. To achieve sustainable use of water resources.	1. Will it help to achieve sustainable use of water resources? 2. Will it protect or improve and monitor local air quality? 3. Will it minimise atmospheric, noise, land, soil and water pollution? 4. Will it protect or improve the quality of controlled waters? 5. Will it improve infrastructure such as coastal defences? 6. Will it prevent and/or reduce the risk of local flooding?	0	0	0	New residential development at Hart village would need some new water utility infrastructure but assessors considered that overall the impact would be neutral.
10. Liveability and Place. To create and sustain liveable places, promoting sustainable lifestyles and social cohesion.	1. Will it improve accessibility and quality of key services and facilities and improve access to jobs? 2. Will it provide sufficient retail facilities for local people? 3. Will it improve access to culture, leisure and recreational activities? 4. Will it create and sustain a vibrant and diverse community and promote a sense of place? 5. Will it promote social cohesion?	-	-	-	No further residential development in the villages would impact negatively on improving accessibility and quality of key services and facilities in the villages. It would also discourage village shops. Development at Upper Warren would support the existing local services and facilities but this is probably less critical than in the villages.
11. Equity, Diversity, Equality and Participation- To promote strong and inclusive communities	1. Will it promote social inclusion and tackle worklessness? 2. Will it help to reduce deprivation and ensure no group of people are disadvantaged? 3. Will it encourage stronger socially inclusive communities? 4. Will it increase community cohesion? 5. Will it create community ownership, participation and engagement?	-	-	-	No further residential development in the villages would reduce the community cohesion as there would be fewer opportunities for local young people to access the housing market in the villages.
12. Energy Efficiency and Natural Resources. To minimise energy use and support	1. Will it minimise energy use through sustainable, efficient and effective use of buildings and land? 2. Will it support or promote the increasing use of renewable energy resources in environmentally acceptable locations? 3. Will it reduce demand for natural	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral.

Appendix 2 – Alternative Policy & Growth Scenarios

Hartlepool Local Plan – Draft 2016					
Scenario being appraised: Scenario E – No development in villages and extension to upper Warren					
Appraisers: Fiona Riley (Planning Policy), Matthew Clifford (Planning Policy) and Steven Carter (Health Improvement)					
Appraised: 21 st July 2017					
Sustainability appraisal objectives	Appraisal criteria	Timescale			Commentary/ explanation
		ST	MT	LT	
renewable energy production and encourage the prudent use of natural resources.	resources? 4. Will it encourage the prudent and efficient use of natural resources?				
13. Waste. To minimise the production of waste and to maximise opportunities for recycling.	1. Will it minimise the generation of household and commercial waste? 2. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with as close to the source as feasible? 3. Will it maximise the opportunities for recycling waste materials? 4. Will it ensure that waste is dealt with in a sustainable manner? 5. Does it make provision for an adequate supply of minerals?	0	0	0	Assessors considered that the overall impact would be neutral.
14. Climate Change. To address the causes of climate change and minimise emissions of greenhouse gasses.	1. Will it encourage prudent use of natural resources? 2. Will it lead to a reduction in CO ₂ e emissions? 3. Will it assist in mitigation and/or adaptation to climate change? 4. Will it increase emphasis on the issue of climate change and global warming effects, such as rising sea levels and the impact of additional development? 5. Will it ensure that flood management takes a sustainable approach? 6. Will it reduce the risk of flooding? 7. Will it tackle global sustainability issues?	+	+	+	There would be more access to services and facilities by sustainable travel modes.
15. Futurity. To ensure that development that meets the needs of today should not restrict choices and opportunities for future generations	1. Will its outcomes be detrimental to future generations? 2. Will it restrict the choices of future generations?	--	--	--	No further residential development in the villages would restrict the choices of future generations.
<p>Conclusions: Assessors considered that the alternative scenario would have marginal negative impacts for economy, education and skills, health, housing, transport, built and natural environment, liveability and place and equity, diversity and participation and a significant negative impact for futurity but there would be no relationship or a neutral impact overall for the other SA objectives with the exception of climate change which would have a marginal positive impact.</p> <p>Recommendations: Retain the current strategic approach to housing distribution</p>					