

Sunderland Draft Core Strategy and Development Plan

Sustainability Appraisal incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment

On behalf of **Sunderland City Council**



Project Ref: 36447 | Rev: B | Date: July 2017



Document Control Sheet

Project Name: Sustainability Appraisal of the Sunderland Core Strategy

Project Ref: 36447

Report Title: Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Draft Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan

Doc Ref: 36447R003i2

Date: July 2017

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Thomas Fleming	Graduate Planner	TF	18.07.2017
	Chris Moore	GIS Analyst	CM	
	Lauren Park	Senior Planner	LP	
	Duncan Smart	Senior Planner	DS	
Reviewed by:	Duncan Smart	Senior Planner	DS	19.07.2017
	Cicely Postan	Principal Planner	CP	
	Nick Skelton	Equity Director	NS	
Approved by:	John Baker	Partner	JB	20.07.2017
	Nick Skelton	Equity Director	NS	
For and on behalf of Peter Brett Associates LLP				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
B	26.07.2017	Final Report including amendments to respond to client comments	TF / DS	DS	NS

This report has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP ('PBA') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which PBA was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). PBA accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Report Purpose and Objectives	1
1.3	How to Comment on this SA Report	1
1.4	Structure of this Report	1
1.5	Statutory Requirements.....	2
1.6	The Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan	2
1.7	Preparation of the Emerging Sunderland CSDP	3
2	Sunderland: Baseline and Policy Analysis	5
2.1	Introduction.....	5
2.2	The Sustainability Baseline of Sunderland.....	5
2.3	Review of Plans, Programmes and Strategies.....	11
2.4	Predicted Evolution of the Baseline in the Absence of the Emerging Sunderland CSDP	12
2.5	Key Sustainability Issues.....	14
3	The Sustainability Appraisal Process	18
3.1	Introduction.....	18
3.2	SA and SEA Purpose and Objectives	18
3.3	Meeting the Requirements of the SEA Regulations.....	18
3.4	Approach to SA and SEA	20
3.5	Preparation of this SA Report.....	25
4	Sustainability Appraisal of the Draft Sunderland CSDP	29
4.1	Introduction.....	29
4.2	SA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP Vision and Strategic Priorities	29
4.3	SA of High Growth Option Implementation and Proposed Spatial Strategies	33
4.4	SA of Strategic Site Allocations	34
4.5	SA of Draft Policies.....	64
5	Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations	92
5.1	Introduction.....	92
5.2	Mitigation and Enhancement – Draft Vision and Strategy Priorities	92
5.3	Mitigation and Enhancement – Draft Spatial Strategies.....	92
5.4	Mitigation and Enhancement - Proposed Strategic Site Allocations	93
5.5	Mitigation and Enhancement - Draft Policies	93
6	Conclusions, SA Next Steps and Monitoring	98
6.1	Summary of SA Report	98
6.2	How to Comment on this SA Report	98
6.3	Next Stages of Sunderland CSDP Preparation.....	98
6.4	Monitoring.....	99

Figures

Figure 4.1: Proposed Vision within the Draft Sunderland CSDP	30
Figure 4.2 Sustainability Appraisal of Draft Policies (Pre-Mitigation) – Visual Summary	66

Tables

Table 2.1 Evolution of the Baseline Scenario in the Absence of the Emerging Sunderland CSDP	13
Table 2.2: Key Issues for the emerging Sunderland CSDP and this SA	15
Table 3.1: Requirements of the SEA Regulations and how they are met through the SA report	19
Table 3.2 Summary of Scoping Consultation Responses and Changes	22
Table 3.3 Sustainability Objectives within the Sunderland CSDP SA Framework.....	25
Table 3.4 SA Scoring System to Establish Likely Significant Effects.....	28
Table 4.1: Draft Sunderland CSDP Strategic Priorities	32
Table 4.2 Sustainability Appraisal of Candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites – Visual Summary	37
Table 4.3 Sustainability Appraisal of Candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites - Key	39
Table 4.4 Sustainability Appraisal of Candidate KEA and PEA	43
Table 4.5 Sustainability Appraisal of Candidate TSGT Sites	59
Table 4.6 Sustainability Appraisal of Candidate TSGT Sites - Key	62
Table 5.1 Schedule of Draft Policy Mitigation Recommendations	93
Table 5.2 Schedule of Draft Policy Mitigation Recommendations	94

Appendices

Appendix A	Relevant Environmental Designations
Appendix B	Review of Plans, Programmes and Strategies
Appendix C	Sunderland CSDP Sustainability Appraisal Framework
Appendix D	SA of Draft Strategic Priorities
Appendix E	SA of Draft Spatial Strategies
Appendix F	SA of Draft Strategic Site Allocations
Appendix G	SA of Draft Policies

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) has been commissioned by Sunderland City Council (SCC) to undertake a sustainability appraisal (SA), incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), of the emerging Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan ('the emerging Sunderland CSDP').
- 1.1.2 This introductory section identifies the purpose, objectives and structure of this SA report. It then outlines core statutory requirements for undertaking SA and provides a summary of the proposed content and purpose of the emerging Sunderland CSDP.

1.2 Report Purpose and Objectives

- 1.2.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an integrated SA and SEA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP (July 2017), which has been prepared by SCC as the latest consultative document in the preparation of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. In doing so this report responds to statutory SA and SEA requirements, considers the evolution of the emerging Sunderland CSDP to date and presents an assessment of likely effects from the Draft Sunderland CSDP.
- 1.2.2 The main objectives of this report are to fulfil statutory SA and SEA reporting requirements, to identify likely significant effects from the Draft Sunderland CSDP and to identify mitigation or enhancement measures which should be incorporated in future iterations of the Sunderland CSDP to enhance its effectiveness and sustainability performance.

1.3 How to Comment on this SA Report

- 1.3.1 This SA Report is being issued for consultation alongside the Draft Sunderland CSDP. The consultation will run from **7 August 2017** to **2 October 2017**. Details of how to respond to the consultation are provided below.
- 1.3.2 Comments on the draft plan can be made online through SCC's consultation portal at <http://sunderland-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>. Alternatively, comments can be submitted by email to planningpolicy@sunderland.gov.uk, or in writing to Strategic Plans and Housing Team, Sunderland City Council, Civic Centre, Burdon Road, Sunderland, SR2 7DN.

1.4 Structure of this Report

- 1.4.1 This report is structured as follows:
- The remainder of this section identifies core statutory requirements for undertaking SA and provides a summary of the proposed content and purpose of the emerging Sunderland CSDP;
 - Section 2 provides an analysis of baseline characteristics, the predicted evolution of the baseline in the absence of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, and a review of other plans and programmes (RPP). The purpose of this section is to identify key sustainability issues which require consideration in the preparation of the emerging Sunderland CSDP and in this SA. The environmental baseline analysis is supported by a review of relevant environmental designations provided in Appendix A. The full RPP, which identifies relevant legislative and policy requirements and targets and international, national, regional and local scale, is provided in Appendix B;

- Section 3 provides an overview of the SA process undertaken to date and how the SA has been carried out for the Draft Sunderland CSDP;
- Section 4 presents the key findings of the SA undertaken for the Draft Sunderland CSDP. The detailed results of the SA undertaken for the Draft Sunderland CSDP are provided in Appendices D - G;
- Section 5 builds upon section 4 to identify mitigation and enhancement recommendations; and,
- Section 6 provides an overview, identifies the next step in the SA process and outlines potential monitoring arrangements.

1.5 Statutory Requirements

- 1.5.1 Under Section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ('the 2004 Act'), SCC is required to carry out a SA of the Core Strategy¹ to help guide the selection and development of policies and proposals in terms of their potential social, environmental and economic effects. In discharging the requirement for SA, local planning authorities must also incorporate the requirements of European Union Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment ('the SEA Directive') and its transposing regulations, the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 as amended ('the SEA Regulations'). These statutory requirements are reflected in paragraph 165 of the NPPF (2012) and relevant sections of National Planning Practice Guidance.
- 1.5.2 There is a requirement to consult on the scope of SEA with the Consultation Authorities (Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency) prior to undertaking the actual SA. A SA and SEA Scoping Report was duly submitted to the Consultation Authorities in October 2015 and the results of the scoping exercise have informed the SA (incorporating SEA) presented in this report. Further details regarding SA Scoping are provided in Section 3.4.
- 1.5.3 The SEA Regulations also introduce a link between SEA and a need in some cases to undertake a separate Habitats Regulation Appraisal (HRA) of plans and projects where there is the potential for significant effects on European Sites (Special Protection Areas and Special Areas of Conservation). A full HRA Report has been prepared by SCC for the Draft Sunderland CSDP and has been examined in the preparation of this SA report.

1.6 The Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan

- 1.6.1 Once finalised and adopted, the Sunderland CSDP will provide a coherent and overarching vision, spatial planning strategy, suite of development management policies and set of strategic site allocations for the SCC area. The Sunderland CSDP will replace some of the existing statutory Development Plan for the SCC area, which presently comprises the adopted Sunderland Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 1998 as amended by the adopted UDP Alteration No. 2 (2007). The remaining UDP Policies will be replaced in due course (after the adoption of the Sunderland CSDP) by policies within the emerging Allocations and Designations Plan. In addition, the Sunderland International Advanced Manufacturing Park Area Action Plan ('the IAMP AAP'), presently undergoing an Examination in Public, will once adopted also form part of the statutory Development Plan for the SCC area². Together with national planning policy, the role of the statutory Development Plan is to set a spatial

¹ For the purposes of the 2004 Act the Core Strategy is a type of Local Plan and is therefore subject to SA requirements.

² Whilst the IAMP AAP has been prepared in tandem with the emerging Sunderland CSDP, a separate SA (incorporating SEA) of the AAP has been carried out.

development strategy and policy framework to guide development within the SCC area. Under planning law, all planning applications must be determined in accordance with the statutory Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Once adopted, the Sunderland CSDP will therefore form an important component of the planning policy framework applicable to the SCC area.

- 1.6.2 The Sunderland CSDP will provide a clear picture of SCC's spatial expectations, ambitions and plan for delivering sustainable development across the SCC area over an 18year period from 2015 to 2033 and beyond. The document will also interpret national planning policies within the local context and seek to guide future development across the SCC area. To achieve this, the Sunderland CSDP will set out an overarching vision and strategic objectives which will be implemented through a suite of policies and site allocations.
- 1.6.3 The Sunderland CSDP will cover the whole of the SCC area, although policies regarding the International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP) will be detailed in a separate Area Action Plan (AAP) and a separate Allocations and Designations Plan will subsequently be prepared in line with the Sunderland CSDP to allocate non-strategic housing and other sites to meet identified needs³. A number of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) will be prepared to provide further detail regarding specific aspects of the Core Strategy, including some of the proposed strategic site allocations.
- 1.6.4 The emerging Sunderland CSDP is being prepared in the context of an evidence base that draws together detailed information about the City area and its characteristics, with a particular reference to the housing and regeneration needs of the city and the delivery of development. The SA draws on this evidence base to identify likely significant effects from the implementation of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, particularly any likely significant environmental effects as required by the SEA Regulations. The SA process also provides a mechanism to identify possible mitigation and enhancement measures in order to avoid significant adverse effects, reduce or eliminate other adverse effects, and to enhance the sustainability performance of the emerging Sunderland CSDP.

1.7 Preparation of the Emerging Sunderland CSDP

- 1.7.1 Following the adoption of the Sunderland UDP Alteration No. 2 in 2007, work commenced on a new Local Plan or Core Strategy for Sunderland in 2009. Two stages of consultation were completed prior to the publication of the Sunderland Core Strategy Preferred Options document in 2013. However, by this point a number of changes had occurred within the SCC area and in the relevant policy context, including proposals to develop an International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP). To ensure that the next statutory Development Plan for Sunderland appropriately responds to these changes, takes account of the updated evidence base and includes sufficient detail regarding both development planning and development management issues, a decision was taken by SCC to reset the process and start afresh with preparation of a new Core Strategy. This Core Strategy has evolved into the Sunderland Core Strategy & Development Management Plan (CSDP). The Draft Sunderland CSDP is the latest consultative document in a process which will result in the adoption of a new Sunderland CSDP.
- 1.7.2 Since the development planning process was reset, the only consultation stage to have been undertaken is the consideration of options for housing growth through the Sunderland Core

³ Strategic sites are those which raise strategic implications due to their large size, land use or location within existing Greenbelt or Settlement Break designations. Conversely, non-strategic sites are those which only raise local scale implications (e.g. proposed housing allocations already identified as potentially suitable housing sites within the Sunderland Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Non-strategic site allocations have been deferred for consideration in a future Allocations and Designations Development Planning Document (DPD) which will support the Sunderland CSDP.

Strategy: Growth Options Consultation (May 2016). A SA report was prepared and consulted on in tandem with this document.

- 1.7.3 The Sunderland Core Strategy Growth Options Consultation was used to inform the preparation of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. Its content features within the Draft Sunderland CSDP under consideration in this report as SCC decided to adopt a broader set of spatial strategies as the basis for the Draft Sunderland CSDP. In consequence, the spatial strategies underpinning the Draft Sunderland CSDP have been subject to a fresh SA (set out in Section 4.3 and Appendix E of this report). This SA report is therefore not reliant on the previous SA report prepared for the Sunderland Core Strategy Growth Options Consultation.

2 Sunderland: Baseline and Policy Analysis

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 In accordance with the SEA Regulations, this section summarises relevant baseline characteristics of the SCC area which, considers the evolution of the baseline in the absence of the emerging Sunderland CSDP and notes the relationship between the emerging Sunderland CSDP and other qualifying plans, programmes and strategies (PPS). The section therefore identifies the sustainability context within which the emerging Sunderland CSDP is being prepared and which should be reflected in this SA.

2.2 The Sustainability Baseline of Sunderland

2.2.1 Drawing upon sources including the Draft CSDP itself, this subsection presents a review of both the socio-economic and environmental aspects, context and baseline scenario within which the emerging Sunderland CSDP is being developed. In doing so the subsection establishes the sustainability baseline which must be taken account of in this SA report. Matters including population, economic opportunities, health, air, climatic factors, water, biodiversity (including flora, fauna and soil), cultural heritage, landscape and material assets have been included in establishing this baseline. In line with the SEA Regulations, this section also identifies relevant environmental issues and problems which have informed the development of the emerging Sunderland CSDP and associated SA Framework.

Geographical Context

2.2.2 Sunderland City is located on the north-east coast of England at the mouth of the River Wear, covering an area of approximately 137 km². The administrative area of the City is bounded to the south and west by Durham County and to the north by South Tyneside, with the North Sea to the east. There is also a stretch of the north-western boundary of the City which adjoins Gateshead.

2.2.3 The Sunderland City Council (SCC) area can be broken down into three distinct areas; the urban area of Sunderland City itself; Washington, which is a new town built from the 1960s onwards; and a number of small former coal mining settlements located to the south west of the administrative area.

2.2.4 The A19 runs north-south through the City of Sunderland, linking to Teesside and Tyneside. There are good links to the A1 on the western boundary of the City. The Durham coast railway line runs along the North Sea coast.

Socio-economic Trends

Population

2.2.5 The population of the SCC area is currently around 278,000⁴ and has been predominantly falling over the past 20 years, by 4% from 1997 whilst the regional population of the North East totals around 2,636,800. This trend contrasts with regional growth (3%) and national UK growth (13%) over the same period. Latest population predictions (not taking into account any policy aspirations) show that the population is likely to grow slightly by 2037 (3%) though at a lesser rate compared to the region (5%) and United Kingdom (12%).

2.2.6 In Sunderland, current population estimates when broken down by age group are;

⁴ NOMIS 2016 ONS Population Estimates – local authority based by five year age band

- Aged 0-15 - 48,249 persons;
- Aged 16-25 - 32,095 persons;
- Aged 25-49 - 88,098 persons;
- Aged 50-64 - 57,047 persons; and,
- Aged 65+ - 52,473 persons.

2.2.7 Demographic trends also indicate historic migration patterns affecting Sunderland:

- Significant outflows of population to neighbouring areas, particularly County Durham; and
- Net inflow of population in the 18-24 age group as a result of the University, however significant net outflows of the 25-29 age group, as graduates leave.

Economy

2.2.8 The ONS Business Register and Employment Survey 2015 indicates that there are approximately 119,000⁵ employee jobs in the SCC area, resulting in a jobs density of 0.73⁶ that is lower than the national figure of 0.83 but equal to the North East regional figure of 0.73. The majority of jobs are in manufacturing (17.6%), which comprises a greater proportion of total jobs in the SCC area compared to the North East region (11.0%) and Great Britain (8.3%). The second largest employment industry in the SCC area is Human Health and Social Work Activities (13.4%), which is lower than the regional figure (15.7%) but consistent with the national figure (13.4%). The third largest employer industry in the SCC area is Wholesale and Retail Trade; repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles (12.6%), which is lower than both the regional figure (14.0%) and national figure (15.8%).

2.2.9 Sunderland's traditional industries (Coalmining, shipbuilding and heavy manufacturing) have been in long term decline from 1975 onwards. Reflective of the employment statistics detailed above, the area's economic base has partly shifted towards the growth of advanced manufacturing aligned to the Nissan car plant, as well as a significant increase in office based employment along the northern bank of the Wear and at Doxford Park. In 2016 the number of individual business units within the SCC area totalled approximately 7,410, representing a 12.8% increase from 2010 which is reasonably consistent with the North east regional increase of 13.7%. Specifically, for manufacturing, Sunderland's largest employment sector, this makes up 6.82% of the total number of individual business units which is higher when compared to the regional figure of 5.64%.⁷

2.2.10 Sunderland's occupational profile suggests a greater proportion of people are employed in skilled⁸ and semi-skilled jobs⁹, making up 57.7% of the total occupational profile which lower than across the region (60.7%) and in the United Kingdom (66.1%)¹⁰.

2.2.11 Despite the relatively positive employment figures for the SCC area, there remains a high proportion of the resident population that are unemployed (7.4% in December 2016) which is significantly higher than in the North East (6.6%) and Great Britain (4.8%). Out-of-work benefit claimant levels are only slightly above the regional average (3.3% to 3.2%). The average

⁵ ONS Business Register and Employment Survey 2015

⁶ the ratio of jobs to working age population (16-64 years old)

⁷ NOMIS 2016 Local Unit Figures

⁸ Managers, Directors & Senior Officials; Professional Occupations; Associate Professional & Technical

⁹ Skilled trades occupations; Administrative & Secretarial roles

¹⁰ ONS Annual Population Survey, 2016.

gross weekly wages of the City's resident's at £483.00 lags behind those of the North East (£492.20) and national average (£541.00)s.¹¹

Qualifications

- 2.2.12 The proportion of residents with no qualifications in Sunderland has been in decline over a number of years, falling from 18% in 2004 to just 8.4% in 2016. This is below the North East average (9.3%) but higher than the national average of 8.0%.
- 2.2.13 Furthermore, educational attainment beyond GCSE in Sunderland is relatively poor when compared to both the regional and national averages. The proportion of residents with NVQ4 level qualifications and above is just 25.9%, in comparison to 31.3% at the regional level and 38.2% nationally. However, this has been improving significantly over recent years, increasing from just 15.5% in 2004 and narrowing the gap to the regional average¹². The percentage of pupils receiving 5 A*-C grades at GCSE is however rising steadily and reached 53.9% in 2016, up from 51.0% in 2013/2014. This is below the North East average at 56.5% and national average at 57.8%.

Deprivation

- 2.2.14 The 2015 English Indices of Deprivation ranked the SCC area as the 37th most deprived local authority, out of 326 local authority areas in England. This is a worsening from the 2010 Indices when Sunderland was ranked as the 44th, however the 2015 rank is still an improvement on the 2007 and 2004 rankings. At a more local level, 19% of the Lower-layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) in the SCC area in the top 10% most deprived areas of England, whilst 38% of these LSOAs rank within in the 20% most deprived across England.

Transport

- 2.2.15 A large proportion of the population residing within the SCC area live within the urban areas of Sunderland and Washington, which benefit from good public transport links.
- There are nine Metro stations in the City on the Tyne and Wear Metro providing a regular service to Gateshead, Newcastle and Newcastle Airport. There is also the Durham coast railway line providing an hourly rail service to Teesside and Newcastle and the Grand Central service which currently provides up to five services per day between Sunderland, York and London. Virgin East Coast has also recently started operating a twice daily direct service between Sunderland and London.
 - There are no rail or Metro services in the Coalfield area and Washington. However, regular bus services provide links to the centres of Sunderland, Gateshead, Durham and Newcastle. However, access by public transport across the City (away from centres) can involve multiple journeys, particularly when seeking to access outlying employment areas.
- 2.2.16 The majority of travel journeys within the SCC area are made by private car, although bus and metro patronage continues to grow. Bus travel continues to be the most commonly used mode of public transport, comprising of approximately 75% of all journeys made. Car use has increased rapidly following on from a low point after the recession and cycling has decreased. However, car use in the City is lower than the national average, but increasing.
- 2.2.17 The 2011 census showed a net inflow of more than 40,000 commuters to the SCC area each day, mainly from neighbouring South Tyneside and County Durham, with the main outflows

¹¹ NOMIS 2016 Earnings by place of residence – ONS annual survey of hours and earnings

¹² NOMIS 2016

recorded to County Durham and Gateshead. However, multiple economic and demographic factors may alter this position within the lifetime of the emerging Sunderland CSDP.

Housing

- 2.2.18 The Sunderland SHMA Update 2017 – Final Report notes that the SCC area is one of the most affordable authority areas in the North East and the most affordable of the Tyne and Wear authorities. This document identifies a shortage of detached properties and bungalows across all sub-areas when compared to aspirations, as well as unmet demand for affordable housing¹³. Housing tenure figures from the 2011 Census indicate that at that point in time there were 32,419 owned outright houses, 39,499 houses owned with a mortgage/loan/shared ownership and 15,441 private rented or living rent free within the SCC area¹⁴.

Human Health

- 2.2.19 The health of people in Sunderland is varied compared with the England average. Deprivation is recorded to be higher than average and approximately 24.0% (11,500) children live in poverty¹⁵. Life expectancy for both men and women is also lower than English average levels.
- 2.2.20 There is significant inequality in life expectancy within the SCC area, with life expectancy being 9.9 years lower for men and 7.6 years lower for women in the most deprived areas when compared to the least deprived area. One of the factors affecting this may be the significantly higher number alcohol-related hospital stays and smoking related deaths in Sunderland compared to the England average.

Crime and Disorder

- 2.2.21 The latest data for Sunderland (2015/2016) indicates that the overall crime rate has been steadily increasing from 12.92 per 1,000 persons in 2012 to 22.85 per 1,000 persons in 2016, which is consistent with the average for the Northumbria Police area. Crime rates for Public Order were among the highest in the policing area in 2016 (8.24 per 1,000 population), while robbery and theft were among the lowest (0.43 and 0.47 per 1,000 persons, respectively).¹⁶

Education

- 2.2.22 The development of the higher education industry (University of Sunderland and Sunderland College) has increased at a significant pace over the last decade or so. The University and College have key links with the City-wide economy and support a wide range of local, City region and regional businesses. Both the University and College have invested heavily in the area in the last few years with the development of new buildings and facilities.

Environmental Baseline

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- 2.2.23 In accordance with the SEA Regulations a review of relevant sites designated at European level for reasons of biodiversity conservation or species importance has been undertaken to inform this SEA. This review has identified 5 Special Protection Areas (SPA) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), as detailed in Appendix A, which could potentially be affected by the emerging Sunderland CSDP and which therefore require to be considered when

¹³ Sunderland Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2017

¹⁴ NOMIS 2016 Census 2011 Data – Tenure by household composition

¹⁵ Sunderland Health Profile 2016 (<http://fingertipsreports.phe.org.uk>).

¹⁶ <https://www.police.uk/northumbria/>

undertaking this SA. The inclusion of all 5 SPAs and SACs within Appendix A does not however indicate whether or not these sites are likely to experience likely significant effects under the terms of the EU Habitats and Birds Directives, only that they are of potential relevance in the context of the SEA Regulations.

2.2.24 However, the SCC area itself only includes two European designated sites, namely:

- The Northumbria Coast Special Protection Area (SPA and Ramsar) characterised by rocky foreshore. During the winter season Purple Sandpipers and Turnstones are present. Key threats to these are the potential loss of feeding habitat (as a result of removal or smothering of the habitat), and non-physical disturbance through noise or visual disturbance (e.g. from dog walking)¹⁷. During the breeding season the SPA also supports pairs of Little Terns¹⁸. Threat to these potentially include habitat loss and disturbance at the breeding areas, and declines in food supply¹⁹; and
- The Durham Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is the only example of vegetated sea cliffs on the magnesian limestone exposures in the UK. Key threats include loss of habitat e.g. as a result of natural erosion processes being constrained and loss of habitat particularly related to changes in vegetation composition and structure e.g. as a result of changes in grazing fertiliser application and/or trampling pressure from people and wildlife.

2.2.25 Individual units which make up these European designated sites are also designated at the national level as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Within the City there are also a further 17 SSSIs, 2 of which are identified for both biological and earth heritage (geological or geomorphic) value and 5 for earth heritage value alone²⁰. There are two areas identified as of biological importance that are in an unfavourable and two of these are declining (Fulwell & Carley Quarry and Moorsley Bank), three recovering (Eppleton Grasslands, Hatton Bogs and High Haining Hill) and one unchanged (part Eppleton Grasslands). All other SSSI are in favourable condition. The designated sites in unfavourable and declining condition are Claxhaugh Road & Ford Limestone Quarry and Fulwell & Carley Quarry.²¹

2.2.26 In relation to non-statutory local designations, the SCC area includes 63 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and 14 proposed Local Wildlife Sites (PLWS), which together cover more than 500 hectares.

2.2.27 The sites identified above are all designated for reasons of biodiversity conservation and/or species or geological importance. This includes a number of sites designated for the protection of habitats associated with protected species. Owing to the high level nature of this SA the ecological features of individual designated sites are not considered further within this specific report.

Landscape

2.2.28 Sunderland is included in the Tyne and Wear Lowlands and the Durham Magnesian Limestone Plateau under Natural England's landscape character areas. The Hendon Leas to Ryhope coastline forms part of the Durham Heritage Coast, which has been defined by Natural England as a nationally important landscape.

¹⁷ City of Sunderland Unitary Development Plan, Alteration No.2 Central Sunderland Appropriate Assessment.

¹⁸ <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-161>

¹⁹ City of Sunderland Unitary Development Plan, Alteration No.2 Central Sunderland Appropriate Assessment.

²⁰ <http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/report.cfm?category=C,CF>

²¹ <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk>

Cultural Heritage

- 2.2.29 St Peters Church, which together with St Pauls Church in Jarrow forms the Wearmouth – Jarrow monastery, was put forward as a candidate World Heritage site jointly by SCC and South Tyneside Council. Although the bid was unsuccessful, it is still the Council’s intention to support any future proposals for World Heritage status. The Wearmouth Masterplan and Design Code Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted in February 2012 and provides specific planning and design guidance for development in this area. The SCC area includes 14 conservation areas, 11 with character appraisals and management strategies adopted as formal planning guidance.
- 2.2.30 The SCC area contains nine Scheduled Ancient Monuments and approximately 692 Listed Buildings. This includes 9 Grade I Listed Buildings and 16 Grade II* Listed Buildings, with the remainder listed as Grade II. There are two historic parks on the Historic England national Register of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest; Mowbray Park in Sunderland City centre and Roker Park. In addition, there are currently seven structures on the national Historic England ‘Heritage at Risk Register’, including two Grade I listed churches, and four Grade II* Listed buildings. There are also two scheduled monuments within the SCC area on this register.

Material Assets

- 2.2.31 In the area from Hendon Promenade southward to the City boundary and beyond, coastal erosion and landslip is known to occur where existing defences such as walls/promenades/piers are not present. There are large areas of previously developed land in need of regeneration on the eastern river corridor. The Agricultural Land Classification categorises land into Grades 1-5, with Grades 1, 2 and 3a being considered to be the best and most versatile agricultural land. Whilst the amount of land which has been assessed within the SCC area is limited, there are significant pockets of Grade 2 and Grade 3a agricultural land identified to the South of Sunderland, associated with the Magnesian Limestone grassland. Much of the land within the western half of the SCC area falls within Grade 3b and is therefore not considered to be the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Climatic Factors

- 2.2.32 In 2012 Sunderland’s carbon emissions were 1,684,400 tonnes of CO₂, which represents an increase of 6.6% on the figure measured in the previous year. However, overall there has been a general reduction in the SCC area’s carbon emissions in recent years, dropping from over 2,000,000 tonnes of CO₂ in 2005. Of Sunderland’s 2012 carbon emissions, 39% were from Industry; 37% from Domestic properties; and 24% from transport.

Air

- 2.2.33 The result of the last Updating and Screening Assessment of Air Quality (USA) found that air quality across Sunderland is currently within pollutant limits. As a result, no AQMAs have had to be declared in the City.

Waste

- 2.2.34 The amount of municipal waste arising within the City has been reducing in recent years from 144,894 tonnes in 2009/10 to 134,708 tonnes by 2015. The amount of waste collected per household has also generally been declining in recent years reducing from 474kg per household in 2009/10 to 444.44kg in 2014/15. A total of 269,159 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste was recorded as arising in Sunderland in 2015 and there was also in the order of 762,987 tonnes of Construction, Demolition and Excavated (CDE) waste deposited in Sunderland. However only 615,432 tonnes of this CDE waste arose within the SCC area.

Water

- 2.2.35 The SCC area lies within the Northumbria River Basin district, the Wear management catchment and mainly within the Wear Lower and Estuary operational catchment. Water quality data from the Environment Agency 'Catchment Data Explorer' online tool enables those water bodies in the operational catchment that are of moderate or lower quality to be identified. Within the SCC area, the water bodies identified as moderate or poor quality are: Herrington Burn from Source to Lumley Park Hendon Coastal; Lumley Park Burn to Herrington Burn and River Wear; and Joe's Pond. The only water body of these to show an improvement from 2009 to 2015 is the Herrington Burn from Source to Lumley Park Burn (poor to moderate) all others have seen a decline (good to moderate for Hendon Coastal and Joe's Pond) and moderate to poor for Lumley Park Burn to Herrington Burn. All are classified as heavily modified water bodies (with the exception of Joe's Pond that is artificial).
- 2.2.36 There are two designated Bathing Waters within the SCC area, located on the seafront area between Seaburn and South Bents, and at Roker. These are considered to be 'sensitive' areas for water quality with any waste water requiring secondary treatment before deposition. In 2015, their water quality was rated as 'excellent, meeting European Bathing Water guideline standards' and improving from the previous two years where they were rated as 'good'.
- 2.2.37 Groundwater quality in the magnesian limestone found in the east of the City is currently rated as poor for both qualitative and chemical quality. Groundwater in the carboniferous limestone and coal measures further west is currently good in terms of quantitative quality but poor in chemical quality, with the situation expected to remain unchanged. However, part of the SCC area is identified as a Nitrate Vulnerability Zone owing to identified risks of pollutants including nitrate infiltrating soils.
- 2.2.38 In relation to surface water quality, the River Wear is classed by the Environment Agency as being very good in terms of both chemical and biological water quality.

2.3 Review of Plans, Programmes and Strategies

- 2.3.1 As required by the SEA Regulations, a review of relevant plans, programmes and strategies (RPP) has been carried out to inform this SA report and is provided in Appendix B. This RPP included a review of relevant national and European legislative requirements, as well as relevant international, national, sub-regional and local plans and strategies.
- 2.3.2 The RPP identified a large number of policy requirements, targets and relevant issues were identified as requiring consideration in the preparation of the emerging Sunderland CSDP and the associated SA process. Key issues identified pointed to the need for the emerging Sunderland CSDP to:
- Identify and plan to meet the development needs of the City over the period to 2033, including the allocation of key strategic sites;
 - Deliver well-designed homes providing a range of sizes and tenures, including the appropriate level of affordable housing and large family homes;
 - Stopping the out-migration of residents through delivering an improved housing offer within the City;
 - Positively seek to allocate and safeguard sufficient employment land in appropriate locations, in addition to the International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP), which will be delivered separately through an Area Action Plan;

- Reduce the need to travel, provide opportunities to travel by means that are capable of improving health and wellbeing such as cycling and walking;
- Seek to use development to deliver improved and expanded transport links, public transport and electronic infrastructure, such as superfast broadband;
- Seek to protect, enhance and, where necessary, increase outdoor sports facilities, parks and open spaces;
- Seek to protect heritage assets and sites of potential archaeological interest in ways appropriate to their significance. Specific protection is required for the potential World Heritage Site at St Peter's;
- Develop effective community engagement techniques to respond to the views of wider communities and facilities effective neighbourhood planning;
- Promote the efficient use of resources, including moving towards a low carbon economy, use of waste as a resource, energy efficient buildings, and appropriate renewable and low carbon energy;
- Seek to improve air quality and ensure that the Council continues to have no areas designated as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs);
- Ensure that there are no significant negative impacts on internationally and nationally designated nature sites;
- Give full consideration to the potential impacts on water, including water quality, ecosystems, sustainable use of water, capacity of sewerage, flood risk and the opportunities to improve flood risk management;
- Seek ways to maximise Green Infrastructure coverage (linked areas of open space and wildlife corridors) and connectivity across a wide range of scales and increase ecosystems services including biodiversity;
- Seek ways to maximise the wider social and economic benefits of Green Infrastructure;
- Use land efficiently by prioritising the use of previously developed land. Consider soil quality and agricultural land classification when assessing potential development sites;
- Recognise the different landscapes within the City and their differing capacity to accommodate change; and
- Promote development that minimises landscape impacts and protects landscapes appropriate to their significance.

2.4 Predicted Evolution of the Baseline in the Absence of the Emerging Sunderland CSDP

- 2.4.1 Taking account of the environmental information provided in Sections 2.2 – 2.3 above and in Appendix A, as well as the content of the Draft Sunderland CSDP, Table 2.1 below outlines the expected evolution of the baseline environmental position in the absence of the implementation of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. The environmental topic headings refer to the matters specified within the SEA Regulations for consideration.

Table 2.1 Evolution of the Baseline Scenario in the Absence of the Emerging Sunderland CSDP

SEA Regulation Topic(s)	Possible Changes without the emerging Sunderland CSDP
Air Quality & Climatic Factors	<p>If the Sunderland CSDP is not implemented it is likely that demand for, and use of, motorised forms of transport would increase unchecked as physical development occurs across the SCC area, whilst opportunities to encourage transport modal shift to walking, cycling and public transport would be lost.</p> <p>In the absence of a significant shift towards the use of electric vehicles (which is not considered likely to occur on a significant scale in the SCC area within the relatively short timescales of the emerging Sunderland CSDP) the resulting increase in traffic would increase fossil fuel combustion, carbon emissions and local atmospheric pollution, in particular greater release of particulate matter. This would act against wider policy efforts to decarbonise key economic sectors including transport mitigate climate change. It could also lead to worsening air quality.</p> <p>As a result, despite relatively good existing air quality levels, in future SCC could fail to meet their duties in relation to climate change mitigation and adaptation under the Climate Change Act 2008 and could be required to designate Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) to address areas of poor air quality. Sustained breaches of European air quality limits could also trigger fines being imposed on the UK Government and SCC.</p>
Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna	<p>To meet identified needs and facilitate continued economic growth within the SCC area there will be a requirement for new development and infrastructure, which in the absence of the emerging Sunderland CSDP could occur in inappropriate locations and/or at unsustainable levels. Construction of such development could put pressure on biodiversity, including the loss and fragmentation of habitats, while increases in traffic and noise could disturb sensitive species.</p>
Water	<p>To meet identified needs and facilitate continued economic growth within the SCC area there will be a requirement for new development and infrastructure, which in the absence of the emerging Sunderland CSDP could occur in inappropriate locations and/or at unsustainable levels. Construction of such development could put pressure on water resources and adversely affect the quality of the water environment.</p>
Land & Soil	<p>To meet identified needs and facilitate continued economic growth within the SCC area there will be a requirement for new development and infrastructure, which in the absence of the emerging Sunderland CSDP could occur in inappropriate locations and/or at unsustainable levels. Construction of such development could lead to land contamination and soil erosion. Pressure for the development of new facilities, housing and employment generating uses could also lead to the loss of best or most versatile agricultural land.</p>
Health	<p>If the emerging Sunderland CSDP is not implemented and significant increases in both physical activity and active travel are not achieved, various health issues including obesity, inactivity and poor air quality, will</p>

SEA Regulation Topic(s)	Possible Changes without the emerging Sunderland CSDP
	<p>continue to affect the population, causing increases in ill-health and potentially a reduction in life expectancy.</p> <p>Furthermore, to meet identified needs and facilitate continued economic growth within the SCC area there will be a requirement for new development and infrastructure, which in the absence of the emerging Sunderland CSDP could occur in inappropriate locations and/or at unsustainable levels. Construction of such development could lead to the loss of areas of open space, reducing opportunities for physical activity.</p>
Population	<p>If the emerging Sunderland CSDP is not implemented and the resident population of the SCC area continues to increase in line with projections, demand for public service provision, economic opportunities and transport infrastructure may outstrip supply/availability. As well as creating development pressure in unsustainable locations, the built and natural environments of the SCC area may therefore fail to meet identified population needs.</p>
Cultural Heritage	<p>To meet identified needs and facilitate continued economic growth within the SCC area there will be a requirement for new development and infrastructure, which in the absence of the emerging Sunderland CSDP could occur in inappropriate locations and/or at unsustainable levels. Construction of such development may add development pressure to sensitive areas of historic and/or archaeological interest, as well as undermining the character of conservation areas.</p>
Landscape	<p>To meet identified needs and facilitate continued economic growth within the SCC area there will be a requirement for new development and infrastructure, which in the absence of the emerging Sunderland CSDP could occur in inappropriate locations and/or at unsustainable levels. Construction of such development could have a significant negative impact on the landscape character of the SCC area, especially if additional new development were to be concentrated within the existing Green Belt, Settlement Breaks and areas of high landscape value.</p>
Material Assets	<p>Without the emerging Sunderland CSDP it is likely that a range of infrastructure proposals would not be delivered. This would adversely impact upon the implementation of SCC's Economic Masterplan (2010) and the Economic Leadership Boards 3,6,9 Vision and fail to meet identified needs to support a growing population.</p>

2.5 Key Sustainability Issues

- 2.5.1 The baseline characterisation and RPP detailed above were used to define key sustainability issues of relevance to the emerging Sunderland CSDP and the associated SA. These issues, which are listed in Table 2.2 below, informed the development of a SA Framework which has underpinned the SA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP.

Table 2.2: Key Issues for the emerging Sunderland CSDP and this SA

Key Issues	Implications for emerging Sunderland CSDP
Social	
Ageing population	There is a need to plan to provide age friendly development in recognition of the ageing population in the City.
Outward migration of the working age population	There is a need to plan to provide more housing that will support the working age population; this includes larger family housing, to reduce the outmigration of the working age population. It is also important to ensure that the plan delivers sufficient new housing to meet identified needs.
Improve housing choice, in particular addressing the shortfall in affordable and larger family housing.	Seek to meet deficiencies in housing stock identified through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), in particular increasing the delivery of affordable and larger family housing to meet identified needs.
Poor educational performance post GCSE	Support improvements to the University and College.
Reduce crime and the fear of crime.	Promote good design and mixed use developments, to increase usage at all times of the day and improve passive surveillance.
Based on the 2015 Indices of Deprivation, Sunderland is ranked as the 37 th most deprived local authority in England.	Include policies to address deprivation within the City in order to significantly improve the cities IMD ranking.
Improve health and well-being of residents of the City.	Inclusion of policies to promote healthy lifestyles in order to promote health outcomes. This includes protection of green spaces used for leisure and recreation.
Environmental	
Need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to help meet EU, national and local targets.	Plan positively for renewable forms of energy. Ensure good design to reduce energy demands of buildings. Promote sustainable patterns of development to reduce the distance travelled and promote modal shift towards more sustainable transport methods.
Reduce the risk of flooding	Direct development away from those areas at highest risk of flooding. Use available funding sources to mitigate flood risk in key areas.
Coastal Erosion and sea level rise	Seek to implement measures to reduce the rate of coastal erosion. Ensure development takes account of likely sea level rises and direct development away from low lying areas particularly at risk.

Key Issues	Implications for emerging Sunderland CSDP
Improve waste management	Seek to push waste management techniques up the waste management hierarchy, with greater emphasis on reducing the amount of waste generated and increasing levels of reuse and recycling.
Improve ground water quality	Seek to introduce measures to improve groundwater quality, particularly in those areas where water quality is considered poor such as the magnesian limestone in the east of the City. Ensure that high standards of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) are adhered to in any new development.
Conserve and enhance important ecological and geodiversity sites.	Ensure policies seek to protect and enhance designated sites. Where impacts are unavoidable, appropriate mitigation should be sought. The plan should also aim to ensure adequate protection for the City's biological resources and protected species.
Retain green belt where effective.	Retain protection for the openness of the Green Belt. Where any green belt losses are proposed, it should be demonstrated that these are exceptionally justified and that all other reasonable alternatives have been considered first.
Preserve the heritage coast	Protect the undeveloped qualities of the heritage coast that falls within the City boundaries and neighbouring areas.
Enhance landscape character	Ensure that policies protect and enhance the City's rural and urban landscape, with particular emphasis to improve existing poorer quality environments.
Protect the historic environment	Seek to protect both designated and non-designated heritage assets based on their significance.
Economic	
Promote a strong and stable economy, creating jobs.	Ensure a strong focus on economic development within the Core Strategy. Ensure an adequate supply of employment land is provided in the right locations to support economic growth.
Balance the aims of promoting economic development and maintaining a high quality environment	Seek good quality design on employment sites, particularly new employment sites over which the plan has greater control.
Improve GVA through increased participation, increased productivity, and creating businesses.	Support economic growth in order to help reduce unemployment, create new businesses and increase GVA to help achieve the aspirational targets set out in the SEP.
Promote City for low carbon economy.	Ensure that the Core Strategy supports the move to a low carbon economy, in accordance with the NPPF, Sunderland Strategy, Economic Masterplan and the City Deal.

Key Issues	Implications for emerging Sunderland CSDP
Make greater use of Nissan, the Port, University and employment land as engines for economic growth.	Utilise the economic advantages from Nissan, the Port and the University as growth drivers. The IAMP will seek to build upon the success of Nissan and make better use of its supply chain, whilst the Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor should help to support the Port and regeneration of the urban riverside corridor.
Improve infrastructure to facilitate economic growth	Promote investment in infrastructure to support economic growth. Develop Infrastructure Delivery Plan to identify infrastructure required to support the level of development envisaged through the plan and detail how this will be delivered.
Promote the City Centre for office development, particularly through the Vaux site.	Ensure the plan supports the redevelopment of the Vaux site as a driver for growth in the City centre in order to support the Sunderland Strategy, Economic Masterplan and the City Deal.

3 The Sustainability Appraisal Process

3.1 Introduction

- 3.1.1 This section provides an overview of the SA process, incorporating SEA, which has been undertaken to date for the emerging Sunderland CSDP. In doing so the section explains the approach which has been adopted for undertaking the SA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP (July 2017).

3.2 SA and SEA Purpose and Objectives

- 3.2.1 In accordance with the SEA Regulations the purpose of SEA is to identify, assess and evaluate the likely significant environmental effects of a qualifying plan, programme or strategy (PSS). Under the 2004 Act, the purpose of SA is to assess the contribution of a Local Plan (in this case a Core Strategy and Development Plan) to delivering sustainable development. SA and SEA therefore share a common focus on assessing environmental and wider sustainability performance and can be undertaken and reported together, as in this report.

3.2.2 A key objective of SA, incorporating SEA, is to enhance the environmental and wider sustainability performance of a PPS. This is achieved through identifying any likely significant effects from implementation of the PPS as drafted, proposing mitigation measures to address any identified significant adverse environmental effects, and identifying enhancement measures to improve the overall performance of the PPS. As such, SA incorporating SEA is an integral part of good development planning and should not be viewed as a separate or retrospective activity.

3.3 Meeting the Requirements of the SEA Regulations

- 3.3.1 To satisfy the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations, it is necessary for this SA report to fulfil certain information requirements. The approach to addressing these requirements is shown in **Table 3.1**.

Table 3.1: Requirements of the SEA Regulations and how they are met through the SA report

SEA Requirements	Section Reference
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationships with other relevant plans and programmes.	Appendix B
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme.	Section 2.2 and Appendix A
c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.	
d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC.	
e) The environmental protection objectives, established at international, community or national level which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation.	Section 2.3 and Appendix B
f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as: biodiversity; population; human health; fauna; flora; soil; water; air; climatic factors; material assets; cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage; landscape; and the interrelationship between the above factors. These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative.	Section 4 and Appendices D - G
g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and, as fully as possible, offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme.	Section 5 and Appendices D - G
h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with and a description of how the assessment was undertaken, including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information.	Section 3.5
i) A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10.	Section 6.2
j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings.	Refer to separate Non Technical Summary SA Report
Taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision-making (Art. 8).	Sections 1.6, 4 and 6

3.4 Approach to SA and SEA

SA Project Team

- 3.4.1 The SA (incorporating SEA) of the emerging Sunderland CSDP is being undertaken independently by Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) on behalf of Sunderland City Council (SCC). The consultant team involved in carrying out the SA is therefore independent of the CSDP preparation team within SCC, which helps to ensure the objectivity of the SA and to identify components requiring improvement throughout its development. The SA team within PBA has however held regular discussions with SCC officers to allow informal and early feedback of recommendations and ideas for improvement prior to finalising Draft Sunderland CSDP for public consultation.
- 3.4.2 The consultant team from PBA undertook SA of all Draft Sunderland CSDP components and their reasonable alternatives on an objective basis, without regard to whether individual sites are preferred for allocation by SCC or not. Justifications were later provided by SCC for inclusion in this SA report to identify and explain, in the context of the SA, why individual sites are either proposed for allocation, reserved for safeguarding or have been rejected from inclusion in the emerging Sunderland CSDP. This helps to demonstrate how the components contained in the Draft Sunderland CSDP have been selected from reasonable alternatives.

Previous SA and SEA Reporting

- 3.4.3 SA and SEA has been undertaken in relation to two previous consultations regarding the emerging Core Strategy:
- Sunderland Core Strategy SA & SEA Scoping Consultation (October 2015).
- 3.4.4 This document outlines the approach to SA and the SA Framework which has underpinned this SA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP.
- Sunderland Core Strategy Growth Options Consultation (May 2016).
- 3.4.5 This consultative document outlined three conceptual growth options (Baseline, Medium Growth and High Growth) and associated spatial strategy variants which could underpin the emerging Sunderland CSDP. The associated SA report examined the relative sustainability implications of these growth options and spatial strategies. Following this consultation, the High Growth option was selected by SCC to underpin the emerging Sunderland CSDP, although significant changes in the evidence base now mean that a lower quantum of development would be required within the SCC area to implement the option.
- 3.4.6 Responses from these two consultations have therefore informed both the content of the emerging Sunderland CSDP and the SA undertaken for the Draft Sunderland CSDP, reported here in.

SA Scoping and the SA Framework

- 3.4.7 The Sunderland Core Strategy SA & SEA Scoping Report (March 2016) ('the Scoping Report') defined the overall approach to SA and the SA Framework which has been used in both the SA of the Sunderland Core Strategy Growth Options Consultation (May 2016) and in this SA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP. This SA Framework was developed directly in response to the key sustainability issues identified from baseline analysis and the RPP, as listed in Table 2.2.
- 3.4.8 The Scoping Report set out a proposed SA Framework to assess in a systematic way the sustainability and environmental effects likely to arise from all components of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. This Framework comprises a series of sustainability objectives and guide questions regarding identified socio-economic and environmental issues of relevance to

Sunderland which may affect (or be affected by) the emerging Sunderland CSDP together with other relevant PPS. The SA objectives are accompanied by a set of guide questions and criteria to enable assessment of proposed options, objectives, policies and allocations (i.e. the emerging Sunderland CSDP components) as well as their reasonable alternatives.

- 3.4.9 The overall approach to SA and the SA Framework were amended to take account of Scoping consultation responses, as detailed in Table 3.2 below.

Table 3.2 Summary of Scoping Consultation Responses and Changes

Respondent Name	Comment	Response
Environment Agency	Reference should be made to the Northumbrian River Basin Management Plan (RBMP). This plan is currently in the process of being updated and a final version will be published on our website at the end of December 2015.	Published in February 2015. RMPB will be included in Appendix 2.
	Environment Agency Medium Term Plan should also be referenced as this sets out our investment programme from 2015 to 2021.	The only relevant project in Sunderland was already under construction as of April 2015. No change proposed.
	We support the inclusion of the EU Waste Framework within Appendix 2. We would advise that when developing policies on waste we emphasise the importance of the 'Waste Hierarchy'	Noted
	We support the inclusion of water quality indicators in the water section of Appendix 3. However, it only appears that the River Wear and 2 coastal bathing waters have been taken into consideration. We would advise that all water bodies within the Local Authority administrative boundary should be taken into consideration.	Updated to reflect information on EA Catchment Data Explorer.
	We support the indicator for percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting. Also suggest that the number of site waste management plans submitted with new development could be included as an indicator.	Noted. SWMP are no longer required for planning applications. Should the Local Plan include a policy setting this as a requirement then it may be suitable to include this as a criteria.
Highways England	We note in paragraph 1.29 reference is made to consultation having been carried out with the three specific consultation bodies in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012, and also with other key stakeholders, which includes Highways England.	Noted
	We note it is the intention to assess strategic allocations against the SA Framework using the same approach as for the spatial strategy and other policies, utilising the same matrix and scoring mechanism.	Noted

Respondent Name	Comment	Response
	Consideration should be given to the Department for Transport Road Investment Strategy, for the 2015/2016 – 2019/20 Road Period (March 2015) which sets out a long-term programme and funding for motorways and major roads over the next five years and comprises a long-term vision for England's motorways and major roads,	The importance of the Highways England Delivery plan is recognised as part of delivering economic growth. However, it is not a plan that in itself seeks to deliver sustainable development and therefore is not included in the review of relevant national policy. No change proposed
	Consideration could be given to Highways England Delivery Plan 2015/2020 (March 2015) which outline what Highways England will do over the next five years to delivery against the five strategic outcomes	The importance of the Highways England Delivery plan is recognised as part of delivering economic growth. However, it is not a plan that in itself seeks to deliver sustainable development and therefore is not included in the review of relevant national policy. Relevant schemes are included in Appendix 3.
	It would be useful to identify the extent of the road network in the SCC area, including Highways England's responsibility for the strategic road network and reflect on accessibility and the condition of the road network, recognising where there are particular congestion issues on parts of the network.	Areas of congestion and pinch points identified from the LTP3 have been used to appraise candidate strategic site allocations.
	The Core Strategy will need to promote investment in infrastructure to support economic growth and therefore it will be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, to identify the infrastructure required to support the scale of development proposed in the Plan and detail how this will ultimately be delivered which is welcomed. As is the intention to promote sustainable patterns of development to reduce the travel distances and promote a modal shift away from the private car towards more sustainable means, in relation to the need to reduce greenhouse gas emission issues. It is also noted that storage support is provided for the development of the Vaux site to promote growth in the city centre particularly for office development and the intentions to increase economic growth utilities the opportunities presented by Nissan, the Port and the University.	Noted
	Supportive of the objectives and in particular Objective 7 – Transport and Communication. Also supportive of the scope of the associated guidance questions and indicators proposed in respect of this objective	Noted

Respondent Name	Comment	Response
Natural England	Broadly welcomes the proposed approach to SA.	Noted
	Natural England is not aware of any other policies, plans or strategies that should be included for consideration.	Noted
	The baseline information does not include any detail about the current condition of the internationally designated sites found within Sunderland. Natural England is aware that survey work has been undertaken, and further work is ongoing, in regards to bird numbers found along the coast, and this data should be included in the baseline information when it becomes available. Wetland Bird Survey (WeBS) data may also be available which can further inform the current baseline situation.	Noted. The HRA will consider the status of the internationally designated sites in further depth. The SA will cross refer to the appropriate information. Appendix A of this SA Report identifies relevant European sites.
	Natural England agrees with the SA Objectives identified, however suggests that the 'Guide Questions' in relation to SA Objective 1 be expanded to include a reference to 'no net loss of habitat' as well as conserving and enhancing international and national designated nature conservation sites. Also welcome the guide question referring to the avoidance of loss of best and most versatile agricultural land within the Land Use and Soils Objective.	Noted. Guide question updated to reflect comments.
	Natural England does not consider there to be any issues that are not being addressed by this scoping report.	Noted

- 3.4.10 Taking account of the changes outlined in Table 3.2, the finalised SA Framework used in this assessment is set out in Appendix C. This SA Framework focuses on assessing potential effects on the 15 sustainability objectives listed in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Sustainability Objectives within the Sunderland CSDP SA Framework

1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network.
2. Housing: To meet the housing needs of the Sunderland City area.
3. Economy and Employment: To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities for everyone.
4. Learning and Skills: To improve the educational attainment and skills of Sunderland City's residents.
5. Sustainable Communities: To promote sustainable communities within the Sunderland City area.
6. Health and Wellbeing: To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Sunderland City area.
7. Transport and Communication: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of travel, improve telecommunications infrastructure and align investment in infrastructure with growth.
8. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.
9. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion: To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change.
11. Air: To improve air quality.
12. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change.
13. Waste and Natural Resources: To promote the movement up the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources.
14. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.
15. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscape.

3.5 Preparation of this SA Report

- 3.5.1 PBA commenced work on the SA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP in March 2017 following completion of the first draft of the plan by SCC officers. A number of modifications were made to the Draft Sunderland CSDP in Spring 2017, in part to respond to recommendations from initial SA work undertaken by PBA. The finalised Sunderland Draft CSDP was then subject to a full SA in June – July 2017.

SA Methodology

- 3.5.2 The SA was undertaken generally in accordance with the general approach to SA and the SA Framework set out in the Sunderland Core Strategy SA & SEA Scoping Report (March 2016). However, between March and June 2017 it became clear that to provide a robust development planning basis for the SCC area, the Draft Sunderland CSDP would need to include a wider range of strategic site allocations and development management policies than

previously envisaged when preparing the Sunderland Core Strategy SA & SEA Scoping Report (March 2016).

3.5.3 On behalf of SCC, PBA therefore undertook a review of the adequacy of the proposed approach to SA and the SA Framework for assessing the proposed components of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. This review concluded that whilst the generic SA Framework could be used to assess the emerging Sunderland CSDP vision, strategic priorities and policies, a revised suite of assessment criteria needed to be developed to underpin a robust yet proportionate SA (incorporating SEA) of all proposed site allocations and reasonable alternatives. Relevant criteria were developed by PBA and agreed with SCC to ensure sufficient coverage against the 15 sustainability objectives from the SA Framework when assessing the following 'topic specific' proposed allocations:

- Proposed Green Belt Housing Release Sites (and reasonable alternatives);
- Proposed Key Employment Areas and Primary Employment Areas (and reasonable alternatives); and
- Proposed Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Sites (and reasonable alternatives).

3.5.4 The criteria and scoring thresholds adopted for use in applying the generic SA Framework to the assessment of proposed site allocations are detailed within Appendix F - SA of Proposed Site Allocations.

3.5.5 With regard to the SA of draft policies, this was undertaken by policy grouping for each chapter of policies contained within the Draft Sunderland CSDP. The one exception is the Sunderland's Environment chapter of policies which have been divided into three groupings (Design & Historic Environment, Environment and Amenity) to allow different sustainability issues arising from these policies to be assessed in a manageable way.

Identification of Reasonable Alternatives

3.5.6 The SEA Regulations require the likely significant effects of implementing both a PPS (i.e. the emerging Sunderland CSDP) and reasonable alternatives to the PPS to be examined, as well as the rationale for identifying reasonable alternatives to be described. The SEA Regulations further state that to be considered as reasonable alternatives, options (e.g. alternative policy criteria or site allocations) must relate to the PPS' objectives and geographical scope. Reasonable alternatives must therefore be:

- **Realistic**, in that they are plausible alternatives which could be implemented and are consistent with relevant national and other policy frameworks;
- **Related** to the objectives of the PPS under consideration; and
- Within the **geographical scope** of the PPS as they relate to the distribution of development specific to SCC area.

3.5.7 For this SA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP, the following reasonable alternatives were identified where possible and subject to SA in the same way as proposed plan components:

- Alternative policy criteria/tests considered by SCC officers during the preparation of the Draft Sunderland CSDP, e.g. application of a higher or lower affordable housing provision requirement. Where reasonable alternatives to draft policies were identified, this is noted within relevant SA matrices provided in Appendix G.

- Alternative Urban Strategic Scale Sites – the justifications for allocating the South Sunderland Growth Area (SSA) and Vaux Site were examined to determine whether any reasonable alternatives exist;
- Alternative Green Belt Housing Release Sites – all candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites which reached Stage 2 of SCC’s Green Belt Review were assessed;
- Alternative Key and Primary Employment Areas – all sites examined within the Sunderland Employment Land Review 2016 (comprising 94 individual site areas) as forming part of the existing employment land supply were assessed; and
- Alternative Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites (TSGT) – all sites examined by SCC as potential TSGT sites and not discounted to viability constraints were assessed.

3.5.8 Given that reasonable alternatives must relate to the objectives of the PPS, no reasonable alternatives to the vision or strategic objectives contained within the Draft Sunderland CSDP could be identified, as any alternatives would change the strategic direction of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. Having regard to the status, objectives and justification for the South Sunderland Strategic Growth Area (SSGA) and The Vaux proposed allocations, no reasonable alternatives to these strategic scale urban allocations could also be identified. The methodologies for the identification of reasonable alternatives in relation to proposed Green Belt Housing Release Sites, KEA, PEA and TSGT sites are detailed within Appendix F.

SA Matrices

- 3.5.9 All components of the Draft Sunderland CSDP and reasonable alternatives were appraised in detail using matrices to identify likely significant effects on the SA objectives. This approach allowed for systematic recording of potential effects and their significance together with any assumptions, uncertainties and suggested mitigation or enhancement measures (e.g. changes to policy wording). The appraisal of each plan component was undertaken on a pre-mitigation basis, i.e. assuming full implementation of the component as stated in the Draft Sunderland CSDP, without the provision of additional policy safeguards or mitigation measures.
- 3.5.10 The identification of any uncertainties is important as all plan components, in particular development management policies, need to be unambiguous to ensure they can be implemented as intended and therefore fully contribute to sustainable development. Appraisal matrices consequently include recommendations for policy clarifications where necessary to enhance the overall quality of the emerging Sunderland CSDP.
- 3.5.11 The identification of mitigation measures to avoid likely significant adverse effects from proposed site allocation is also of critical importance. Such mitigation measures usually take the form of requirements to undertake technical assessments regarding potential environmental effects and, depending on the outcome of these assessments, to implement mitigation, compensatory and/or offsetting measures through the implementation of any planning permission granted for a development proposal. Mitigation measures identified within the SA of proposed site allocations therefore need to be secured through the emerging Sunderland CSDP and capable of implementation through the development management process.
- 3.5.12 The completed appraisal matrices are provided in Appendices D – G, with a summary of key findings provided in Section 4 of this report.
- 3.5.13 The qualitative scoring system shown in Table 3.4 below was adopted to complete all appraisal matrices and, in doing so, to identify likely significant environmental and wider sustainability effects.

Table 3.4 SA Scoring System to Establish Likely Significant Effects

Score	Description	Symbol
Significant (Major) Positive Effect	The proposed option/policy contributes significantly to the achievement of the SA objective.	++
Minor Positive Effect	The proposed option/policy contributes to the achievement of the SA objective but not significantly.	+
Neutral Effect	The proposed option/policy is related to but does not have any effect on the achievement of the SA objective	0
Minor Negative Effect	The proposed option/policy detracts from the achievement of the SA objective but not significantly.	-
Significant (Major) Negative Effect	The proposed option/policy detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective. Significant Adverse effect predicted; mitigation therefore required in accordance with the SEA Regulations.	--
Uncertain Effect	The proposed option/policy has an uncertain relationship to the SA objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.	?
No Clear Relationship	There is no clear relationship between the proposed option/policy and the achievement of the SEA objective or the relationship is negligible.	~

4 Sustainability Appraisal of the Draft Sunderland CSDP

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 This section provides the results of the SA prepared for the Draft Sunderland CSDP. The following plan components have been subject to SA and are considered below in turn:

- Vision and Strategic Priorities;
- Selected Growth Option and Spatial Strategies;
- Proposed Strategic Site Allocations; and
- Draft Policies.

4.1.2 This section of the SA report summarises the findings from the SA, whereas the detailed SA matrices for each plan component are provided separately in the following appendices:

- Appendix D - SA of Draft Strategic Priorities;
- Appendix E - SA of Draft Spatial Strategies;
- Appendix F - SA of Draft Strategic Site Allocations; and
- Appendix G - SA of Draft Policies.

4.1.3 Sections 4.2 – 4.5 identify (pre-mitigation) effects from the components of the Draft Sunderland CSDP. Mitigation and enhancement recommendations to address any predicted significant adverse effects and to enhance the sustainability performance of the Draft Sunderland CSDP are then detailed in Section 5 of this SA report.

4.2 SA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP Vision and Strategic Priorities

4.2.1 This section considers the sustainability implications of the Draft Sunderland CSDP Vision and Strategic Priorities which provides a strategic framework upon which the spatial strategy, site allocations and development management policies are based.

Vision

4.2.2 Informed by SCC's Corporate Plan 2016-2020 and its associated key priorities and themes, as well as the Sunderland Economic Masterplan (2010), the Draft Sunderland CSDP sets out a proposed spatial vision for the development of the SCC area up to 2033. This vision statement is shown in Figure 4.1 below and is thereafter subject to a sustainability appraisal.

Figure 4.1: Proposed Vision within the Draft Sunderland CSDP

Sunderland 2033

By 2033 Sunderland will be a vibrant and growing city, with a minimum of 13,800 net additional homes built. Sunderland will become a more sustainable city, with a strong sense of place, by offering an appropriate mix of good quality housing of the types, sizes and tenures to meet the needs of its existing and future communities.

It will be a welcoming City, internationally recognised, where people have the opportunity to fulfill their aspirations for a healthy, safe and prosperous future. Sustainable development and growth will see a distribution of land uses creating a city where residents have access to first class services, facilities and opportunities. The city centre will have been revitalised and will become a destination of choice for people to live, work and play. It will be a cultural hub in the region.

As a result of housing renewal and investment, the city's housing stock will be considerably improved. The city will be revitalised through an improved mix of housing including a significantly increased supply of larger family homes. Investment in new and existing housing will support district and local centres and local communities, playing a vital role in reducing carbon emissions and improving sustainable travel options and the health of residents.

Our enhanced housing offer will be complimented by improvements to the City's social infrastructure, with additional healthcare, education and community facilities provided.

Sunderland will be an entrepreneurial University city and the heart of a low carbon regional economy which will create new and diverse job opportunities. The city will draw on major investment in high-tech employers, attracted to the city by the availability of development sites, a skilled workforce as well as the quality of its infrastructure and transport connectivity. The University of Sunderland and Sunderland College will play a vital role in attracting the best minds and investment supplying an appropriately skilled workforce who will be retained within the city.

Employment on the International Advanced Manufacturing Park and the A19 Corridor will ensure that the city becomes an international focus for automotive and advanced manufacturing, research and development. The city centre will be revitalised and will become the destination of choice for the whole city to live, work and play in. The development of the strategic allocation at the former Vaux site will have created a new Central Business District in the heart of the city for a mix of uses, including office, leisure and residential.

Improved public transport, including a rejuvenated Metro system, will play a key role in providing a more sustainable city, with improved links between communities and connections between Sunderland, the wider Tyne and Wear/North East city-region and the rest of the country. The Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor will have provided enhanced access from the Port and city centre to the A19 via the new bridge crossing the River Wear.

A network of green infrastructure will have been established across the city, linking in with housing and employment and resulting in an increase in biodiversity and wildlife whilst also improving provision of green, open space for all residents and visitors. The city's built heritage will have been protected and enhanced to play a vital cultural role. Conservation areas and listed buildings will have been revitalised with sensitive and appropriate development and help to ensure that the city's townscape sustains a distinctive sense of place.

- 4.2.3 The Vision is considered to set out a strategy for development that is compatible with achieving sustainable development. Should the aspirational vision be successfully implemented through a well worded set of policies it would therefore have the potential to have significant beneficial sustainability effects against all of the sustainability objectives. These relate to:

- Housing: by delivering new homes of range of types and tenures to meet the project population increase in the City area;
 - Economy and Employment: a substantial focus of the vision relates to support for the economy including through the through delivery of the International Advanced Manufacturing Park, as well as through smaller scale diverse job opportunities;
 - Education and Learning: The support to the University and College will help support and potential achieve significant beneficial effects where followed up through policy. However, it will be equally important to ensure that there are good quality schools for all children, which can be easily accessed from where people live;
 - Sustainable communities: by supporting development of new housing with district and local centres there is the potential to have significant beneficial effects against this objective through provision of additional healthcare, education and community facilities;
 - Health and wellbeing: the vision sets our clear aspirations for achieving beneficial effects for the wider determinants of health, to include supporting non-car travel, education, job creation, new housing etc. However, more could be added on preventing people suffering from the adverse effects of pollution, including for noise, air and ground contamination;
 - Transport and communications: the need to support district and local centres and sustainable travel, in particular walking and cycling could have direct positive significant effects; and
 - Air quality: aspirations for reducing car dependence could have significant benefits for air quality effects in relation to this objective.
- 4.2.4 Other potential effects include positive impacts on land and soils through prioritising regeneration, although there is no specific reference to contamination. There are also aspirations for biodiversity protection and enhancement, although meeting the housing need has the potential for some adverse effects, which could also be the case for impacts on cultural heritage and landscape objectives.
- 4.2.5 Flooding is also an identified issue in the City area. The vision does not directly cover this, or water quality and supply, all of which are climate change related issues. This is unlikely to have an adverse impact but may be an omission in the vision.
- 4.2.6 The high level of growth which the vision seeks to deliver could also generate potential adverse impacts on waste and natural resources, although new homes and development may be more resource efficient than existing stock.

Strategic Priorities

- 4.2.7 The Vision is supported by a set of Strategic Priorities which indicate how the vision will be achieved, including through the implementation of an overarching spatial strategy for the SCC area. These Strategic Priorities are listed in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Draft Sunderland CSDP Strategic Priorities

Strategic Priorities	
SP1.	To deliver sustainable growth within the city to meet all identified development needs, in particular supporting the retention of young economically active age groups and graduates.
SP2.	Ensuring an appropriate distribution and balance of employment, housing growth and other competing land uses. Where viable, maximising the reuse of previously developed land.
SP3.	Improving and protecting citizens' health, promoting healthy lifestyles and ensuring the development of facilities to enable lifelong learning to reduce inequality and ensure a high quality of life.
SP4.	Providing enough land to meet the city's housing requirement and ensuring a range and choice of housing types and tenures, including increased provision of affordable and larger family homes.
SP5.	Developing cohesive, inclusive and attractive sustainable neighbourhoods and neighbourhoods that are well integrated with schools, shops, services, facilities and open space whilst ensuring that the diverse needs of the city's different communities are met.
SP6.	Facilitating economic growth by providing a wide portfolio of high quality employment sites, whilst supporting the development of new key employment sectors, including the low carbon economy, automotive and advanced manufacturing sectors, whilst strengthening existing industry.
SP7.	To consolidate the City Centre and develop its fringe into a vibrant and economically buoyant entity connected to its River and Coast, by improving and expanding the office and retail offer, whilst securing the vitality and viability of other designated centres throughout the city.
SP8.	To increase the contribution that urban design and valued cultural and heritage assets can make to the image of the city and the quality of life of its residents.
SP9.	Protecting the city's biodiversity, geological resource, countryside and landscapes, including the River Wear, the coast and the Magnesian Limestone Escarpment and seeking opportunities to enhance that resource where possible, whilst ensuring that all homes have good access to a range of interlinked green infrastructure.
SP10.	Adapting to and minimising the impact of climate change by reducing carbon emissions and seeking to reduce the risk and impact of flooding.
SP11.	Implementing sustainable transport solutions that enhance the city's profile, improve its economic competitiveness and achieve low-carbon outcomes, whilst enhancing accessibility for all to a full range of facilities and jobs and reducing dependency on the car. To implement traffic management measures to manage congestion and associated environmental and health impacts of traffic
SP12.	Increasing the reuse and recycling of 'waste' in line with sub-regional responsibilities and plan for the most sustainable way of disposing of the remainder.
SP13.	To manage the city's mineral resources ensuring the maintenance of appropriate reserves to meet the future needs of the community whilst making sure that environmental impacts are properly considered.
SP14.	To ensure that the City has the infrastructure in place to support its future growth and prosperity.

4.2.8 As with the Vision, these Strategic Priorities are aspirational and therefore are generally compatible with achieving beneficial sustainability outcomes. The strategic priorities alone cannot implement the Vision or more widely achieve sustainable development, rather they help to define a spatial strategy and overarching framework for implementation measures within the Core Strategy, including site specific allocations and development management policies.

- 4.2.9 A detailed assessment of the Strategic Priorities against the SA Framework is provided in Appendix D. In summary, there is good coverage of all SA Objectives in the proposed Strategic Priorities, with many potential significant beneficial effects identified and no Significant Adverse effects. The Strategic Priorities therefore provide a strong framework to underpin site allocations and development management policies. Notwithstanding this, the assessment undertaken has identified several areas where the Strategic Priorities could be enhanced or clarified, including:
- Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion: only one Strategic Priority (10) picks this up flooding as an issues, although this is one amount several aspects relating to climate change. Given the risk of flood from various sources in the City area there could be greater emphasis on this objective;
 - Water Resources: No Strategic Priority directly addresses issues of water quality and resources, although there may be associated benefits for instance in relation to climate change. There is the potential for this to be addressed in more detail to further promote the potential for beneficial effect;
 - The need to avoid pollution effects is not picked up very clearly by the Strategic Priorities and this could be improved, both in terms of protecting human health and the ecological effects;
 - For Strategic Priority 4 equal weight should be given to the need to provide affordable homes to meet needs as for family homes;
 - Strategic Priority 3 covers two topics in one and could be more clearly defined, with the measures envisaged that would support a healthy population (based on the wider determinants of health) as well as lifelong learning; and
 - To achieve a City Centre that is vibrant and supports sustainable communities, consideration could be given in Strategic Priority 7 to the future residential roles of the area, as part of making a mixed use area in a sustainable location.

4.3 SA of High Growth Option Implementation and Proposed Spatial Strategies

- 4.3.1 The Draft Sunderland CSDP is underpinned by the High Growth Option selected from the previous Sunderland Core Strategy Growth Options Consultation (May 2016). However, owing to significant changes in the evidence base (predominately due to changes in economic growth forecasts, as well as updated population and household formation projections) a lower quantum of development than originally envisaged would be required to implement this growth option. In consequence, whilst the Draft Sunderland CSDP remains aligned with assumptions used in the High Growth Option previously consulted upon, two specific spatial strategies, one for the entire SCC area and one covering the Sunderland Urban Core, have since been developed to form the backbone of the emerging Sunderland CSDP.

Implementation of High Growth Option

- 4.3.2 The proposed implementation of the High Growth Option through the Draft Sunderland CSDP retains the advantages previously set out within the Sunderland Core Strategy Growth Options Consultation (May 2016). This includes providing for an uplift of housing growth from the baseline position to support economic growth, which could in turn generate positive significant effects by:
- Allowing housing supply to meet the economic growth aspirations;
 - Reducing outmigration of people to live outside but work in the City area; and

- Supporting a more mixed demographic profile and reducing the proportion of the population who are over 65, by providing homes for working age people.
- 4.3.3 The reduced quantum of development now envisaged means there is a reduction in some of the negative effects previously identified for High Growth option. The revised High Growth option embodied within the Draft Sunderland CSDP includes provision for approximately 5,000 new homes fewer over the plan period than previously assessed, meaning that effects on the natural environment from housing development are now more likely to be comparable to those predicted under the Baseline or Medium Growth options. Consequently, a reduction in the level and significance of multiple environmental effects can be expected, including:
- Land take and the quantum of green belt and other green land that will be required to deliver development;
 - A reduction in natural resource requirements as fewer homes need to be built;
 - A reduction in likely pollution effects from the reduction in the quantum of development (and therefore effects from road traffic) but also as the growth option no longer relies on a high level of in-commuting to support predicted job growth; and
 - The new job forecast demonstrated that the population growth was not sufficient to support the anticipated level of jobs growth within the City area, primarily as a result of the ageing population and the outmigration of economically active households.

SA of Proposed Spatial Strategies

- 4.3.4 Two spatial strategies have been developed to underpin all spatial components of the Draft Sunderland CSDP. These are a Spatial Strategy for Growth, covering the whole SCC area, and a Spatial Strategy for the Urban Core, which is focused on the future development of Sunderland City Centre.
- 4.3.5 The two proposed spatial strategies are summarised within policies SS3 and SS4 respectively, however unlike the rest of the Draft Sunderland CSDP, the supporting text to each of these policies provides additional substantive details to shape SCC's spatial strategy. The results of the SA undertaken for policies SS3 and SS4 are presented in Appendix G whilst Appendix E provides the results of the SA carried out for the spatial strategy supporting text. Read together, these SA matrices demonstrate that the two spatial strategies are either or both predicted to have Significant Positive effects on:
- SA objectives 2 and 3 through making land available and encouraging development in specific areas to meet identified housing and employment needs;
 - SA objectives 4 and 6 through promoting the provision of additional learning and sports facilities in accessible locations;
 - SA objective 7 through setting out a coherent transport strategy for the Urban Core and supporting improvements to transport infrastructure; and,
 - SA objectives 14 and 15 through prioritising the protection and restoration of historic assets, encouraging high quality design, promoting public realm improvements and promoting the integration of new development with the existing environment.

4.4 SA of Strategic Site Allocations

- 4.4.1 This section presents key findings from the SA of all proposed site allocations and reasonable alternatives which is detailed fully in Appendix F. The following types of proposed site allocations have been appraised:

- Urban Strategic Scale Sites;
- Green Belt Housing Release Sites;
- Key and Primary Employment Areas; and,
- Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers (TSGT) Sites.

4.4.2 Key findings from the appraisal of each type of proposed site allocation are detailed in turn below.

Proposed Urban Strategic Scale Sites

Vaux Site (Policy SA2)

4.4.3 The policy provides the policy framework to deliver the Council's long term aspiration to create a new office led regeneration development on the former Vaux site. The allocation is a continuation of the support already given by Policy SA55A.2 of the existing adopted development plan for central Sunderland (UDP Alteration No.2 – adopted September 2007) and would be consistent with the Council's Economic Masterplan and the Economic Leadership Board's 3,6,9 Vision.

4.4.4 This site was allocated through Policy SA55A.2 of the adopted Sunderland UDP Alteration No. 2 (2007), has planning permission and is under construction. The proposed allocation of the site therefore merely reflects its current planning status and provides continued policy support for the implementation of a consented development. No new or different environmental or sustainability effects are therefore likely to occur as a result of the site's proposed allocation within the emerging Sunderland CSDP. On this basis the Vaux Site has been scoped out of the detailed SA undertaken for other proposed strategic site allocations presented in Appendix F.

South Sunderland Growth Area (Policy SA1)

4.4.5 The SA of the proposed South Sunderland Growth Area (SSGA) is contained within the separate SA report which accompanies the Consultative Draft SSGA Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which SSC have committed to consulting on in tandem with the Draft Sunderland CSDP. Relevant caselaw has confirmed that this nested approach to SA is appropriate as a means of undertaking proportionate assessment and avoiding unnecessary duplication.

4.4.6 The Draft SSGA SPD SA Report has been prepared by other consultants appointed by SCC and is therefore not appended directly to this SA report. However, PBA have examined the document to ensure that the SA methodology and conclusions broadly align with this SA report and that appropriate mitigation has been proposed to address all identified Significant Adverse effects. On this basis the SSGA has been scoped out of the detailed SA undertaken for other proposed strategic site allocations presented in Appendix F.

Green Belt Housing Release Sites

4.4.7 Policy SA3 – Housing Release Sites identifies 15 proposed strategic housing allocations presently within the Green Belt to deliver a total of approximately 1,546 dwellings

4.4.8 The findings from the SA of all candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites, including the 15 proposed allocations and all reasonable alternatives identified through a full Green Belt Review are summarised in Table 4.2 below and detailed in Appendix F (including confirmation of each site's status and mitigation requirements). The location of all candidate Green Belt Housing Release sites which have been considered in this SA is shown within the Stage 3 Green Belt Review Report which accompanies the Draft Sunderland CSDP.

- 4.4.9 Of note, all candidate sites have not been assessed against SA objectives 3 - Economy and Employment, 12 - Climate Change and 13 - Waste and Natural Resources as these are either not relevant or not possible to assess at this stage. The key to explain the summary provided in Table 4.2 is detailed within Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.2 Sustainability Appraisal of Candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites – Visual Summary

Site	SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	SA2: Housing	SA3: Economy and Employment	SA4: Learning and Skills	SA5: Sustainable Communities	SA6: Health and Wellbeing	SA7: Transport and Communication	SA8: Land Use and Soils	SA9: Water	SA10: Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	SA11: Air	SA12: Climate Change	SA13: Waste and Natural Resources	SA14: Cultural Heritage	SA15: Landscape and Townscape
Peareth Hall / Trust SP11	+	+	N/A	+/-/-	+/-/-/+/0/-	-/-/+/0/0/-	++/+/-/-/+/+/-	0/0/+/0	0/0/-	0/0/0/-	++			--	0/0
South of Stoney Lane SP15 (424)	+	+	N/A	++/-/-	++/-/-/+/0/-	-/-/+/0/0/-	++/+/+/-/-/-/+/+/-	0	0/0/-	0/-/0/-	++			0	-/0
North East of Mount Lane 407C	0	+		++/-/-	++/-/-/+/0/0	-/-/+/0/0/0	++/+/+/-/-/-/+/+/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/-	0/-/0/-	++			0	-/0
Pitch & Putt, Stone Cellar Lane USS1 (567)	+	+	N/A	+/-/0	+/-/-/+/0/0	-/-/+/0/0/-	++/+/+/-/-/-/+/+/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/-	0/0/0/-	++			0	-/0
West of Waterloo Rd US6 (463A)	0	++	N/A	-/-/0	-/-/-/+/0/0	-/-/+/0/0/-	+/-/-/-/-/+/+/-	-/0-/0	0/0/-	0/-/0/-	+			0	-/0
Southern Area PF FA1-2-3 (671)	0	++	N/A	+/+/-	+/+/-/+/0/-	++/+/+/0/0/-/0	++/+/+/-/+/+/+/+/-	-/0/0/-	0/-/-	0/-/0/-	++			-	-/0
James Steel Park FA5-6 (673)	0	+	N/A	+/+/-	+/+/-/+/0/-	++/-/+/0/0/-/0	++/+/+/-/+/+/-/+/+/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/-	0/0/0/-	++			-	-/0
Glebe House Farm PA3 (646)	0	+	N/A	-/+/0	-/+/+/+/0/0	-/-/+/0/0/-	+/-/+/+/-/-/+/+/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/-/0	+			-	-/0
NW of Ferryboat La HY2 (416)	0	++	N/A	+/+/0	+/+/-/+/0/0	++/-/+/0/0/-	+/+/+/-/+/+/-/+/+/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/-	0/0/0/-	+			-	-/0
Newcastle Road RE17 (675)	-	++	N/A	+/+/0	+/+/+/+/0/0	+/+/+/0/0/-/0	++/+/+/+/+/+/+/+/-	-/0/0/-	0/-/0	0/-/0/0	++			-	-/0
Land at West Park MD8 (676)	0	++	N/A	++/+/0	++/+/+/+/0/0	-/-/+/0/0/-/0		-/0/0/0	-/0/0	0/-/0/-	++			-	-/0
Beside Herrington CP HE8-9 (465)	+	++		++/-/-	++/-/+/+/0/-	+/+/+/0/0/0	++/+/+/-/+/+/+/+/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/-	0/-/0/-/0	++			-	-/0
New Herrington WMC H01 (113)	+	++	N/A	-/-/0	-/-/+/+/0/0	+/+/+/0/0/0	++/-/-/+/+/+/+/+/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/-	0/-/0/-	++			0	-/0
Granaries, Offerton CO31 (464B)	+	+	N/A	-/-/0	-/-/-/0/0	-/-/0/0/0/-	+/-/-/-/-/+/+/-	+/0/+/0	0/0/0	0/0/-/0	+			0	+/-
Philadelphia Comp. Ho11-12-13 (330B)	-	++	N/A	-/-/0	-/-/+/+/0/0	++/+/+/0/0/0/-	+/-/-/+/+/+/+/+/+/-	-/0/-/0	0/0/-	0/-/0/-	+			-	-/0

Site	SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	SA2: Housing	SA3: Economy and Employment	SA4: Learning and Skills	SA5: Sustainable Communities	SA6: Health and Wellbeing	SA7: Transport and Communication	SA8: Land Use and Soils	SA9: Water	SA10: Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	SA11: Air	SA12: Climate Change	SA13: Waste and Natural Resources	SA14: Cultural Heritage	SA15: Landscape and Townscape
N of Nissan Ph 1 NI5-6-10-11-12-13 (401 & 697) ²²	0	++	N/A	+/-/-	+/-/-/+/+0/-	-/-/+/+0/0/-	+/-/-/-/-/+/+/-/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/0-	0/-/0/-	+			0	-/0
Warren Lea SP10 (354)	0	+	N/A	++/-/-	++/-/+/+/+0/-	-/-/+/+0/0/0	++/+/+/-/+/+/-/+/+/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/0-	0/0/0/0-	++			-	-/0
Uplands Way SP10 (415)	+	+	N/A	+/-/-	+/-/+/+/+0/-	-/-/+/+0/0/0	+/-/+/+/-/-/+/+/-/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0/0-	+			0	-/0
Mount La / Windsor SP13 (407 and	0	++	N/A	++/-/-	++/-/+/+/+0/-	-/-/+/+0/0/0-	++/+/+/-/+/+/-/+/+/-	-/0/0/0-	0/-/0-	0/-/0/0-	+			0	-/0
George Wash Golf USS1 (405A and 405B)	-	++	N/A	+/-/-	+/-/-/+/+/+0/-	-/-/+/+0/0/-/0	+/-/+/+/-/-/+/+/+/-/-	-/0/0/0	0/0/0	0/-/0/0-	+			-	-/0
W of Waterloo Rd (west) US3 (463B)	+	+	N/A	-/-/0	-/-/-/+/+/+0/0	-/-/+/+0/0/-/0	++/-/+/+/-/-/+/+/+0	-/0/-/0	0/0/0-	0/-/0/0-	++			--	-/0
East of Witherwack RE7 (672)	-	+	N/A	++/+/+0	++/+/+/+/+/+0/0	+/-/+/+0/0/-/0	++/+/+/+/+/+/+/+/+/+0	-/0/0/0-	-/-/0	0/0/0/0	++			-	-/0
North of Hillcrest MD4 (419)	0	++	N/A	+/-/0	+/-/-/+/+/+0/0	-/-/+/+0/0/0	++/+/+/+/-/-/+/+/+0	-/0/-/0	0/0/0	0/-/0/0-	++			-	-/0
Middle Herrington (SW) MD4-5-6 (648B)	-	++	N/A	+/-/0	+/-/-/+/+/+0/0	-/-/+/+0/0/0	++/+/+/+/-/-/+/+/+0	-/0/-/0	-/0/0-	0/-/0/0	++			-	-/-/0
Middle Herrington (NE) MD2-4 (648D)	-	++	N/A	+/-/0	++/+/+/+/+0/0	-/-/+/+0/0/0-	++/+/+/+/-/-/+/+/+0	-/0/-/0	0/0/0-	0/0/0/0-	++			-	-/-/0
West of Cherry Knowle BU4 (674)	-	++	N/A	+/-/0	+/-/-/+/+/+0/0	+/-/+/+0/0/0	++/+/+/+/-/+/+/+0	-/0/0/0	--/0/0-	0/-/0/0	+			-	-/0
W of Biddick Woods FA12 FA13 (444)	0	+	N/A	+/-/-	+/-/-/+/+/+0/-	+/-/+/+0/0/0-	+/-/+/+/-/+/+/+0	-/0/0/0	0/0/0-	0/-/0/0-	+			-	-/0
N of Market Place IE WA23 (423)	0	+	N/A	+/-/0	+/-/+/+/+0/-		++/+/+/+/+/+/+/+/+0	-/0/0/0	-/0/0	0/0/0/0-	+			0	-/0
E of Seaham Road WA33 (645)	0	++	N/A	++/+/0	++/+/+/+/+0/-/0		++/+/+/+/+/+/+/+/+0	-/-/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0/0-	++			-	-/0

²² This site is split into two components, 401 and 697, each of which could be viewed as individual sites.

Table 4.3 Sustainability Appraisal of Candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites - Key

Colour	Description
	Majority double plus (++) (significant effects)
	Majority single plus (+)
	Neutral (0)
	Majority single negative (-)
	Majority double negative (--) (significant effects)
	Majority double plus, some double negative (single symbols not colour coded) (significant effects)
	Majority double plus, some single plus (significant effects)
	Majority double plus, some single negative (significant effects)
	Majority double negative, some double positive (single symbols not colour coded) (significant effects)
	Majority double negative, some single positive (significant effects)
	Majority double negative, some single negative (significant effects)
	Majority single positive, some single negative
	Majority single negative, some single positive
	Equal double positive and double negative (significant effects)
	Equal single positive and single negative

4.4.10 The effects illustrated in Table 4.2 are discussed below with reference to each applicable SA Framework sustainability objective.

SA Objective 1 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- 4.4.11 No likely significant effects on this SA objective are predicted. However, the candidate sites are predicted to have either Neutral, Minor Positive or Minor Negative effects on this SA objective owing to their proximity to sites designated for reasons of biodiversity conservation, species importance or geological importance.

SA Objective 2 - Housing

- 4.4.12 As proposed housing allocations or reasonable alternatives, all candidate sites are considered to have the potential accommodate housing, subject to other constraints. No Negative (Adverse) effects on this SA objective are therefore predicted. All candidate sites have been assessed as having their Minor Positive or Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA objective, with Significant effects predicted for 14 sites with an estimated capacity of 100+ dwellings.

SA Objective 4 - Learning and skills

- 4.4.13 9 sites are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA objective owing to their immediate proximity to existing school infrastructure. No Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects are predicted, either in relation to proximity to schools or capacity issues. However, a number of Minor Positive, Minor Negative and Neutral effects are predicted from other candidate sites owing to the distance to school infrastructure and/or identified capacity constraints,

SA Objective 5- Sustainable Communities

- 4.4.14 28 candidate sites (i.e. all except Granaries, Offerton CO31 (464B)) are predicted to have some Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA objective owing to their close proximity to amenities and community facilities. However, 5 of these same sites are also predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects through their lack of proximity to other specific amenities. Two additional sites that are not predicted to have any Major Positive effects are predicted instead to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect owing to their lack of proximity to convenience stores and allotments respectively. A number of Minor Positive, Minor Negative and Neutral effects are predicted from candidate sites owing to varying distances to specific amenities and community facilities.

SA Objective 6 - Health and Wellbeing

- 4.4.15 28 candidate sites (i.e. all except Granaries, Offerton CO31 (464B)) are predicted to have a Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effect on this SA objective owing to their proximity to open space, which could facilitate and encourage physical activities as well as enhancing mental health. However, 9 candidate sites are predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on this site due to the potential loss of designated open spaces, playing fields or well used allotments. A number of Minor Positive, Minor Negative and Neutral effects are predicted from candidate sites owing to varying distances to specific health facilities (including open spaces).

SA Objective 7 - Transport and Communication

- 4.4.16 This SA objective considers proximity to transport networks and accessibility to key services. 28 candidate sites (i.e. all except Granaries, Offerton CO31 (464B)) are predicted to have a Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effect on this SA objective owing to their proximity to open space. 12 candidate sites are also predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects due to their close proximity to other amenities, whilst a total of 17 sites are predicted to have a Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effect as they are located within 400m of a bus stop on regular/frequent route or 800m of a train station. Six candidate sites are however predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on this SA

objective owing to being located more than 1200m away from a convenience store. A number of Minor Positive, Minor Negative and Neutral effects are predicted from candidate sites owing to varying distances to specific amenities and public transport infrastructure.

SA Objective 8 - Land Use

- 4.4.17 All candidate sites are located within the designated Green Belt. Notwithstanding this. Notwithstanding this, 3 candidate sites are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA objective as they are identified as being brownfield land. 4 candidate sites are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective as they have site areas exceeding 2 hectares and within agricultural use and include land identified as 'best and most versatile quality'. 1 additional candidate site (East of Seaham Road WA33 (645)) is predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on this SA objective due to the site encompassing existing, well used allotments. A number of Minor Negative and Neutral effects are predicted from candidate sites owing to the sites either being less than 2ha and/or not identified as containing best and most versatile quality agricultural land, or because the sites are within areas of known contamination.

SA Objective 9 - Water

- 4.4.18 1 candidate site (West of Cherry Knowle BU4 (674)) is predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on this objective owing to being located within an inner Groundwater Source Protection Zone (Zone 1). All other candidate sites are predicted to have either Minor Negative or Neutral effects on this SA objective due to either being within areas of known contamination, areas with no sewage capacity (diversions required) or not being located in these constrained areas.

SA Objective 10 - Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion

- 4.4.19 1 candidate site (Middle Herrington (SW) MD4-5-6 (648B)) is predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on this objective owing >5% of the site area being within in area affected by 1:30 incidence surface water flooding. All other candidate sites are predicted to have either Minor Negative or Neutral effects on this SA objective due to either being within less flood prone areas, although this varies between individual sites.

SA Objective 11 – Air Quality

- 4.4.20 As there are currently no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) designated within the SCC area, alternative criteria had to be developed to consider indirect effects on air quality through reliance on transport modes to access key amenities. 17 sites are predicted to have a Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effect on this SA objective owing to being located within either 400m from a bus stop on regular/frequent route or 800m from a train station. All other sites are predicted to have a Neutral effect given the potential need to use car travel to access key amenities.

SA Objective 14 - Cultural Heritage

- 4.4.21 1 site (Peareth Hall / Trust SP11 (299-300)) is predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on this SA objective as it encompasses the Grade II listed Peareth Hall. All other sites are predicted to have Minor Negative or Neutral effects owing to either being located within a conservation area, adjacent to a listed building or Scheduled Monument, covered by a local archaeological area designation, or (for Neutral effects) not being situated within any of these constrained areas.

SA Objective 15 - Landscape and Townscape

- 4.4.22 9 sites are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective owing to being located within an area identified by SCC as being of higher landscape

value and thus for landscape protection. In addition, 9 sites are predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect as they encompass designated open space or playing fields which could be lost to development. 11 sites are predicted to have a Minor Negative effect on this SA objective as they either include Tree Preservation Orders or lie adjacent to ancient woodland or other identified key landscape features. All other sites are unaffected by these constraints and are therefore predicted to have a Neutral effect on this SA objective.

Proposed Primary and Key Employment Areas (PEAs and KEAs)

- 4.4.23 The findings from the SA of all candidate Primary and Key Employment Areas (PEAs and KEAs) including proposed allocations and reasonable alternatives are summarised in Table 4.4 and detailed in Appendix F (including confirmation of each site's status and mitigation requirements). All candidate KEAs and PEAs as well as reasonable alternatives have been identified from the ELR 2016, which includes a map of all candidate sites.
- 4.4.24 The level of assessment undertaken was less than for candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites and candidate TSGT sites in order to remain proportionate, as all candidate KEA/PEA sites are existing employment locations. As shown in Table 4.4 all candidate sites have not been assessed against SA objectives 2 - Housing, 12 - Climate Change and 13 - Waste and Natural Resources as these are either not relevant or not possible to assess at this stage.

Table 4.4 Sustainability Appraisal of Candidate KEA and PEA

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA3	SA 4	SA5	SA 6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA14	SA15	
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary
Groves	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Claxheugh Rock and Ford Limestone Quarry SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hylton Dene LNR (LWS) , Claxheugh Riverside LWS	+ 5ha or greater site size	+ 5ha or greater site size	++ Within 500m of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	- Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	0	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	- Adjacent to Green Belt or Settlement Break, although the site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes		
Lisburn triangle	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS	+ 5ha or greater site size	+ 5ha or greater site size	++ Within 500m of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	0 Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	- Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes		
Pallion Shipyard	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Baron's Quay and Timber Beach LWS	+ 5ha or greater site size	+ 5ha or greater site size	++ Within 500m of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	- Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	0	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	- Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes		
East End, Russell Street/ West Wear Street	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	++ Within 500m of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Monkwearmouth Anglo-Saxon monastery and medieval priory Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	- Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes		
Stadium Park	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS	+ 5ha or greater site size	+ 5ha or greater site size	++ Within 500m of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	0 Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	- Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes		
Sheepfolds	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS	+ 5ha or greater site size	+ 5ha or greater site size	++ Within 500m of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Monkwearmouth Anglo-Saxon monastery and medieval priory Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	- Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes		

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15		
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary		
North Hylton Enterprise Park (5)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hylton Dene LNR (LWS) , Baron's Quay and Timber Beach LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Ryhope pumping engines Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Trafford Road (8)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0 Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Former Armstrong House	- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Princess Anne Park LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; World War I early warning acoustic mirror on Namey Hill, 570m north of Carley Hill Cricket Ground Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Tower Road (2)	- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Princess Anne Park LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Northern entrance to Industrial Road	- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Princess Anne Park LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Colliery engine house at Washington F Pit, Albany Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Hillthorn Farm (6)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Severn Houses LWS	+ 5ha or greater site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Colliery engine house at Washington F Pit, Albany Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Hillthorn Farm (7)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Severn Houses LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Colliery engine house at Washington F Pit, Albany Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15		
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary		
Turbine Business Park (3) - east of pub	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Hylton Plantation LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	- Within 2km of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (3) - east of Spine Road	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Peepy Plantation LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	- Within 2km of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (3) - south of WBC	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Peepy Plantation LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	- Within 2km of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (3) - south-east of FTC	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Barmston Pond LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	- Within 2km of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (3) - west of Vantec	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Hylton Plantation LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	- Within 2km of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (3) - south of test track	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Hylton Plantation LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ Up to 5ha site size	- Within 2km of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (1)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hylton Plantation LWS	+ 5ha or greater site size	+ 5ha or greater site size	++ 5ha or greater site size	- Within 500m of identified residential area	- Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15		
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	
North of Campanile Hotel	- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; General's Wood LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hylton Castle: a medieval fortified house, chapel, 17th and 18th century country houses and associated gardens Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Silverstone Road, Sulgrave	- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , River Don Streambank LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Blackthorn Way (1)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ + 5ha or greater site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Colliery engine house at Washington F Pit, Albany Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Houghton Colliery	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Houghton Hill, Cut and Scarp LGS (LWS) , Houghton Hill LWS (LGS)	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Biffa landfill site	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Houghton Hill, Cut and Scarp LGS (LWS) , Houghton Hill LWS (LGS)	+ + 5ha or greater site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	-	Site is within Green Belt or Settlement Break
Sunderland Enterprise Park East	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Baron's Quay and Timber Beach LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15		
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary		
East of gasometers depot, Spelter Works Road (2)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Ryhope Beach LGS (LWS) , Hendon Cliffs LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			-- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Gasometers (3)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Ryhope Beach LGS (LWS) , Hendon Cliffs LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			-- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
I J Dewhurst (6)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			-- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Plumb Centre, Sandmere Road	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Tunstall Hills & Ryhope Cutting SSSI (LNR) ; Tunstall Hills LNR (SSSI) ,	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Monkwearmouth Anglo-Saxon monastery and medieval priory Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
South-west of Carrmere Road	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Tunstall Hills & Ryhope Cutting SSSI (LNR) ; Tunstall Hills LNR (SSSI) ,	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Ryhope pumping engines Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Former Purdy Hose, Wellmere Road	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hendon Railway LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			-- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
South East corner of Pennywell Industrial Estate	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0 Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Ryhope pumping engines Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15			
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary			
Crown Road (West of Quay West) (4)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- -	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+ -	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Wear Street (land beside Q A Bridge) (3)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- -	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+ -	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Woodbine Terrace (3)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ +	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	- -	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	0	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Woodbine Terrace (1)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Baron's Quay and Timber Beach LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	- -	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	0	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Crowther Road (1)	- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Princess Anne Park LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ -	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hylton Castle: a medieval fortified house, chapel, 17th and 18th century country houses and associated gardens Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Crowther Road (3)	- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Princess Anne Park LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ -	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Bowes Railway Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15		
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	
West of Walton Road (5)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) ,	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Bowes Railway Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
South of Faraday Close (6)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Barmston Pond LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)*	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Screen Print, North of Alston Rd/Walton Rd (11)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Barmston Pond LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)*	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Low Barmston Farmhouse (10)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hylton Plantation LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ +	Within 2km of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
James Steel, Site 1 (7)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Washington Wildfowl and Wetlands Centre	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Front of James Steel (8)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Washington Wildfowl and Wetlands Centre	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade I)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Holystone Waste, adjoining Railway	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Pattinson South Pond LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade I)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15				
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary				
West of Sterling Close (3)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- -	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- -	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ +	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- -	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade I)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Sterling Close (1)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- -	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- -	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ +	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- -	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade I)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Stephenson Road (2)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Usworth Pond LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ +	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	- -	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ +	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- -	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Stephenson Road (3)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- -	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- -	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ +	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- -	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Former Northumbria Centre (1)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Usworth Pond LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ +	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	- -	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ +	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- -	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	00	Adjacent to Green Belt or Settlement Break, although the site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Hankyu (6)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Princess Anne Park LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- -	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- -	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ +	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- -	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Colliery engine house at Washington F Pit, Albany Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
South of Sedling Road (2)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Vigo Wood & Railway Embankment LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- -	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- -	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ +	Site is within Flood Zone 1	0	- -	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)*	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15		
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary		
West of Cherry Way (4)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
South of Techniks	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Cherry Way (1)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	- Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Adjacent to Green Belt or Settlement Break, although the site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Vaux and Farrington Row	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS	+ + 5ha or greater site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+ Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	- Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	- Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Farrington, west of silksworth way	- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Gilley Law Quarry SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Newport Railway Cutting LGS , Blakeney Woods LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Farrington, East of North moor lane (2)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Gilley Law Quarry SSSI ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	- Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 2	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hasting Hill curcus and causewayed enclosure, 600m south of Hasting Hill Farm Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15		
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary		
Farringdon, East of North moor lane	- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Gilley Law Quarry SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Newport Railway Cutting LGS , Tunstall Hills LNR (SSSI) , Newport Dene LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hasting Hill cursum and causewayed enclosure, 600m south of Hasting Hill Farm Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Gilpin Wood (former Glebe Farm Sewage Works) (6)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	- Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	0		- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes	
Land to west of former Sumitomo factory (1)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Joe's Pond SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Redburn Marsh LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	- Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	0		- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Seven Sisters round barrow, Copt Hill, Houghton-le-Spring Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Adjacent to Green Belt or Settlement Break, although the site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes	
North of Cygnet Way (5)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Joe's Pond SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0		- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes	
South of Cygnet Way (5)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Hetton Bogs SSSI (LNR) ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ 5ha or greater site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0		- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Seven Sisters round barrow, Copt Hill, Houghton-le-Spring Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes	
North of Gadwall Road (1)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Joe's Pond SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Rainton Meadows LWS (PLNR)	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0		- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Seven Sisters round barrow, Copt Hill, Houghton-le-Spring Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes	

SA Objectives	SA 1	SA 2	SA 3	SA 4	SA 5	SA 6	SA 7	SA 8	SA 9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	
Site Name	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Commentary	Relevant Designations	Commentary
North of Colliery Lane (4)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hetton Lyons Country Park LWS (PLNR)	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- - - Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0 Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Land east of Parkgate (2)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Eppleton Railway LWS	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	- -	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	- Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	- - - Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0 Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
South of Gatehouse	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- - - Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- - Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0 Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Gatehouse	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- - - Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- - Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0 Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Small scrap yard (4)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- - - Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0 Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of TKT Cosyfoam (3)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- - - Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0 Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Former Main waste transfer station (5)	- Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;	+ Up to 5ha site size	+ ++	Within 500m of identified residential area	+ +	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++ Brownfield Site	- - - Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+ Site is within Flood Zone 1	0			- Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0 Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

4.4.25 Table 4.4 provides brief commentaries to explain why each candidate site is predicted to have certain effects on each of the SA objectives which have been considered. In relation to predicted significant effects:

- All candidate sites except 1 (West of Azure Court, Camberwell Way (2)) are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on SA objective 1 owing to their immediate proximity to designated sites;
- 17 candidate sites are predicted to have a Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effect on SA objective 3 owing to their site size (thus potential employment generating development) exceeding 5ha;
- 88 candidate sites are predicted to have a Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effect on SA objective 5 owing to being located within 500m of an identified residential area;
- 39 candidate sites are predicted to have a Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effect on SA objective 7 owing to being located within 500m of the strategic transport network. However, 53 candidate sites are predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on this SA objective owing to being located within 2km of an identified area of traffic congestion or pinch point;
- 26 candidate sites are predicted to have a Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effect on SA objective 8 owing to being located on brownfield or previously developed land;
- 51 candidate sites are predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on SA objective 9 owing to being located within 500m of an identified waterbody;
- 11 candidate sites are predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on SA objective 10 owing to being located within or immediately adjoining Flood Zone 3;
- 47 candidate sites are predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on SA objective 14 owing to these sites either encompassing or being located within 500m of a designated cultural heritage site (listed building or Scheduled Monument); and
- One candidate sites are predicted to have a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effect on SA objective 15 owing to being located within the Green Belt or Settlement Break as per the existing statutory Development Plan for the SCC area.

4.4.26 There are no predicted significant effects (positive or adverse) from any candidate sites on SA objectives 4 or 11.

Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers (TSGT) Sites

4.4.27 The findings from the SA of all candidate TSGT Sites, including proposed allocations and reasonable alternatives are summarised in Table 4.5 below and detailed in Appendix F (including confirmation of each site's status and mitigation requirements for the proposed TSGT allocations). Of note, all candidate sites have not been assessed against SA objectives 3 - Economy and Employment, 12 - Climate Change and 13 - Waste and Natural Resources as these are either not relevant or not possible to assess at this stage. The key to explain the summary provided in Table 4.5 is detailed within Table 4.6 below.

Table 4.5 Sustainability Appraisal of Candidate TSGT Sites

Site	SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	SA2: Housing	SA3: Economy and Employment	SA4: Learning and Skills	SA5: Sustainable Communities	SA6: Health and Wellbeing	SA7: Transport and Communication	SA8: Land Use and Soils	SA9: Water Environment	SA10: Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	SA11: Air	SA12: Climate Change	SA13: Waste and Natural Resources	SA14: Cultural Heritage	SA15: Landscape and Townscape
11.Land at Ferryboat Lane (opp no. 163), Castletown	+	++		0	0	-/+/-	++/++	++/0	0	+/-/0/-	++			0	0/0
12.Land at Ferryboat Lane (opp no.11), Castletown	+	++		0	0	++/+/-	++/++	++/0	0	+/0/0/0	++			0	0/0
90.Land to the rear of The Buffs, Southwick	0	++		++/++/-	0	0	+/++	++/0/0	0	+/0/0/-	++			0	0/0
16.Land at Stephenson Road	+	++		++/+/-	0	+/++/-	-/++	++/-/-	0	+/0/0/-	++			0	-/0
18.Land to the west of Donvale Rd, Donwell.	+	++		+/+/-	0	+/+/-	++/++	++/0	0	+/0/0/-	++			-	0/0
19.Land east of Craggyknowe, Blackfell	+	++		+/+/-	0	-/-/-	++/++	++/0	0	+/0/-/-	++			0	0/0
22.Land at Bonemill Lane	+	++		++/+/-	0	0	+/++		0	+/0/0/-	++			0	0/0
23a.Land at Crowther Industrial Estate	+	++		+/++/-	0	-/-/-	++/++	++/0	0	+/0/-/-	++			-	-/0
60. Land to the west of Waterloo Walk, Sulgrave	+	++		++/+/-	0	0	-/++	++/0	0	+/0/0/-	++			0	0/0
98.Land at Hertburn Industrial Estate	+	++		+/++/-	0	++/++/-	++/++	++/0	0	+/0/0/-	++			0	0/0
24.Land to the rear of Penistone Rd, Pennywell	0	++		+/++/0	0	++/++/-	++/++	++/-/-	0	+/0/0/-	++			0	0/0
25.Rear of South Hylton House, Hylton Bank	0	++		0	0	0	+/++	++/0	0	+/-/0/-	++			0	0/0
34. Land west of Silksworth Way, Silksworth	0	++		0	0	0	+/++	++/-/-	0	0	++			0	0/0
35. Land east of Clinton Place	0	++		0	0	0	+/++	++/-/-	0	0	++			0	0/0
36. Land east of Silksworth Lane, High Newport	0	++		0	0	0	+/++	++/0/	-	+/-/-/-	++			-	-/-
65. Land adjacent to Littlewoods Home	-	++		0	0	++/++/-	++/++	++/+/-	-	0	++			-	0/0

Site	SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	SA2: Housing	SA3: Economy and Employment	SA4: Learning and Skills	SA5: Sustainable Communities	SA6: Health and Wellbeing	SA7: Transport and Communication	SA8: Land Use and Soils	SA9: Water Environment	SA10: Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	SA11: Air	SA12: Climate Change	SA13: Waste and Natural Resources	SA14: Cultural Heritage	SA15: Landscape and Townscape
shopping group, Commercial Rd, Hendon															
67.Land at North Moor Lane	0	++		0	0	0	++/++	++/0	0	+/0/-/-	++			0	0/0
68.Ivor Street, Grangetown	-	++		0	0	0	++/++		0	+/0/0/-	++			0	0/0
69.Land to the rear of former Sportsmans Arms P.H, Silksworth	0	++		0	0	0	-/++	++/0	0	+/0/0/-	++			0	0/0
101. Land at Hendon Road East	-	++		0	0	++/++/-	++/++	++/0	0	+/0/0/0	++			-	0/0
111. Land at Sandmere Rd, Leechmere Ind Estate	-	++		++/++/0	0	+/++/-	-/++	++/0	0	+/0/0/0	++			0	-/0
112. Land to the rear of allotments at Hollycarrside Road	-	++		0	0	0	-/++	++/0	0	+/0/0/-	++			-	-/0
38.Land north of Shiney Row Centre, Shiney Row	+	++		++/-/-	++-	0	--/++	++/0	0	+/-/-/-	++			0	0/-
41.Land east of Harle Close, Sunnyside	+	++		++/+/-	0	0	+/++	++/0	0	+/-/-/-	++			-	0/0
45.Land at Lyons Ave, Easington Lane	+	++		0	0	0	--/++	++/0	-	+/0/-/--	++			0	0/0
47.Land north of Moorsley Rd, High Moorsley -Site 1	0	++		0	0	0	-/+	++/0	0	+/0/-/-	++			0	--/0
48. Land north of Moorsley Rd, High Moorsley -Site 2	0	++		0	0	0	-/++	++/-/-	0	+/0/-/-	++			0	--/0
49.Land South Valley View, Moorsley Rd, High Moorsley	-	++		0	0	0	-/+	++/0	-	0	++			0	--/0
50.Site of former Easington lane Primary School.	+	++		0	0	0	--/++	++/0/0	0	0	+			-	0/0
51.Land east of North View,(former Forest Estate) Easington Lane	+	++		0	0	0	--/++	++/0	0	+/0/-/-	++			-	0/0
74. Land north of Collingwood Drive, Shiney Row	+	++		++/-/-	0	0	--/++	++/0	-	+/0/-/-	+			-	0/0

Site	SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	SA2: Housing	SA3: Economy and Employment	SA4: Learning and Skills	SA5: Sustainable Communities	SA6: Health and Wellbeing	SA7: Transport and Communication	SA8: Land Use and Soils	SA9: Water Environment	SA10: Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	SA11: Air	SA12: Climate Change	SA13: Waste and Natural Resources	SA14: Cultural Heritage	SA15: Landscape and Townscape
76. Britannia Terrace Allotments, Fence Houses	+	++		++/+/-	++ ++ --	0	-/++	++/0	-	+/-/-/-	++			0	0/0
79. Site of former Fence houses Primary School	+	++		++/+/-	0	0	-/++	++/0	-	+/0/-/-	++			0	0/0
93.Land at South Hetton Road, Easington Lane	+	++		0	0	-/+/-	--/++	++/0	0	+/0/-/-	++			-	0/0
94. Car Park at Hetton Lyons Ponds	0	++		0	0	0	--/+	++/+/-	0	+/0/0/-	+			-	--/0
95.Land at Forest Estate, Easington Lane	+	++		0	0	0	--/++	++/0	0	+/0/-/-	++			0	0/0
102. Low Moorsley Road, Low Moorsley	+	++		0	0	0	-/++	++/0	-	+/0/-/-	++			0	--/0
105. Council Depot, Gravel Walks, Market Place Industrial Estate	+	++		++/++/-	0	++/++/-	++/++	++/0	-	+/-/-/-	+			0	0/0
106. Gilpin House, Blind Land, Houghton-le-Spring	+	++		++/+/-	0	0	+/++	++/0	-	+/0/-/-	++			0	0/0
107.Land to the north of Pearson's Industrial estate	+	++		0	0	0	--/++	++/0	-	+/0/-/-	++			-	0/0
113. Land at Lorne St/Elemore Lane	+	-		0	0	0	--/+	++/0	0	+/0/-/-	++			-	--/0
114. Land at Gadwall Road, Rainton Bridge Ind Estate	0	++		+/+/-	0	-/+/-	-/++	++/0	0	+/0/-/-	++			0	0/0
115. Land at Mercantile Road, Rainton Bridge Ind Estate	0	++		+/+/-	0	+/++/-	+/++	++/0	0	+/-/-/-	++			0	0/0

Table 4.6 Sustainability Appraisal of Candidate TSGT Sites - Key

Colour	Description
	Majority double plus (++) (significant effects)
	Majority single plus (+)
	Neutral (0)
	Majority single negative (-)
	Majority double negative (--) (significant effects)
	Majority double plus, some double negative (single symbols not colour coded) (significant effects)
	Majority double plus, some single plus (significant effects)
	Majority double plus, some single negative (significant effects)
	Majority double negative, some double positive (single symbols not colour coded) (significant effects)
	Majority double negative, some single positive (significant effects)
	Majority double negative, some single negative (significant effects)
	Majority single positive, some single negative
	Majority single negative, some single positive
	Equal double positive and double negative (significant effects)
	Equal single positive and single negative

4.4.28 The effects illustrated in Table 4.5 are discussed below with reference to each applicable sustainability objective within the SA Framework.

SA Objective 1 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- 4.4.29 No likely significant effects on this SA objective are predicted. However, the candidate sites have either Neutral, Minor Positive or Minor Negative effects on this SA objective owing to their proximity to sites designated for reasons of biodiversity conservation, species importance or geological importance.

SA Objective 2 - Housing

- 4.4.30 As proposed TSGT allocations or reasonable alternatives, all candidate sites are considered to have the potential to accommodate TSGT plots, subject to other constraints. No Negative (Adverse) effects on this SA objective are therefore predicted. All candidate sites except 1 (Land at Lorne St / Elemore Lane) are predicted to have a Significant Adverse effect on this SA objective as their site areas are considered sufficient to accommodate 15+ plots for showpeople or 5+ pitches for gypsy and travellers, both of which would significantly contribute to meeting identified TSGT accommodation needs within the SCC area.

SA Objective 4 - Learning and skills

- 4.4.31 31 sites are predicted to have Significant Positive effects on this SA objective owing to their immediate proximity to existing school infrastructure. No Major Negative (Significant Adverse) effects are predicted, either in relation to proximity to schools or capacity issues. However, a number of Minor Positive, Minor Negative and Neutral effects are predicted from other candidate sites have been identified owing to the distance to school infrastructure and/or identified capacity constraints,

SA Objective 5- Sustainable Communities

- 4.4.32 35 candidate sites are predicted to have some Significant Positive effects on this SA objective owing to their close proximity to amenities and community facilities. However, 2 of these same sites are also predicted to have Major Negative (Significant Adverse) effects through their lack of proximity to other specific amenities. 1 additional site that is not predicted to have any Significant Positive effects is predicted instead to have a Significant adverse effect owing to its lack of proximity to specific amenities. A number of Minor Positive, Minor Negative and Neutral effects are predicted from candidate sites owing to varying distances to specific amenities and community facilities.

SA Objective 6 - Health and wellbeing

- 4.4.33 30 candidate sites are predicted to have a Significant Positive effect on this SA objective owing to their proximity to open space, which could facilitate and encourage physical activities as well as enhancing mental health. No Significant Adverse effects are predicted. A number of Minor Positive, Minor Negative and Neutral effects are predicted from candidate sites owing to varying distances to specific health facilities.

SA Objective 7 - Transport and Communication

- 4.4.34 40 candidate sites are predicted to have a Significant Positive effect on this SA objective owing to their proximity to being located within 500m of the strategic road network (A1M, A194M, A1231, A19, A690, A1018) or being located within 400m of a bus stop on a regular/frequent route or within 800m of a train station. However, 8 of these sites are predicted to have a Significant Adverse effect on this objective owing to being located greater than 1500m from the strategic road network, although these sites remain within 400m of the public transport network. 2 additional candidate sites which are of note are located within 400m of the public transport network and are predicted to have a Significant Adverse effect owing to being located greater than 1500m away from the strategic road network.

SA Objective 8 - Land Use

- 4.4.35 All 43 candidate sites are predicted to have a Significant Positive effect on this SA objective owing to being located within 800m walking distance of a designated open space. A number of Minor Positive, Minor Negative and Neutral effects are also predicted from candidate sites owing to the variety of land use characteristics displayed by each site.

SA Objective 9 - Water

- 4.4.36 No Significant effects (positive or adverse) are predicted on this SA objective. All candidate sites are predicted to have either Minor Negative or Neutral effects on this SA objective due to either being within an outer Groundwater Source Protection Zone (Zone 2) or Catchment (Zone 3), or not within these constrained areas.

SA Objective 10 - Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion

- 4.4.37 1 candidate site (Land at Lyons Ave, Easington Lane) is predicted to have a Significant Adverse effect on this objective as this site is known to be at a high level of risk of groundwater flooding. All other candidate sites are predicted to have either Minor Negative or Neutral effects on this SA objective due to either being within less flood prone areas, although this varies between individual sites.

SA Objective 11 – Air Quality

- 4.4.38 All candidate sites are considered to have a Neutral effect on this SA objective as there are currently no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) designated within the SCC area and proximity to public transport has already been assessed through SA objective 7. No significant effects are therefore predicted.

SA Objective 14 - Cultural Heritage

- 4.4.39 No significant effects (positive or adverse) are predicted on this SA objective. All candidate sites are predicted to have Minor Negative or Neutral effects owing to either being located within a conservation area, adjacent to a listed building or Scheduled Monument, covered by a local archaeological area designation, or (for Neutral effects) not being situated within any of these constrained areas.

SA Objective 15 - Landscape and Townscape

- 4.4.40 6 candidate sites are predicted to have Significant Adverse effects on this SA objective owing to being located within an area identified by SCC as being of higher landscape value and thus for landscape protection. All other candidate sites are unaffected by these constraints and are therefore predicted to have a Neutral effect on this SA objective.

4.5 SA of Draft Policies

- 4.5.1 This section provides a summary assessment of Draft Sunderland CSDP policies against the SA objectives. The detailed assessment of predicted effects from the policies is provided in Appendix G
- 4.5.2 The assessment has been undertaken by policy grouping, corresponding with each chapter of policies contained within the Draft Sunderland CSDP, with the exception of policies within the Sunderland's Environment and Economic Prosperity chapters which have been divided into the following groupings to allow different sustainability issues arising from these policies to be assessed in a manageable way:

- Design & Historic Environment;
- Natural Environment;
- Amenity;
- Employment & Business; and
- Retail & Town Centres.

Overview

- 4.5.3 A visual summary of the detailed assessment provided in Appendix G is shown in Figure 4.2 below. This identifies the significance of predicted effects from each draft policy upon each of the 15 SA objectives (refer to the full SA Framework provided in Appendix C for full descriptions of each SA objective and associated guide questions). The colour coding applied in Figure 4.2 aligns with the scoring system detailed earlier within Table 3.4, and where an uncertainty has been identified in relation to the effects of a policy, this is denoted through the use of question marks on top of the relevant colour coded cell.
- 4.5.4 Figure 4.2 allows for easy identification of predicted effects (pre-mitigation) from the draft policies, which helps to focus the SA on key sustainability issues and predicted significant effects in accordance with core SEA and SA requirements. This indicates that the majority of draft policies are predicted to have either Major (i.e. significant) or Minor (i.e. not significant) positive effects on the SA objectives, and no Major Negative (significant adverse) effects are predicted. Some Minor Negative and Uncertain effects are also predicted to arise from a relatively small number of policies.

Figure 4.2 Sustainability Appraisal of Draft Policies (Pre-Mitigation) – Visual Summary

Policy Group	SA Objectives:	SA0 1	SA0 2	SA0 3	SA0 4	SA0 5	SA0 6	SA0 7	SA0 8	SA0 9	SA1 0	SA1 1	SA1 2	SA1 3	SA1 4	SA1 5
Sustainable Development	SS1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development	Green	Light Green	Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
	SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development	Green	Light Green	Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
Spatial Strategies	SS3: Spatial Delivery for Growth	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Yellow
	SS4: Urban Core Policy	Blue	Green	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green
Health & Wellbeing	HWSS1: Health and Wellbeing	Light Green	Green	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green
	HWSS2: Protection and delivery of community, social and cultural facilities	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
	Policy HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism	Blue	Blue	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
Homes (1)	H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Blue	?	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	?	?	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	?	?	?	Blue	Blue	Blue	?	?
	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green
	Policy H4: Affordable Homes	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Green	Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green
	Policy H6: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Blue	Green	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
Homes (2)	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue
	Policy H9: Backland and	Blue	Green	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green

Policy Group	SA Objectives:	SA0 1	SA0 2	SA0 3	SA0 4	SA0 5	SA0 6	SA0 7	SA0 8	SA0 9	SA1 0	SA1 1	SA1 2	SA1 3	SA1 4	SA1 5	
	Tandem Development	Blue	Green	Green	Light Green	Green	Green	Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
Employment & Business	Policy EP1: Economic Growth	Blue	Orange	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
	Policy EP2: Primary Employment Areas	Blue	Orange	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
	Policy EP3: Key Employment Areas	Blue	Orange	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
	Policy EP4: Other employment sites	Blue	Orange	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Green	?	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
	Policy EP5: New employment areas	Blue	Orange	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Green	?	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
	Policy EP6: Offices	Blue	Orange	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
	Policy EP7: Trade Counters	Blue	Blue	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
Retail & Town Centres	Policy EP8: Designated Centres	Blue	Light Green	Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Green	
	Policy EP9: Retail Hierarchy	Blue	Yellow	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	
	Policy EP10: Retail Impact Assessments	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
	Policy EP11: Primary and Secondary Frontages	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
	Policy EP12: Hot Food Takeaways	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Orange	Light Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	
Design & Historic Environment	Policy E1: Urban Design	Green	Light Green	Green	Blue	Green	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Green	Green	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Green	
	Policy E2: Public Realm	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Green	
	Policy E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	
	Policy E4: Historic Environment	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Light Green
	Policy E5: Historic Assets	Blue	Blue	Orange	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Light Green

Policy Group	SA Objectives:	SA0 1	SA0 2	SA0 3	SA0 4	SA0 5	SA0 6	SA0 7	SA0 8	SA0 9	SA1 0	SA1 1	SA1 2	SA1 3	SA1 4	SA1 5	
Natural Environment	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Green	Light Green	Green	Light Green	?	Light Green	Light Green	Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	
	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	
	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows	Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	
	Policy E9: Greenspace	Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Green	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	
	Policy E10: Burial Space	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	
	Policy E11: Green Belt	Light Green	Orange	Orange	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green
	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Light Green	Orange	Orange	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green
	Policy E13: Development in the open countryside	Light Green	Light Green	Green	Blue	Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green
	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Green
	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green
	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	Light Green	Orange	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Light Green
Amenity	Policy E17: Quality of Life and Amenity	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Green	Light Green	Blue	Light Green	Light Green	
	Policy E18: Noise Sensitive Development	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	
	Policy E19: Contaminated Land	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Yellow	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	
	Policy E20: Health and Safety Areas and Hazardous Substances	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	
Climate Change	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue	Light Green	Blue	Blue	Blue	

Policy Group	SA Objectives:	SA0 1	SA0 2	SA0 3	SA0 4	SA0 5	SA0 6	SA0 7	SA0 8	SA0 9	SA1 0	SA1 1	SA1 2	SA1 3	SA1 4	SA1 5
	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	?		?			?	?	?	?	?	?	?			
	Policy CM3; Energy from Waste	?		?			?	?	?	?	?	?	?			
	Policy CM4; Flood risk and Water management									?	?					
	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management															
	Policy CM6: Water Quality															
	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water															
	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction															
Connecting the City (1)	Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel															
	Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network															
Connecting the City (2)	Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement															
	Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland															
	Policy CC5: Local Road Network															
	Policy CC6: New Development and Transport															
	Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications															
Minerals & Waste (1)	Policy WM1: Waste Management		?	?			?									
	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities		?	?												

Policy Group	SA Objectives:	SA0 1	SA0 2	SA0 3	SA0 4	SA0 5	SA0 6	SA0 7	SA0 8	SA0 9	SA1 0	SA1 1	SA1 2	SA1 3	SA1 4	SA1 5	
	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities		?	?													
	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities		?	?			?										
	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction		?														
	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure		?				?	?									
	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal		?	?			?										
	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy		?														
	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact		?	?			?										
	Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare		?	?													
	Implementation and Enforcement	Policy ID1: Delivering Infrastructure															
		Policy ID2: Planning Obligations															
Policy ID3: Enforcement																	

4.5.5 Following from Figure 4.2, the subsections below outline key sustainability issues and predicted effects arising from the draft policies in relation to each SA objective.

SA Objective 1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

4.5.6 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on aspects of this SA Objective:

- SS1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development;
- SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
- Policy H5: Student Accommodation;
- Policy E1: Urban Design;
- Policy E2: Public Realm;
- Policy E6: Green Infrastructure;
- Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity;
- Policy E8: Woodlands/ Hedgerows and Trees;
- Policy E9: Greenspace;
- Policy CM2: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy;
- Policy CM3: Energy and Waste;
- Policy CM4: Flood Risk and Water Management;
- Policy CM5: Surface Water Management;
- Policy CM6: Water Quality;
- Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction;
- Policy WM1: Waste Management;
- Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities; and
- Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact.

4.5.7 The draft policies above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective, in particular policy E7 – Biodiversity & Geodiversity which is of most relevance. These policies set out criteria to either:

- Safeguard specific ecological receptors and the wider environment from adverse development impacts (e.g. Policies SS2 – Sustainable Development Principles, E8 - Woodlands/ Hedgerows and Trees, WM1 – Waste Management). This would protect the quality of existing green infrastructure, trees & woodlands, priority habitats, species and geodiversity from degradation; or,
- Enhance ecological connectivity, habitats and access to nature through requiring development proposals to provide appropriate green infrastructure, landscaping and

greenspace (e.g. Policies E1 – Urban Design, E6 - Green Infrastructure, E9 – Greenspace).

- 4.5.8 A range of other draft policies are also predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective by setting out criteria to help avoid unacceptable environmental risks (e.g. Policy E19 – Contaminated Land, CM7 – Disposal of Foul Water) or to protect or improve environmental quality (e.g. policies E14 – Landscape Character, E17 - Quality of Life and Amenity).
- 4.5.9 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective. However, Policy H2 – Housing Delivery is predicted to result in a Minor (not significant) adverse effect owing to uncertainties regarding the acceptability criteria used to assess residential development proposals and determine “appropriate” sites for proposals which exceed housing land requirements.
- 4.5.10 Policy SS3 – Spatial Delivery for Growth is predicted to have an overall Neutral effect owing to the combination of directing development to “*sustainable locations*”, which could help to avoid unacceptable adverse development impacts, and allowing the release of Green Belt land to meet housing needs, which could result in adverse impacts on biodiversity interests.
- 4.5.11 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, primarily due to the absence of site specific considerations relating to biodiversity interests within draft policies.

SA Objective 2: Housing

- 4.5.12 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA Objective:
- SS3 Spatial Delivery for Growth;
 - SS4: Urban Core Policy;
 - HWSS1: Health and Wellbeing;
 - H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods;
 - Policy H2: Housing Delivery;
 - Policy H3: Housing Mix;
 - Policy H4: Affordable Homes;
 - Policy H5: Student Accommodation;
 - Policy H6: Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers;
 - Policy H7: Residential Conversations and Change of Use;
 - Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation; and
 - Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development.
- 4.5.13 The draft policies above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective as they would directly support the provision of suitable housing of all types to meet identified needs, including affordable and specialised housing provision. These policies would also directly contribute to this SA objective by directing new housing developments to

sustainable locations and setting out criteria to improve Sunderland's housing stock. The draft policies within Chapter 8 – Homes are of most relevance to this SA objective.

- 4.5.14 A range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective, as they would indirectly support the provision of well-designed housing in appropriate locations to meet identified needs. These policies include:
- Requiring (residential) development proposals to achieve high design standards (Policy E1 – Urban Design);
 - Allowing rural housing provision to meet specific needs (Policy E13: Development in the open countryside); and
 - Taking a positive and pro-active approach to the consideration of development proposals (policies SS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development and SS2 – Principles of Sustainable Development.)
- 4.5.15 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective. However, a number of the policies would restrict where housing can be delivered, for example in the Green Belt and within KEA/PEA allocations, resulting in Minor Negative effects on this SA objective (e.g. policies E11 – Green Belt and E12 – Settlement Breaks).
- 4.5.16 The draft Minerals and Waste policies are predicted to have uncertain effects on this SA objective, as whilst these policies set out criteria to safeguard residential amenity and ensure sufficient availability of locally sourced construction materials, including for housebuilding, there is only a very weak and indirect relationship between these policies and this SA objective.
- 4.5.17 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to either housing provision or the quality of housing stock.

SA Objective 3: Economy & Employment

- 4.5.18 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) on this SA Objective:
- Policy SS1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development;
 - Policy SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
 - Policy SS3: Spatial Delivery for Growth;
 - Policy SS4: Urban Core Policy;
 - HWSS1: Health and Wellbeing;
 - Policy HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism;
 - Policy H2: Housing Delivery;
 - Policy H3: Housing Mix;
 - Policy H4: Affordable Homes;
 - Policy H5: Student Accommodation;

- Policy H6: Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers;
- Policy H7: Residential Conversations and Change of Use;;
- Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation;
- Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development;
- Policy EP1: Economic Growth;
- Policy EP2: Primary Development Areas;
- Policy EP3: Key Development Areas;
- Policy EP4: Other Development Sites;
- Policy EP5: New Employment Areas;
- Policy EP6: Offices;
- Policy EP7: Trade Counters ;
- Policy EP8: Designated Centres;
- Policy EP9: Retail Hierarchy;
- Policy EP10: Retail Impact Assessments;
- Policy EP11: Primary and Secondary Frontages;
- Policy E1: Urban Design; and
- Policy E13: Development in the open countryside.

4.5.19 The draft policies listed above are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA objective as they directly provide support for new employment uses to:

- Meet identified needs;
- Identify designated employment areas where employment uses should be concentrated;
- Seek to prevent the loss of existing employment space;
- Require development proposals to support the vitality of the local area; and,
- Set out criteria to safeguard and enhance the efficiency, functioning, capacity and connectivity of the transport network.

4.5.20 As such these policies would directly contribute to economic growth, business investment and increased employment. The Economic Prosperity draft policies are of most relevance to this SA objective.

4.5.21 A range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective by seeking to protect and enhance environmental quality and amenity, which will be important in retaining and attracting investment resulting in economic growth (e.g. policy E9 – Greenspace). Other policies also indirectly contribute to this SA objective including by supporting proposals to use historic assets for tourism and regeneration purposes (policy E5 –

Historic Assets), supporting rural diversification and economic development (policy CC6 – New development, extension and replacement buildings in the Countryside, Green Belt and Settlement Breaks) and by setting out criteria to safeguard the efficiency and safety of the transport network (policies CC1 – Sustainable Travel, CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network, CC3 – City Centre Accessibility and Movement), all of which would help to meet business needs and support economic growth.

- 4.5.22 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective. However, a range of policies are predicted to have Minor Negative effects on this SA objective by restricting development in particular areas including the Green Belt (e.g. policies E11: Green Belt and E12: Settlement Breaks) and by restricting the demolition of listed buildings (policy E5 – Historic Assets), both of which could restrict employment generating development proposals.
- 4.5.23 The majority of the draft Minerals and Waste policies are predicted to have uncertain effects on this SA objective, as whilst these policies set out criteria to safeguard amenity, which could support inward investment and economic growth, there is only a very weak and indirect relationship between these policies and this SA objective.
- 4.5.24 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to economic growth, jobs, business success and the provision of employment land.

SA Objective 4: Learning & Skills

- 4.5.25 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA Objective:
- SS4 Urban Core Policy; and,
 - Policy HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism.
- 4.5.26 These policies provide support for culture, leisure and tourism development proposals and direct them to highly accessible locations including Sunderland City Centre. This would directly contribute to this SA objective through enhancing lifelong learning and cultural education opportunities and facilities.
- 4.5.27 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive or Negative and therefore significant effects on this SA objective, and also no Minor Negative effects are predicted. However, a range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective:
- Multiple policies set out criteria to protect existing and support the development of new community, social and cultural facilities in accessible locations, which would indirectly enhance access to learning opportunities (e.g. policies HSW3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism, EP8 – Designated Centres, EP9 - Retail Hierarchy and CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network);
 - Policies H5 – Student Accommodation and H6 - Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers support the provision of specialist accommodation to meet identified needs, which would respectively contribute to the development of higher education institutions and ensure local access from proposed TSGT sites to schools and other social infrastructure; and,
 - The draft Economic Prosperity policies all support the retention and expansion of employment and business opportunities, which could indirectly support the creation of apprenticeships and training opportunities.

4.5.28 There are no identified uncertainties from the draft policies in relation to this SA objective. However, there is no clear relationship between the majority of the draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to education and lifelong learning.

SA Objective 5: Sustainable Communities

4.5.29 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA Objective:

- SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
- SS3: Spatial Delivery for Growth;
- SS4: Urban Core Policy;
- HWS1 – Health and Wellbeing;
- HWS2 - Protection and delivery of community, social and cultural facilities;
- HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism;
- Policy H6: Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers;
- Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development;
- Policy E1: Urban Design;
- Policy E2: Public Realm;
- Policy E6: Green Infrastructure;
- Policy E9: Greenspace;
- Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside;
- Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel;
- Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement; and
- Policy CC5: Local Road Network.

4.5.30 The draft policies listed above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective as they would:

- Protect and enhance the provision of community, social and cultural facilities in accessible locations (e.g. policies HSW2 - Protection and delivery of community, social and cultural facilities and HWS3 - Culture, Leisure and Tourism);
- Direct developments, including for specialist housing, to areas with high accessibility and suitable infrastructure provision (e.g. policies H5 – Student Accommodation, H6 - Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers, H3 – Housing Mix); and
- Sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals protect and enhance access to greenspace and opportunities for sport and recreation (e.g. policies E9 – Greenspace, E11 – Green Belt).

- 4.5.31 All of these policies would improve access to local services, leisure facilities, greenspace and amenities, promote social inclusion and ensure appropriate infrastructure provision, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. The draft Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure policies are of most relevance to this SA objective.
- 4.5.32 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective. The policies are also not predicted to have any Minor Negative effects on this SA objective. However, a range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective by ensuring that development proposals enhance social cohesion, promote social inclusion, help to prevent crime, safeguard quality of life and improve accessibility to key services (e.g. policies SS1 - presumption in favour of sustainable development, H3 – Housing Mix, EP8 – Designated Centres, EP9 – Retail Hierarchy, CC1 – Sustainable Travel, CC3 – City Centre Accessibility and Movement, WM1 - Waste Management, WM5 – Mineral Extraction). This would all indirectly contribute to the maintenance and development of sustainable communities, in line with this SA objective.
- 4.5.33 Policy WM6 - Mineral Safeguarding Areas is predicted to have an uncertain effect on this SA objective as it could indirectly restrict the provision of new community facilities within MSA, however in accordance with this policy other material considerations may be able to justify development proposals in safeguarded areas on community benefit grounds. No other uncertainties are predicted.
- 4.5.34 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to the development of sustainable communities.

SA Objective 6: Health & Wellbeing

- 4.5.35 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA Objective:
- SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
 - HWSS2: Protection and delivery of community, social and cultural facilities;
 - Policy H3: Housing Mix;
 - Policy H6: Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers;
 - Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development;
 - Policy E1: Urban Design;
 - Policy E2: Public Realm;
 - Policy E9: Greenspace;
 - Policy E17: Quality of Life and Amenity;
 - Policy E18: Noise Sensitive Development;
 - Policy E19: Contaminated Land;
 - Policy E20: Health and Safety Areas and Hazardous Substances;
 - Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network; and
 - Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement.

4.5.36 The draft policies listed above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective as they set out criteria to:

- Protect existing and develop new health facilities, greenspace, walking/cycling routes and leisure/recreational facilities in accessible locations (e.g. policies HWS2 – Protection and delivery of community, social and cultural facilities, H3 – Housing Mix and E1 – Urban Design); and
- Control potentially hazardous forms of development to avoid unacceptable health and environmental risks (all draft Amenity policies).

4.5.37 All of these policies would directly contribute to improving health and wellbeing outcomes.

4.5.38 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective. The policies are also not predicted to have any Minor Negative effects on this SA objective. However, a range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective by, for example:

- Supporting proposals to improve the quality of the housing stock (e.g. policy H7 - Residential Conversions and Change of Use), which would indirectly improve health outcomes for residents; and
- Restricting new unhealthy eating outlets and committing to working with the NHS to reduce health inequalities (e.g. policies HWS1 – Health and Wellbeing and EP12 – Hot Food Takeaways; and, directing healthcare facilities which constitute main town centre uses (in accordance with the NPPF (2012)) to accessible locations (e.g. policies EP8 – Designated Centres and EP9 – Retail Hierarchy), which would indirectly improve access to healthcare.

4.5.39 The main uncertainties within the draft policies in relation to this SA objective are:

- Whether the support provided for new leisure and tourism developments by policy - Culture, Leisure and Tourism would encourage healthy and/or unhealthy activities; and
- Uncertainty regarding the role of Health Impact Assessments (policy HSW1 – Health and Wellbeing) in the determination of planning applications.

4.5.40 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to the improvement of health and wellbeing.

4.5.41 Achieving this objective is also closely linked to objectives on ‘Housing’ (objective 2), ‘Sustainable Communities’ (objective 5), Transport and Communication (objective 7) and Air (objective 11). Therefore, positive or negative effects scored against those objectives will automatically have an impact on this objective.

SA Objective 7: Transport & Communications

4.5.42 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA Objective:

- SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
- SS4: Urban Core Policy;
- Policy HWS3: Culture Leisure and Tourism;
- Policy H3: Housing Mix;

- Policy H6: Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers;
- Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development;
- Policy EP1: Economic Growth;
- Policy EP2: Primary Employment Areas;
- Policy EP3: Key Employment Areas;
- Policy EP4: Other Employment Sites;
- Policy EP5: New Employment Areas;
- Policy EP6: Offices;
- Policy EP7: Trade Counters;
- Policy EP8: Designated Centres;
- Policy EP9: Retail Hierarchy;
- Policy EP10: Retail Impact Assessments;
- Policy EP11: Primary and Secondary Frontages;
- Policy E6: Green Infrastructure;
- Policy E10: Burial Space;
- Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel;
- Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network;
- Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement;
- Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland;
- Policy CC5: Local Road Network;
- Policy CC6: New Development and Transport; and
- Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Communications.

4.5.43 The draft policies listed above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective as they set out criteria to ensure development proposals reduce travel needs, improve accessibility, connectivity, road safety and transport network efficiency, and support sustainable and active modal shifts, strategic transport projects and appropriately located communications infrastructure. The draft Connecting the City policies are of most relevance to this SA objective.

4.5.44 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective. The policies are also not predicted to have any Minor Negative effects on this SA objective. However, a small number of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective by setting out criteria which would indirectly support public transport provision, sustainable modal shifts, reduced travel needs and improved

accessibility (e.g. policies HWS1 – Health and Wellbeing, E1 – Urban Design, E11 – Green Belt, E9 - Greenspace).

- 4.5.45 There are no identified uncertainties from the draft policies in relation to this SA objective. However, there is no clear relationship between a number of the draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to transport or communications.

SA Objective 8: Land Use & Soils

- 4.5.46 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have either Major Positive or Negative and therefore significant effects on this SA Objective:

- SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
- SS4: Urban Core Policy;
- Policy EP12: Hot Food Takeaways;
- Policy E4: Historic Environment;
- Policy E5: Historic Assets;
- Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity;
- Policy E11: Green Belt;
- Policy E12: Settlement Breaks;
- Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Minerals and Waste Infrastructure;
- Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy; and
- Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare.

- 4.5.47 The draft policies listed above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective. These policies:

- Require development proposals to optimise the use of land and consider future land uses (e.g. policies SS2 – Principles of Sustainable Development, WM8 - Land Instability and Minerals Legacy and WM10 – Restoration and Aftercare);
- Support urban regeneration and the functioning of the Green Belt, which would prioritise brownfield redevelopment (e.g. policies E11 - Green Belt and E12 - Settlement Breaks);
- Require development proposals not to have adverse impacts on locally distinctive priority habitats, which would directly conserve soils and protect soil ecology (policy E7 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity); and
- Avoid the sterilisation of economically recoverable natural resources (e.g. policy WM6 – Mineral Safeguarding).

- 4.5.48 A Minor Negative (not significant) effect on this SA objective is predicted from Policy H2: Housing Delivery. This policy sets out phased minimum housing supply targets and states that these are minimum targets and further housing delivery will be supported on “*appropriate*” sites. However, the term “*appropriate*” is not objectively defined with reference to any acceptability criteria. This creates a tension between this policy and environmental policies, in particular policies E11 and E12. Given that the emerging CSDP’s spatial strategy involves

significant Green Belt housing release to achieve stated targets, the support given in policy H2 for housing proposals to meet and exceed these targets without reference to specific acceptability criteria is an important omission. As drafted Policy H2 could be interpreted as providing support for residential development proposals that would may not be supported by other policies, including policies E11 and E12 for sites located within the Green Belt or Settlement Breaks. However, all residential development proposals would also be assessed against other relevant policies and discussions with Council officers have indicated that the reference to “*appropriate*” sites within Policy H2 refers to the accordance of proposals with other relevant policies.

- 4.5.49 A range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective by directing main town centre and higher density land uses to the hierarchy of identified centres and other accessible locations (e.g. policies H1 – Sustainable Neighbourhoods, EP8 - Designated Centres and EP9 – Retail Hierarchy), which would optimise the use of land and indirectly support the redevelopment of brownfield town centre sites, as well as seeking to avoid land use conflicts (e.g. policies WM1 – Waste Management, WM2 – Waste Facilities and WM4 – Open Waste Facilities).
- 4.5.50 Policy E19 – Contaminated Land relates directly to this SA objective however is only predicted to have a Neutral effect, as whilst the policy sets out a framework to safely control the redevelopment of potentially contaminated land it does not actually promote such redevelopment.
- 4.5.51 In relation to this SA objective there is uncertainty regarding the definitions of “*appropriate*” sites in Policy H2 – Housing Delivery, “*acceptable development*” in Policy EP4 – Other Employment Sites and further uncertainty regarding the interaction between policies EP4 – Other Employment Sites and EP5 – New Employment Areas. These two draft policies appear to set out different policy tests to assess new employment proposals outwith Primary and Key Employment Areas, which could undermine the efficient use of available land.
- 4.5.52 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to the efficient use of land or the conservation of soils.

SA Objective 9: Water

- 4.5.53 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA Objective:
- Policy SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
 - Policy E6: Green Infrastructure;
 - Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity;
 - Policy E17: Quality of Life and Amenity;
 - Policy CM2: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy;
 - Policy CM3: Energy from Waste;
 - Policy CM4: Flood Risk and Water Management;
 - Policy CM5: Surface Water Management;
 - Policy CM6: Water Quality;

- Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction;
- Policy WM1: Waste Management;
- Policy WM2: Waste Facilities;
- Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities;
- Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction;
- Policy WM7: Opencast Coal; and
- Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact.

4.5.54 The draft policies listed above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective as they set out criteria to either:

- Require development proposals not to have unacceptable adverse amenity or environmental impacts, including from surface run-off, the migration of contamination or from dust emissions (e.g. policies SS2 – Principles of Sustainable Development, E17 - Quality of Life and Amenity, WM1 – Waste Management, WM5 – Mineral Extraction, WM7 – Opencast Coal, WM9 – Cumulative Impact). This would protect and enhance the ecological status and overall quality of the water environment;
- Sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals maintain, protect and enhance the integrity and connectivity of locally distinctive priority habitats and species, local geodiversity assets network, and the green infrastructure network. This would protect riparian and aquatic ecology from adverse development impacts and would help to improve water quality (including ecological status); or
- Enhance drainage and water quality through requiring development proposals to provide appropriate drainage including SUDS (policies CM4 and CM5).

4.5.55 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective. A Minor Negative effect is however predicted to result from Policy H2 – Housing Delivery, as the absence of specific acceptability criteria within the policy could result in residential development which adversely affects the water environment. However, any residential development proposals would also need to accord with other policies which do set out assessment criteria to protect and enhance the water environment. The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 is therefore expected to only have a limited adverse effect on the water environment.

4.5.56 A range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective, including by seeking to protect and enhance amenity and environmental quality (e.g. policy HSW1 – Health and Wellbeing), and requiring relevant development proposals to minimise impacts on the water table, which would help to protect ground water quality (policy E10 – Burial Space).

4.5.57 In relation to this SA objective there is uncertainty regarding the definitions of “appropriate” sites in Policy H2 – Housing Delivery and the proposed location of green infrastructure corridors referred to in draft policy E6 - Green Infrastructure) in relation to the water environment.

4.5.58 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to the protection or enhancement of water quality and resources.

SA Objective 10: Flood Risk & Coastal Erosion

4.5.59 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive or Negative and therefore significant effects on this SA Objective:

- Policy SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
- Policy E1: Urban Design;
- Policy E2: Public Realm;
- Policy CM2: Decentralised Renewable and Low Carbon Energy;
- Policy CM3: Energy from Waste;
- Policy CM4: Flood Risk and Water Management;
- Policy CM5: Surface Water Management;
- Policy CM6: Water Quality;
- Policy WM1: Waste Management;
- Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities;
- Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction;
- Policy WM7: Opencast Coal; and
- Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact.

4.5.60 The draft policies listed above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective as they would either:

- Require development proposals to incorporate SUDS wherever possible, and to provide appropriate and well-designed landscaping, public realm and green infrastructure (e.g. policy E1 – Urban Design);
- Require development proposals not to have residual unacceptable adverse or significant adverse environmental or amenity impacts (the exact policy test varies between policies), including on flood risk (e.g. policies WM1 - Waste Management, WM4 - Open Waste Facilities and WM9 – Cumulative Impact); or
- Direct development proposals away from known flood risk areas and require suitable drainage arrangements to be in place (e.g. policies CM4 – CM6).

4.5.61 A Minor Negative (not significant) effect on this SA objective is predicted from Policy H2: Housing Delivery, as The absence of specific acceptability criteria within policy H2 does not reflect the requirements of the NPPF with respect to flood risk management. However, any residential development proposals would also need to accord with policies CM4 – CM5 which do set out flood risk assessment criteria in line with NPPF requirements. The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 is therefore expected to only have a limited adverse effect in relation to sustainable flood risk management.

4.5.62 The only predicted Minor Negative (and therefore not significant effect) would arise from Policy CC2: Connectivity, as this draft policy identifies transport infrastructure projects which will be supported, without reference to environmental acceptability criteria including potential

flood risks or surface water drainage requirements. Given that transport infrastructure may be classified as essential infrastructure within the NPPF this policy could therefore allow transport infrastructure to be developed within/pass through flood risk areas, rather than potentially less sensitive areas, which could potentially exacerbate flooding impacts.

- 4.5.63 A range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective, including by supporting the provision of greenspace and green infrastructure (e.g. policies E6 - Green Infrastructure and E9 – Greenspace). These policies could indirectly reduce potential flood risks through providing space for natural attenuation of water, and by requiring development proposals to provide or fund local improvements to mitigate impacts, would indirectly help to minimise and mitigate flood risks.
- 4.5.64 There is uncertainty regarding the location of and flood risks associated with the transport infrastructure projects supported by policy CC2 – Connectivity. No other uncertainties have been identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 4.5.65 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to flood risk management or protection against coastal erosion.

SA Objective 11: Air

- 4.5.66 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA Objective:
- Policy SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
 - Policy HWS1: Health and Wellbeing;
 - Policy E1: Urban Design;
 - Policy E17: Quality of Life and Amenity;
 - Policy CM2: Decentralised Renewable and Low Carbon Energy;
 - Policy CM3: Energy from Waste;
 - Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel;
 - Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network;
 - Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement;
 - Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland;
 - Policy CC5: Local Road Network;
 - Policy CC6: New Development and Transport;
 - Policy WM1: Waste Management;
 - Policy WM2: Waste Facilities;
 - Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities;
 - Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction;

- Policy WM7: Opencast Coal; and
 - Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact.
- 4.5.67 The draft policies listed above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective as they set out criteria to protect environmental quality and amenity, including requiring development proposals not to have adverse air pollution impacts or unacceptable adverse amenity impacts (the exact policy tests vary between policies). This would protect and enhance air quality.
- 4.5.68 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective. The policies are also not predicted to have any Minor Negative effects on this SA objective. However, a range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective, including the draft Economic Prosperity and Retail & Town Centre policies which seek to concentrate main town centre uses within the highly accessible hierarchy of identified centres. This could indirectly safeguard air quality by maximising public transport use and reducing car dependency.
- 4.5.69 There is uncertainty regarding existing air quality in areas which Policy SS3 – Spatial Delivery for Growth directs development to. The overall effect on this policy on this SA objective is therefore Uncertain. No other uncertainties have been identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 4.5.70 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to air quality.

SA Objective 12: Climate Change

- 4.5.71 Climate change is identified as a standalone sustainability objective. However, in practice it is a cross cutting issues with close links to many of the other sustainability objectives, some of which even refer to climate change effects. In particular, there are close relationships of this objective and Biodiversity (SA objective 1); transport and communications (SA objective 2); water (objective 9); Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion (SA objective 10); Air (SA objective 11) and Waste and Natural Resources (SA objective13). Therefore, the identified effects of the Draft Sunderland CSDP against these objectives will also be relevant when considering climate change effects.
- 4.5.72 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA Objective:
- SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
 - SS4: Urban Core Policy;
 - Policy E6: Green Infrastructure;
 - Policy E9: Greenspace;
 - Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel;
 - Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network;
 - Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement;
 - Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland;
 - Policy CC5: Local Road Network; and

- Policy CC6: New Development and Transport.

4.5.73 The draft policies listed above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective as they:

- Require development proposals to contribute to climate change mitigation, to minimise climate change risks (principally flooding) and to provide green infrastructure, which would help to adapt to climate change including by providing natural attenuation (e.g. policies SS2 – Principles of Sustainable Development, E6 - Green Infrastructure and E9 - Greenspace); and
- Promote sustainable and active travel, direct development to accessible urban locations and establish a strategic network of active travel routes, which would reduce transport emissions (e.g. policies CC1 – Sustainable Travel, CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network, CC3 – City Centre Accessibility and movement),

4.5.74 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects on this SA objective. The policies are also not predicted to have any Minor Negative effects on this SA objective.

4.5.75 A range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective, including the draft Economic Prosperity and Retail & Town Centre policies which seek to concentrate new employment and light industrial uses within highly accessible designated areas, which would support sustainable modal shifts and contribute to climate change mitigation. Other policies would also indirectly contribute to this SA objective by, for example, requiring development proposals to reduce fossil fuel based travel needs and increase access to public transport (e.g. policies H1 - Sustainable Neighbourhoods, H3 – Housing Mix, WM1 - Waste Management, WM2 - Waste Facilities, WM4 - Open Waste Management Sites) and setting out criteria to protect environmental (HW1– Health and Wellbeing) which would indirectly enhance resilience and support climate change adaptation.

4.5.76 There are no identified uncertainties from the draft policies in relation to this SA objective. However, there is no clear relationship between a number of the draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to climate change mitigation or adaptation.

SA Objective 13: Waste & Natural Resources

4.5.77 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) on this SA Objective:

- Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction;
- Policy WM1 – Waste Management; and
- Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities.

4.5.78 These policies set out criteria to encourage sustainable natural resource usage and to maintain sufficient waste management processing capacity to treat waste arisings.

4.5.79 Policy WM1 - Waste Management requires all waste management development proposals to satisfy a sequential test to demonstrate compliance with the waste hierarchy. This would help to maximise resource (including energy) recovery from waste materials, so if implemented properly the policy could have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective.

4.5.80 None of the draft policies are predicted to have Major or Minor Negative effects on this SA Objective. The policies are also not predicted to have any Minor Negative or Uncertain effects

on this SA objective, indeed the majority of policies have no clear relationship with this SA objective.

- 4.5.81 A range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive (and thus not significant) effects on this SA objective, including by safeguarding mineral resources and requiring consideration of the need for minerals extraction (policies WM5 – Mineral Extraction and WM6 - Minerals Safeguarding Areas) and by setting out criteria to improve environmental quality (e.g. Policy E17 – Quality of Life and Amenity), which would indirectly promote sustainable use of natural resources.
- 4.5.82 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to either waste management or the sustainable use of natural resources.

SA Objective 14: Cultural Heritage

- 4.5.83 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive or Negative and therefore significant effects on this SA Objective:

- SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
- SS4: Urban Core Policy;
- Policy HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism;
- Policy E4: Historic Environment;
- Policy E5: Historic Assets;
- Policy E14: Landscape Character;
- Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views;
- Policy CM2: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy;
- Policy CM3: Energy from Waste;
- Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Communications;
- Policy WM1: Waste Management;
- Policy WM2: Waste Facilities;
- Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities;
- Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction;
- Policy WM7: Opencast Coal; and
- Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact.

- 4.5.84 The draft policies listed above are predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective as they set out criteria to ensure that development proposals preserve, protect and enhance the historic environment, including the setting of heritage assets and their contribution to the landscape. No Major Adverse (i.e. significant beneficial) effects are predicted.

- 4.5.85 Policies CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network and H2 - Housing Delivery are predicted to result in Minor Negative (not significant) effects on this SA objective, as neither policy includes clear acceptability criteria. Thus, in isolation these policies could adversely affect the historic environment, including the setting of heritage assets. However, any development proposals would also need to accord with other policies which do set out assessment criteria to preserve, conserve, protect and enhance the historic environment (policies E4 and E5). The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policies CC2 and H2 is therefore expected to only have a limited adverse effect on the historic environment.
- 4.5.86 A range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective, including by setting out criteria to protect and enhance environmental quality and assets (e.g. policy E17 - Quality of Life and Amenity), which would indirectly help to preserve and enhance the historic environment.
- 4.5.87 There is no clear relationship between a number of other draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to cultural heritage interests.

SA Objective 15: Landscape & Townscape

- 4.5.88 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the following draft policies are predicted to have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects on this SA Objective:

- SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development;
- SS4: Urban Core Policy;
- Policy H3: Housing Mix;
- Policy H5: Student Accommodation;
- Policy EP8: Designated Centres;
- Policy E1: Urban Design;
- Policy E2: Public Realm;
- Policy E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts;
- Policy E11: Green Belt;
- Policy E12: Settlement Breaks;
- Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside;
- Policy E14: Landscape Character;
- Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views;
- Policy CM2: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy;
- Policy CM3: Energy from Waste;
- Policy WM1: Waste Management;
- Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities;
- Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction;

- Policy WM7: Opencast Coal; and
 - Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact.
- 4.5.89 The draft policies listed above are all predicted to have significant beneficial effects on this SA objective as they set out criteria to ensure that development proposals respect, conserve, protect and enhance landscape character, specific landscape features (e.g. greenspace, heritage assets, etc.) and the wider physical environment.
- 4.5.90 Policy E14 – Landscape Character is of most relevance to this SA objective, as it sets out criteria to ensure that all development proposals respect, conserve and enhance landscape character. In addition, policies E11 - Green Belt and E12 - Settlement Breaks require development proposals not to conflict with the identified purposes of the Green Belt and Settlement Breaks, which include being to prevent coalescence, maintain openness and preserve the setting and special character of Springwell Village, and to support the functioning of the Green Belt and Settlement Breaks. As such these policies would directly contribute to protecting and enhancing local distinctiveness and wider landscape character.
- 4.5.91 A range of draft policies are predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective by setting out criteria to protect and enhance environmental quality, environmental/heritage assets and amenity (e.g. policies HWS1 – Health and Wellbeing, E5 – Historic Assets, E6: Green Infrastructure, E17 – Quality of Life and Amenity and WM10 – Restoration and Aftercare). This would indirectly help to protect and enhance landscape and townscape character.
- 4.5.92 A Minor Negative effect is also predicted on this SA objective from Policy H2 – Housing Delivery, as the absence of specific acceptability criteria within the policy could result in residential development which unacceptably and adversely affects landscape character, townscape character and/or visual amenity. However, any residential development proposals would also need to accord with other policies which do set out assessment criteria to protect and enhance landscapes, townscapes and visual amenity. The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 is therefore expected to only have a limited adverse effect on landscape and townscape interests.
- 4.5.93 The only draft policy predicted to have a Neutral effect on this SA objective is policy SS3 – Spatial Delivery for Growth. Whilst this directs development proposals to the most sustainable locations within Sunderland, which would indirectly landscape and townscape character, it also allows the release of Green Belt land to meet housing needs, which could result in adverse landscape impacts and could affect the functioning and integrity of the Green Belt.
- 4.5.94 Within Policy H2 the term “*appropriate*” is not objectively defined. This creates uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to determine whether development proposals accord with this policy.
- 4.5.95 There is no clear relationship between the majority of the draft policies and this SA objective, as the focus of these policies is unrelated to the protection and enhancement of landscape/townscape character.

Cumulative and Synergistic Effects from Draft Policies

- 4.5.96 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, the draft policies are predicted to have a range of significant cumulative and/or synergistic effects in relation to multiple SA objectives. In summary:
- There is uncertainty regarding the implementation of policies SS1 and SS2 in cases where a development proposal either accords with or is contrary to other subject specific policies. This tension could prevent policies SS1 and SS2 from being properly

implemented in pursuit of sustainable development, resulting in a Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) cumulative effect on potentially all SA objectives.

- Owing to the focus of policy SS2 on environmental sustainability issues, subject to the resolution of the uncertainties noted above this policy could strengthen the implementation of all other policies related to environmental and amenity protection, resulting in Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) cumulative effects on SA objectives 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15.
- Policy SS3 interacts with all land use allocations within the Core Strategy, as well as policies relating to the distribution of new housing and employment developments, as it directs development to the most sustainable locations and identifies areas where growth should be focused. As such, this policy acting in combination with subject specific policies regarding accessibility, infrastructure provision and environmental or amenity protection would result in Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) cumulative effects on SA objectives 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8.
- All of the draft Health and Wellbeing policies reinforce each other and would interact with relevant environmental quality, greenspace and amenity protection policies, as well as policies SS1 and SS2 in relation to implementing sustainable development. These policies would therefore have Minor Positive cumulative effects on SA objectives 1, 6 and 11.
- Acting together and in combination with policy SS1, all of the draft Housing policies would have a Major Positive synergistic effect on SA objectives 2 and 3 as they would support the provision of well-designed housing in appropriate and accessible locations to meet identified housing (and thus labour supply) needs. However, the spatial distribution of new housing and employment development would influence the success of these synergistic effects.
- As drafted Policy H2 could be interpreted as providing support for residential development proposals that would may not be supported by other policies, including policies E11 and E12 for sites located within the Green Belt or Settlement Breaks. Given that the emerging CSDP's spatial strategy involves significant Green Belt housing release to achieve stated targets, the support given in policy H2 for housing proposals to meet and exceed these targets without reference to specific acceptability criteria is an important omission. However, all residential development proposals would also be assessed against other relevant policies and discussions with Council officers have indicated that the reference to "*appropriate*" sites within Policy H2 refers to the accordance of proposals with other relevant policies. The identified uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to assess residential development proposals under policy H2 could result in Minor Negative cumulative effects on SA objectives 1, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15.
- The draft Economic Prosperity policies all seek to meet identified employment needs to stimulate economic growth in appropriate locations, which would directly contribute to the implementation of sustainable development and the Core Strategy's spatial strategy. As such these policies would have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) cumulative effects in combination with each other and with policies SS1, SS2 and S3 on SA objective 3.
- The draft Retail and Town Centre policies seek to concentrate main town centre uses within the highly accessible hierarchy of identified centres and to protect the vitality of such centres. This would contribute to the implementation of sustainable development as set out in policies SS1 and SS2 and directly help to implement the Core Strategy's spatial strategy set out in policy SS3. These policies, acting together and in combination with transport, employment and environmental policies, would result in positive cumulative accessibility, employment and climate change mitigation effects. As such these policies

would have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) cumulative effects on SA objectives 3, 5, 7, 8 and 12.

- By meeting cultural, leisure and tourism development needs in appropriate and accessible locations and by directing high footfall development proposals to the identified hierarchy of centres, draft policy HWS3 – Culture, Leisure and Tourism would help to implement sustainable development, provide facilities to meet population needs and support the vitality and vibrancy of the identified centres. This would result in Minor Positive cumulative effects in combination with policies SS1, SS2 and S3 on SA objectives 3 and 5.
- Through requiring development proposals to achieve high design and placemaking standards and by protecting designated heritage assets (including their setting), the draft Design and Historic Environment policies would ensure that development proposals are appropriately sited, designed and integrated with their surroundings. Acting together these policies would have Major Positive cumulative effects on the quality of the built environment and the creation of sustainable, attractive places. In doing so the policies would help to implement sustainable development and therefore have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) cumulative effects in combination with policies SS1 and SS2 on SA objectives 5, 8, 9, 14 and 15.
- The draft Environment and Amenity policies set out criteria to protect and enhance environmental quality and to avoid unacceptable adverse health and amenity impacts. Acting together the policies would reinforce each other and have Major Positive cumulative effects on the overall quality of built and natural environments and local amenity. In doing so the policies would help to implement sustainable development; therefore, these policies would have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) cumulative effects in combination with policies SS1 and SS2 on SA objectives 1, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 15.
- Policies CC1, CC3 and CC5 and CC6 would help to meet identified connectivity needs, concentrate and unlock new development in accessible locations, encourage sustainable modal shifts and increase access to key facilities and employment opportunities. As such these policies would have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) cumulative effects in combination with the housing, economic prosperity, retail & town centre and spatial strategy policies on SA objectives 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11 and 12.
- The draft Minerals and Waste policies set out criteria to ensure sufficient availability/capacity of mineral resources and waste management processing facilities to meet identified needs, whilst minimising land use conflicts and avoiding significant adverse environmental or amenity impacts. As such the policies would individually and cumulative contribute to sustainable development and would therefore have Major Positive (i.e. significant beneficial) effects in combination with policies SS1, SS2 and SS3 on SA objectives 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 15.
- The draft Implementation and Enforcement policies set out mechanisms to ensure that development proposals provide adequate infrastructure to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms and are implemented in accordance with valid planning permissions. but they do not set out policy tests. The policies would therefore be limited to playing a supporting role in implementing other subject specific policies in pursuit of sustainable development, but are not predicted to have any individual or cumulative significant effects.

5 Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The SEA Regulations require consideration to be given to “*measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme how any significant effects identified during the SA process could be mitigated*”. This section builds upon the SA findings detailed in Section 4 and Appendices D – G to identify potential mitigation and enhancement measures which should be incorporated into the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. Such measures have been identified both to mitigate predicted Significant Adverse effects (in accordance with the SEA Regulations) and to enhance the effectiveness of the emerging Sunderland CSDP in delivering its intended vision and contributing to sustainable development.

5.2 Mitigation and Enhancement – Draft Vision and Strategy Priorities

5.2.1 The findings detailed in Section 4.2 indicate that no mitigation is required in respect of the draft vision statement, however a number of clarifications could usefully be added to the proposed Strategic Priorities. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP it is therefore recommended that:

- The Strategic Priorities should include greater emphasis on robust flood and coastal erosion risk management, as well as the protection of the water environment;
- A new Strategic Priority should be defined (or an existing one is recast) to clearly state the need to avoid pollution, adverse ecological effects and to improve health outcomes;
- Strategic Priority 3 should be more clearly defined and should be expanded to outline the measures envisaged to support a healthy population (based on wider determinants of health) and lifelong learning;
- Strategic Priority 4 should be amended to give equal weight to affordable and family housing provision to meet identified needs; and
- Strategic Priority 7 should include greater emphasis on the potential future residential role of Sunderland City Centre.

5.3 Mitigation and Enhancement – Draft Spatial Strategies

5.3.1 As detailed in Appendix E – SA of Spatial Strategies, a number of recommended mitigation measures have been identified in relation to proposed spatial strategies SSG and SSSUC. A schedule of the 3 recommended spatial strategy mitigation measures is provided in Table 5.1 below. Corresponding recommendations have also been developed for policies SS3 and SS4, as detailed within Section 5.4.

Table 5.1 Schedule of Draft Policy Mitigation Recommendations

SA Objective	Spatial Strategies Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network.	To ensure that SSG does not inadvertently support the release of Green Belt land in appropriate locations, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the strategy should be amended to clarify that Green Belt land release must be in accordance with the policy principle (policy SS3) of directing development to sustainable locations.
5. Sustainable Communities: To promote sustainable communities within the Sunderland City area.	To address the identified uncertainties, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP it is recommended that the word “utilised” is removed from SSSG and further clarification is provided as to the intended delivery mechanisms for the provision of high quality infrastructure.
6. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	To ensure that SSSG does not inadvertently support the release of Green Belt land in appropriate locations, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the strategy should be amended to clarify that Green Belt land release must be in accordance with the policy principle (policy SS3) of directing development to sustainable locations.

5.4 Mitigation and Enhancement - Proposed Strategic Site Allocations

5.4.1 The detailed SA of all candidate sites is provided in Appendix F. This includes separate schedules of recommended mitigation and enhancement measures for each type of site that has been subject to the SA. For reasons of brevity, these schedules are not reproduced in full here. However, in general terms the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures identify potential requirements for technical assessments to be carried out in support of relevant planning applications and in some cases also specify infrastructure or amenities which will be required to be provided.

5.5 Mitigation and Enhancement - Draft Policies

5.5.1 There are several general methods which can be used to mitigate potential adverse impacts and more widely enhance the contribution of specific policies to delivering the proposed vision and achieving sustainable development:

- Implementing additional planning policies to address environmental issues not fully addressed within the draft policies or to mitigate specific predicted impacts;
- Adjusting or expanding policy wording to ensure that policies can be implemented successfully in pursuit of sustainable development. This could include, clarifying or making wording less ambiguous or more positive for some policies to help deliver the desired policy output; or
- Setting requirements for developers to show how they have addressed environmental and sustainability concerns through their development, whether through specific policies or site specific allocations.

5.5.2 As detailed in Appendix G – SA of Draft Policies, a number of recommended mitigation and enhancement measures have been identified in relation to specific draft policies. A schedule of all recommended policy mitigation measures is provided in Table 5.2 below.

Table 5.2 Schedule of Draft Policy Mitigation Recommendations

SA Objective	Policies	Mitigation or Enhancement Recommendation
SA1: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	S3 – Spatial Delivery for Growth.	To ensure that the release of Green Belt land under this policy does not undermine this SA objective or conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP this policy should be amended to insert the word “inappropriate” before “development” within criteria 4 and to include a cross-reference to assessment criteria within Policy E11 – Green Belt.
	H2 – Housing Delivery	To ensure that residential development proposals do not result in adverse biodiversity impacts, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP policy H2 should be expanded to define the term “ <i>appropriate sites</i> ” and include appropriate acceptability criteria, including in relation to the protection of biodiversity and geodiversity interests. In doing so the revised policy should clarify that residential development proposals should accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP
	Policy E7 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity	To provide appropriate protection for designated sites, in accordance with legislative requirements and the NPPF it is recommended that Policy E7 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity should be expanded to include criteria to assess the acceptability of adverse impacts on protected species.
	Policy CM2 – Decentralised renewable and low carbon energy.	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or unmitigated significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts.
	Policy CM3 – Energy from Waste	
	Policy CM4 – Flood risk and Water management	There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF.
	Policy CM5 – Surface Water Management	
	Policy CM6 – Water Quality	
Policy CC2 - Connectivity and Transport Network	To address the identified deficiency regarding consideration of environmental impacts associated with the transport infrastructure projects supported by policy CC2 – Connectivity, it is recommended that this policy should be expanded to reference the need for these projects to accord with other relevant planning policies and to demonstrate that they would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts.	
SA2: Housing	Policy H2 – Housing Delivery	To address identified uncertainties, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP Policy H2 should explain the Council's housing land strategy and set out mechanisms to ensure that a five-year land supply is maintained at all times.
SA6: Health and Wellbeing	HWSS1 – Health and Wellbeing	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to maximise the contribution of policy HWSS1 to this SA objective it is recommended that further information requirements for HIA should be specified and the policy should not support development proposals where an HIA indicates that they would result in adverse health effects.
	HWS3 – Culture, Leisure and Tourism	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to allow Policy HWS3 to contribute positively to this SA objective it is recommended that in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, the policy should be expanded to specifically encourage leisure development proposals which contribute to healthy lifestyles, including facilities to undertake physical activities.
	CM2 – Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, it is recommended that policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts.
	CM3 – Energy from Waste	
	CM4 – Flood risk and Water management	There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies, including in relation to this SA objective. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF.
	CM5 – Surface Water Management	
	CM6 – Water Quality	
SA7: Transport and Communication	SS3 - Spatial Delivery for Growth	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, ensure the release of Green Belt land under this policy does not undermine this SA objective, conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations or adversely affect the functioning of existing transport infrastructure, the policy should be amended to insert the word “inappropriate” before “development” within criteria 4 and to include a cross-reference to assessment criteria within Policy E11 – Green Belt.
	Policy CM2 – Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable
	CM3 – Energy from Waste	

SA Objective	Policies	Mitigation or Enhancement Recommendation
		and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts.
SA8: Land Use and Soils	SS3 - Spatial Delivery for Growth	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure the release of Green Belt land under this policy does not undermine this SA objective or conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations, the policy should be amended to insert the word “inappropriate” before “development” within criteria 4 and to include a cross-reference to assessment criteria within Policy E11 – Green Belt.
	Policy H2 – Housing Delivery	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP policy H2 should be expanded to define the term “ <i>appropriate sites</i> ” and include appropriate acceptability criteria. In doing so the revised policy should clarify that residential development proposals should accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP To further enhance the effectiveness of the policy it should be expanded to include acceptability criteria for all residential development proposals, including those intended to meet the specified housing targets.
	Policy EP4 Other Employment	To improve clarity and policy effectiveness, in the next iteration of the emerging CSDP it is recommended that policies EP4 – Other Employment Areas and EP5 – New Employment Areas should be combined into a single policy. This should provide support for new employment uses or extensions out with PEA and KEA where a) the proposal would contribute to significant regeneration or where a need for the development at the proposed location can be demonstrated and b) no unacceptable adverse impacts would occur, including on access and amenity. In addition, the term “acceptable development” in Policy EP4 should be defined within the rationalised policy.
	Policy EP5 New Employment	
	Policy E19 Contaminated Land	To allow Policy E19 – Contaminated Land to contribute to this objective it is recommended that in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy should be expanded to include support for the redevelopment of brownfield and contaminated land, providing that development proposals remediate known contamination and do not result in unacceptable health or environmental risks.
	CM4 – Flood risk and Water management	There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF.
	CM5 – Surface Water Management	
CM6 – Water Quality		
SA9: Water	CM2 – Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy.	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts.
	Policy CM3 – Energy form Waste.	
	Policy H2 – Housing Delivery	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP policy H2 should be expanded to define the term “ <i>appropriate sites</i> ” and include appropriate acceptability criteria, including in relation to the protection and enhancement of the water environment. In doing so the revised policy should clarify that residential development proposals should accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP To further enhance the effectiveness of the policy it should be expanded to include acceptability criteria for all residential development proposals, including those intended to meet the specified housing targets.
	CM4 – Flood risk and Water management	To address identified uncertainties within policy CM4, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy should be amended to clarify required surface run-off reductions and set out criteria to assess impacts on environmental and amenity receptors from proposed new or extensions/ improvements to existing waste water, sludge or sewage treatment works.
	CM4 – Flood risk and Water management	There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF.
	CM5 – Surface Water Management	
CM6 – Water Quality		
SA10: Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion (1)	S3 - Spatial Delivery for Growth	To ensure that this policy directly contributes to this SA objective, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy should be expanded to direct inappropriate development, as defined within the NPPF and Planning Policy Guidance, away from flood risk areas in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP
	H2 – Housing Delivery	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure housing delivery minimises flood risks policy H2 should be expanded define the term “ <i>appropriate sites</i> ” in relation to sites for housing proposals to both meet or exceed housing supply targets. In doing so the policy should cross-reference the Sequential and Exception Test requirements of policies CM4, CM5 and the NPPF.
	CM2 – Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts.
	Policy CM3 – Energy form Waste	

SA Objective	Policies	Mitigation or Enhancement Recommendation
	CM4 – Flood risk and Water management	To address identified uncertainties within policy CM4, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy should be amended to clarify required surface run-off reductions.
SA10: Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion (2)	CM4 – Flood risk and Water management	There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF.
	CM5 – Surface Water Management	
	CM6 – Water Quality	
	Policy CC2 Connectivity and Transport Network	To address the identified deficiency regarding consideration of environmental and potential flood risk impacts associated with the transport infrastructure projects supported by policy CC2– Connectivity and Transport Network it is recommended that this policy should be expanded to reference the need for these projects to accord with other relevant planning policies and to demonstrate that they would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts.
SA11: Air	SS3 – Spatial Delivery for Growth	To ensure that policies SS3 and SS4 do not inadvertently concentrate development in areas with known poor air quality and thereby exacerbate air pollution, in the next iteration of the emerging CSDP the policy should be amended to include a cross-reference to relevant assessment criteria within Policies HWSS1 - Health and Wellbeing and E17 – Quality of Life and Amenity.
	SS4 – Urban Core Policy	
	Policy E17 – Quality of Life and Amenity	Whilst there are no existing AQMA's within the City Council's area, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP Policy E17 could usefully be expanded to set out an approach to monitoring areas with known poor air quality and to taking appropriate mitigation measures, to ensure that no AQMA's require to be declared. This would enhance the contribution of Policy E17 to this SA objective.
	CM2 – Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts.
	Policy CM3 – Energy form Waste	
SA12: Climate Change	SS1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development	The requirement for development proposals to “ <i>aim to achieve higher levels of sustainable construction through incorporating the principles low carbon development</i> ” is currently ambiguous and should be clarified in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP.
	SS2 – Principles of Sustainable Development	
	SS3 - Spatial Delivery for Growth	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. To ensure the release of Green Belt land under this policy does not undermine this SA objective or conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations, the policy should be amended to insert the word “inappropriate” before “development” within criteria 4 and to include cross-references to assessment criteria within Policies E11 – Green Belt and CC1 – Sustainable Travel.
	CM2 – Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	To address identified inconsistencies, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or unmitigated significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure these policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst providing an appropriately supportive policy framework for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development in pursuit of this SA objective, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts.
	Policy CM3 – Energy form Waste	
	CM4 – Flood risk and Water management	
	CM5 – Surface Water Management	There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF.
CM6 – Water Quality		
SA13 Waste and Natural Resources	Policy WM1 Waste Management	To minimise duplication between policies, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP it is recommended that policy WM1 – Waste Management should be recast to focus on strategic criteria, including setting out a clear waste hierarchy, identifying waste management capacity requirements, establishing the need for development and directing proposals to preferred locations. Policy WM2 – Waste Facilities should be dedicated to assessing all waste management development proposals against design, environmental and amenity criteria.
	Policy WM2 Waste Facilities	
	Policy WM7 Open Cast Coal	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, Policy WM7 – Open Cast Coal should be amended to require relevant development proposals to satisfy criteria in policy WM5.
SA14: Cultural Heritage	H2 – Housing Delivery	To ensure that residential development proposals do not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on the historic environment, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP policy H2 should be expanded to define the term “ <i>appropriate sites</i> ” and include appropriate acceptability criteria, including in relation to the protection of biodiversity and geodiversity interests. In doing so the revised policy should clarify that residential development proposals should accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP

SA Objective	Policies	Mitigation or Enhancement Recommendation
	Policy CC2 – connectivity and Transport Networks	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to address the identified deficiency regarding consideration of environmental impacts associated with the transport infrastructure projects supported by Policy CC2 – Connectivity, it is recommended that this policy should be expanded to reference the need for these projects to accord with other relevant planning policies and to demonstrate they would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts (including on cultural heritage receptors).
SA15: Landscape and Townscape	SS3 – Spatial Delivery for Growth	To ensure the release of Green Belt land under this policy does not undermine this SA objective or conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy should be amended to insert the word “ <i>inappropriate</i> ” before “ <i>development</i> ” within criteria 4 and to include cross-references to assessment criteria within Policies E11 – Green Belt, E14 – Landscape Character and E15 – Creating and Protecting Views.
	Policy H2 – Housing Delivery	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure that residential development proposals do not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on landscapes and townscapes, policy H2 should be expanded to define the term “ <i>appropriate sites</i> ” and include appropriate acceptability criteria. In doing so the revised policy should set out acceptability criteria, including with reference to the protection of landscape character, local distinctiveness and visual amenity, and should also clarify that residential development proposals should accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP.
	CM2 – Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests, in particular landscape character and visual amenity, whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. Without this modification, wind energy development proposals may not be capable of according with Policy CM2 as some adverse landscape impacts could be expected from most proposals.
	Policy CM3 – Energy from Waste	
	Policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, address the identified deficiency regarding consideration of environmental impacts associated with the transport infrastructure projects supported by Policy CC2 – Connectivity, it is recommended that this policy should be expanded to reference the need for these projects to accord with other relevant planning policies and to demonstrate they would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts (including landscape impacts, erosion of Settlement Breaks or harm to the functioning or integrity of the Green Belt).
	Policy WM9 Cumulative Impact	It is not clear why the scope of Policy WM9 – Cumulative Impact is limited to only minerals and waste developments, especially as the draft Core Strategy does not contain similar policies to assess cumulative impacts from any other development types. The policy also fails to consider the acceptability of impacts as it only refers to impact significance, which could unreasonably restrict development given that a minerals or waste development of any significant scale could be expected to have a limited number of significant adverse impacts, including significant adverse local landscape character or visual impacts, resulting in significant cumulative adverse impacts by default if several development proposals are located within the same study area. The policy wording is also ambiguous regarding whether residual significance or merely significance in the absence of potential mitigation is to be assessed. These issues should be resolved in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP by rewording the policy to require the avoidance of unacceptable residual significant cumulative impacts.
Cumulative Effects on SA Objectives	SS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development	There is uncertainty regarding how policies SS1 and SS2 would be used to ensure the sustainability of development proposals where the proposal either accords with or is contrary to other subject specific policies. This means there is uncertainty regarding the ability of these policies, acting in combination with each other and with other relevant policies, to ensure that all development proposals contribute to sustainable development. To address this, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP it is recommended that policies SS1 and SS2 should be expanded to clarify their relationship with other subject specific policies and how they will be applied by Sunderland City Council to ensure that all development proposals contribute to sustainable development.
	SS2 - Principles of Sustainable Development	
	SS3 – Spatial Delivery for Growth	To ensure consistency between policy SS3 and subject specific policies, as well as to ensure that this policy does not undermine SA objectives, the policy should be expanded to define “sustainable locations” with reference to sustainability and environmental issues In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP.
	SS3 – Spatial Delivery for Growth	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure that the release of Green Belt land under Policy SS3 does not undermine multiple SA objectives or conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations, the policy should be amended to insert the word “ <i>inappropriate</i> ” before “ <i>development</i> ” within criteria 4. For the same reason policy SS3 should also be amended to include appropriate cross-references to assessment criteria within relevant subject specific policies including Policy E11 – Green Belt, E14 – Landscape Character, E15 – Creating and Protecting Views, CC1 – Sustainable Travel, HWSS1 - Health and Wellbeing and E17 – Quality of Life and Amenity
	HWSS1 – Health and Wellbeing	In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy HWSS1 should be expanded to clarify the role of HIA’s in the determination of relevant planning applications to ensure that health impacts are appropriately treated as material considerations.

6 Conclusions, SA Next Steps and Monitoring

6.1 Summary of SA Report

6.1.1 This SA report has been prepared to accompany the Draft Sunderland CSDP. Both documents, and all representations received in response to them, will inform the preparation of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. This SA report has

- Provided an overview of the Draft Sunderland CSDP;
- Identified the purpose and legal requirements of undertaking SA of the Draft CSDP;
- Described the approach to undertaking the SA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP;
- Detailed the findings of the SA of the Draft Sunderland CSDP; and
- Proposed mitigation and enhancement measures to improve the effectiveness and sustainability performance of the emerging Sunderland CSDP.

6.2 How to Comment on this SA Report

6.2.1 This SA Report is being issued for consultation alongside the Draft Sunderland CSDP. The consultation will run from **7 August 2017** to **2 October 2017**. Details of how to respond to the consultation are provided below.

6.2.2 Comments on the draft plan can be made online through SCC's consultation portal at <http://sunderland-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>. Alternatively, comments can be submitted by email to planningpolicy@sunderland.gov.uk, or in writing to Strategic Plans and Housing Team, Sunderland City Council, Civic Centre, Burdon Road, Sunderland, SR2 7DN.

6.3 Next Stages of Sunderland CSDP Preparation

6.3.1 The SA of the emerging Sunderland CSDP will continue until the adoption of the plan. This SA report has been prepared to accompany a preliminary 'draft' version of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. Consequently, another round of consultation on the emerging Sunderland CSDP will be required. The next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP will be accompanied an updated SA report, which will take account of all previous representations received regarding both the SA and the emerging Sunderland CSDP. Similarly, SCC will take account of all findings and recommendations within this SA report when developing the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP.

6.3.2 At Examination in Public, the Inspector will consider the Proposed Submission CSDP (as then submitted by SCC to the Secretary of State), representations and the SA in identifying the need for further modifications to the plan. These modifications will be consulted on and screened to consider whether they require a further update of the SA.

6.3.3 Once the Sunderland CSDP is found sound and modifications included, it will be formally adopted by SCC as the new statutory Development Plan for the SCC area. At the time of adoption, 'statements' must be published setting out (amongst other things) 'the measures decided concerning monitoring' and how the SA/SEA process has informed the preparation of the then adopted Sunderland CSDP.

6.4 Monitoring

- 6.4.1 There is a requirement for monitoring of the sustainability appraisal. This provides a check of the Local Plan implementation on sustainable development. This will need to consider positive and negative impacts, triggering a review if necessary. The specific requirements of the SEA Regulations on monitoring are to:
- 6.4.2 *“Monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation...with the purpose of identifying unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage”.* (Regulation 17(1))
- 6.4.3 The SA Framework set out in Appendix C is a good starting point for developing targets and indicators for monitoring. However, monitoring for the SA can be part of the wider monitoring process for the Local Plan, using a subset of the overall monitoring objectives. The SEA Regulations specifically state that monitoring for SEA can be incorporated into other monitoring arrangements (Regulation 17(2)), and therefore it may be possible to combine with the authority monitoring proposals for the Local Plan.
- 6.4.4 For a successful monitoring framework, SCC must ensure that the indicators they choose for monitoring are specific, manageable and targeted towards measuring the implementation of the Sunderland CSDP. For instance, demonstrating a relationship between the condition of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Sunderland CSDP may be difficult. In additional monitoring indicators must be relevant to the Sunderland CSDP and should also only address matters required through policy, rather than with reference to quantified targets that exceed policy expectations or relate to protection of assets not addressed in the Sunderland CSDP.
- 6.4.5 At this relatively early stage of plan preparation, the indicators identified within the SA Framework (Appendix C) are considered to provide sufficient details regarding the proposed approach to monitoring. However, this approach will be refined within future iterations of this SA as the components of the emerging Sunderland CSDP and their likely effects become more certain.

Appendix A Relevant Environmental Designations

A.1.1 In accordance with paragraph 4 of Schedule 2 to the SEA Regulations, Table A.1 below identifies sites designated at European level for reasons of biodiversity conservation of potential relevance to the emerging Sunderland CSDP. The site specific context of these sites (e.g. their sensitivity) must be considered when characterising the environmental baseline position and identifying the relevance of existing environmental problems to the PPS under consideration in this SA report.

Table A.1 Relevant European Sites

Site	Included/Excluded from HRA	Qualifying Features	Identified Vulnerabilities ²³
Durham Coast SAC	Included	Only example of vegetated sea cliffs on magnesian limestone exposures in the UK	Fertilisation, Human intrusions and disturbances, Invasive non-native species, Induced changes in hydraulic conditions, Abiotic (slow) natural processes, Erosion from recreational activity, pollution.
Northumbria Coast SPA and Ramsar Site	Included	Supports multiple bird populations of European importance.	Disturbance to bird breeding due to tourism along the coast. Habitat damage, toxic/non-toxic contamination and biological disturbance.
Castle Eden Dene SAC	Excluded	Represents the most extensive northerly native occurrence of yew <i>Taxus baccata</i> woods in the UK.	Increased recreational pressure Increased urbanisation Coastal squeeze Changes in water quality Changes in air quality
Thrislington SAC	Excluded	Contains the largest of the few surviving stands of CG8 <i>Sesleria albicans</i> – <i>Scabiosa columbaria</i> grassland	Increased recreational pressure Increased urbanisation Coastal squeeze Changes in water quality Changes in air quality
Teesmouth & Cleveland SPA and Ramsar	Excluded	Supports multiple bird populations of European importance	Increased recreational pressure Increased urbanisation Coastal squeeze Changes in water quality Changes in air quality

²³ With reference to Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations, the identified vulnerabilities may indicate potential environmental problems as well as source-pathway-receptor mechanisms for potential effects.

Appendix B Review of Plans, Programmes and Strategies

- B.1.1 This Appendix supports section 2.3 by providing a review of all qualifying PPS of relevance to the Draft Sunderland CSDP. This review identifies relevant environmental protection objectives and policy requirements within the related PPS to establish the relationship between the other qualifying PPS and the Draft Sunderland CSDP.
- B.1.2 The review of relevant PPS is detailed in Table B.1 below. This review will be updated as required to take account of policy developments and appended to future iterations of the SA report.

Table B.1 Review of Relevant PPS

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
International			
Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development	Commits the UK (and other signatories) to promoting sustainable development.	Commitments include: · Taking sustainable development considerations into account in national and local development planning, infrastructure investment decisions, business development, and public procurement.	The CSDP needs to set out an overarching strategy for achieving sustainable development across the city.
The Landfill Directive	Requires member states to make significant reductions to landfill waste, and to mitigate environmental impacts, principally the emission of methane from landfill biodegradation.	Reduction of biodegradable material sent to landfills by 35% of 1995 levels.	Consider the inclusion of objectives that relate to the minimisation of waste and promoting the prudent use of resources.
The IPPC Directive	Aims to prevent, reduce and eliminate pollution at source, through efficient use of natural resources.	Sets standards and target dates for the reduction of concentrations of various pollutants dangerous to human health. The directive is applicable to certain waste management facilities.	Consider the inclusion of objectives on pollution, air quality and human health.
Communication COM (2005) 666: Taking Sustainable use of resources forward	Proposes a strategy and future legislative challenges based on principles of recycling, recovery of waste materials and recovery of energy from waste.		The emerging Sunderland CSDP must consider the need to improve the sustainability of the waste produced and how it is managed within the area using the waste hierarchy. Consider the inclusion of objectives that relate to the minimisation of waste and promoting the prudent use of resources.
The Packaging Waste Directive	Sets out measures aimed at preventing production of excess packaging waste and promoting reuse, recycling and other forms of recovering packaging waste.	Updates the recovery and recycling targets to be met in the UK, which must be revised every five years.	The Local Plan should aim to reduce the production of waste and encourage sustainable waste management. Consider the inclusion of objectives that relate to the minimisation of waste and the prudent use of resources.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Kyoto Protocol to the UN Convention on Climate Change	The protocol aims to curb the growth in emissions of 6 gases connected to climate change. The intention is to achieve stabilisation of atmospheric concentrations of these gases at levels that will prevent dangerous interference with the climate system.	Industrialised countries committed to cut their combined emissions by 5% below 1990 levels by 2008-2012. Each country has agreed its own specific targets. EU countries, including the UK, are committed to cut by 8%. The UK stated its own goal to cut by 12.5%. [The UK Climate Change Act 2008 sets a framework to deliver an 80% cut by 2050].	The CSDP must set out a strategy that will help contribute to a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
Towards a Circular Economy: A Zero Waste Programme for Europe (2014)	Sets out measures to promote resource efficiency.		The CSDP should assess measures set out in the document regarding increasing resource efficiency, such as recycling targets. Consider the inclusion of objectives that relate to the minimisation of waste and promoting the prudent use of resources.
EU Directive on the Incineration of Wastes	The aim of the directive is to keep up environmental improvements to waste incinerator operators in order to limit risks to the environmental and human health posed by waste incineration.	The directive sets a dioxin emission limit of no more than 1 part in 10 billion.	Waste development, particularly incineration, could impact air quality. Regulation and monitoring of emissions is carried out by the Environment Agency. Consideration should still however be given to whether the location and scale of development will impact on air quality. Also consider the inclusion of objectives on pollution, air quality and human health.
EU Waste Oil Directive	Requires national governments to ensure the safe collection and disposal of waste oils, preventing escape to land or water.	National governments must ensure as far as possible that the disposal of waste oil is carried out by recycling, in accordance with the waste hierarchy.	The CSDP must consider the need to manage waste within the waste hierarchy. The CSDP should seek to ensure that waste does not have a negative impact on sensitive receptors. Consider the inclusion of objectives that relate to the minimisation of waste and the prudent use of resources.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
EU Directive on Large Combustion Plants	Sets emissions ceilings for plants over a certain size regardless of fuel type.		<p>Although regulation and monitoring of emissions is carried out by the Environment Agency, policies should look to ensure that the location and scale of development will not harm air quality or health.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives on pollution, air quality and human health.</p>
EU Directive on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE)	Directive which encourages the reuse, recycling and recovery of waste electrical and electronic equipment and sets criteria for their collection, treatment, recycling and recovery,		<p>Policies should encourage the development of appropriate treatment facilities for these wastes. The CSDP should promote the management of waste in line with the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives that relate to the minimisation of waste and the efficient use of natural resources.</p>
EU Directive on the Management of Waste from Extractive Industries	Sets out measures, procedures and guidance to prevent and reduce as far as possible adverse effects on the environment from extractive industries.		<p>Although regulation and monitoring of emissions is carried out by the Environment Agency, policies should look to ensure that the location and scale of development will not harm air quality or health.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives on pollution, air quality and human health.</p>
UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the World's Cultural and Natural Heritage	<p>Countries are required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ensure that measures are taken for the protection, conservation and presentation of cultural and natural heritage. · Adopt a general policy that gives cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community · Integrate the protection of heritage into comprehensive planning programmes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Designation of UNESCO World Heritage Sites. 	<p>The CSDP should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Strategies/policies that address heritage and archaeological issues generally. · Specific protection for the potential candidate World Heritage Site at St Peter's, should the Council wish to pursue another bid for World Heritage status in the future.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
The Ramsar Convention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stem the progressive encroachment on, and loss of, wetlands now and in the future. Consider the fundamental ecological functions of wetlands – regulators of water regimes, habitats supporting characteristic flora and fauna. Recognise that wetlands are a resource of great economic, cultural, scientific and recreational value. Include wetland conservation considerations in planning. 	The designation of suitable wetlands as Wetlands of International Importance (known as Ramsar sites).	The city contains a section of the Northumbria Coast Ramsar site. The CSDP should contain strategies/policies which protect the Ramsar site. Impacts of the CSDP upon the Ramsar site will be identified, assessed and appropriately mitigated through the Habitats Regulation Assessment.
The Bern Convention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote conservation of wild flora and fauna, and their natural habitats. Integrate conservation into national policies. Monitor and control endangered and vulnerable species. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure strategies and policies do not negatively impact designated wildlife sites and habitats, and instead seek to enhance their condition. Consider the impact of policies and proposals on wildlife and habitats more generally and seek ways to enhance ecosystems and biodiversity.
EU Air Quality Directive (Directive 2008/50/EC on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defines a policy framework for a number of air pollutants known to have harmful effects on human health and the environment. Set maximum levels for certain toxic heavy metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon concentrations. Sets target dates for reducing very fine particulates (PM_{2.5}); continues with previous standards and targets for fine particulates (PM₁₀). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit values and alert thresholds for a number of air pollutants, including nitrogen dioxide. Requires monitoring/reporting of air quality and the production of action plans where limits are exceeded. Reduce exposure to PM_{2.5} to below 20µg/m³ in urban areas by 2015. In all areas to respect the PM_{2.5} limit value of 25µg/m³. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the potential impacts of growth strategies and policies on air quality. Whilst the city does not currently have any Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), ensure that appropriate strategies are put in place to improve air quality in AQMAs if any are identified.
EU Birds Directive (Directive 2009/147/EC/ on the conservation of wild birds)	Member States have a duty to sustain naturally occurring wild bird populations at ecologically and scientifically sound levels. Protection applies to birds and eggs, nests and habitats/biotopes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take special measures to protect species listed in Annex 1 of the directive, including classifying areas in most suitable for these species as Special protection Areas (SPAs). SPA designation requires measures to promote conservation of the species and their habitat. 	The city contains a section of the Northumbria Coast SPA. The effect of the plan policies on this SPA must be appropriately assessed and mitigated to acceptable levels through the preparation of the Habitats Regulation Assessment.
EU Habitats Directive (EU Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (EU Habitats Directive) (As amended by 97/62/EC))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain biodiversity by conserving natural habitats and wild fauna and flora. Encourage the management of landscape features that are essential for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange of wild species. Establish systems of strict protection for animal and plant species particularly those threatened and study the desirability of reintroducing these species; Prohibit the use of non-selective methods of taking and capturing or killing certain animal and plant species. 	Requires the designation of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), selected for their importance as natural habitat types and as habitats for species listed in Annexes to the Directive. Requires measures to be taken to avoid deterioration of natural habitats as well as disturbance of the species for which the areas have been designated.	The city contains a section of the Durham Coast SAC. The effect of the plan policies on this SAC must be appropriately assessed and mitigated to acceptable levels through the preparation of the Habitats Regulation Assessment.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
EU Waste Framework Directive (Directive 2008/98/EC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Limit waste production. · Promote prevention, recycling and conversion of waste with a view to re-use. · Requires waste to be managed without endangering human health, harming the environment, and without nuisance that would adversely affect the countryside or places of special interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · By 2020, 50% of certain waste materials from households and other origins similar to households for re-use and recycling, and 70% preparing for re-use, recycling and other recovery of construction and demolition waste. 	<p>Within the scope available to this plan, consideration should be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Encourage waste efficient development, including the use of secondary and recycled aggregates. · Encourage recycling facilities in new developments.
EU Water Framework Directive (Directive 2000/60/EC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · To prevent further deterioration and protect and enhance the status of aquatic ecosystems and associated wetlands. · To promote the sustainable consumption of water; to reduce pollution of waters from priority substances. · To prevent the deterioration in the status and to progressively reduce pollution of groundwater. · To contribute to mitigating the effects of floods and droughts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Achieve good ecological and good chemical status for inland waters by 2015. · Reduction and ultimate elimination of priority hazardous substances. · Requires that strategic management plans are produced for each River Basin District (RBD) across the Union's territory. 	<p>In developing the plan consideration should be given to the impact of proposals on water. This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Surface and groundwater quality · Bathing water quality · Aquatic ecosystems · The sustainable use of water · Avoiding the hazards of flooding · The availability of water resources · The capacity of sewerage.
EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment)	<p>The environmental consequences of plans, programmes and/or policies must be identified and assessed as part of their preparation.</p>	<p>Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs)</p>	<p>The emerging CSDP will be the subject of an SEA, which will form part of the sustainability appraisal.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>EU Environmental Action Programme: Living Well, Within the Limits of Our Planet</p>	<p>Provides a strategy to guide future action by EU institutions and member states. There are 9 priority objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protect, conserve and enhance natural capital. 2. Create a resource efficient, green, and competitive low-carbon economy. 3. Safeguard the people from environment related pressures and risks to health and wellbeing. 4. Improve implementation of environmental legislation. 5. Increase environmental knowledge and widen the evidence base for policy. 6. Investment in environment and climate policy and account for the environmental costs of activities. 7. Better integrate environmental concerns into other policy areas and ensure coherence. 8. Make cities more sustainable. 9. Address international environmental/climate change challenges more effectively. 	<p>The programme also identifies mechanisms/actions to help achieve each objective. Those most relevant to planning are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Natural Capital: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Water Framework, Air Quality, Habitats, and Bird Directives. · The 2020 Biodiversity Strategy, The Blueprint to Safeguard Europe's Water Resources · Soil protection, Sustainable use of land and forests 2. Resource efficient, low carbon economy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Deliver the climate and energy package. · Turning waste into a resource. · More efficient use of water. 3. Human health and wellbeing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Air and water pollution, excessive noise, and toxic chemicals. 4. Implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Help people secure improvements in their own environment. 7. Integration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Policy areas to include: regional policy, energy and transport. 8. Sustainable cities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Implement policies for sustainable urban planning and design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Where relevant, the priority objectives should be used to inform the CSDP strategic objectives. · Planning strategies and policies need to help deliver on the relevant objectives and mechanisms, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensuring protection required by legislation. o Maximising biodiversity and other ecosystems. o Promoting a move to a low carbon economy o Minimising resource use (including water) and supporting 'waste as a resource' initiatives. o Creating sustainable urban environments including reducing the impact of transport on the built environment and human health. o Ensure environmental concerns are fully integrated within the CSDP. o Facilitating effective community engagement and Neighbourhood planning.
<p>European Spatial Development Perspective</p>	<p>To work towards a balanced and sustainable development of the EU and to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Economic and social cohesion. · Conservation and management of natural resources and cultural heritage. · More balanced competitiveness of the European territory. 		<p>The CSDP should identify and work towards achieving a more sustainable spatial vision.</p>
<p>European Sustainable Development Strategy 2001 (Renewed 2006, Reviewed 2009)</p>	<p>Achieving sustainable development requires economic growth that supports social progress and respects the environment. Strategic objectives/priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Limiting climate change and increasing the use of clean energy. · Addressing threats to public health. · Combating poverty and social exclusion. · Dealing with the economic and social implications of an ageing population. · Managing natural resources more responsibly. · Improving the transport system and land use management. 		<p>The CSDP needs to consider all aspects of sustainable development i.e. the economic, environmental, and social aspects of sustainability.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
EU Biodiversity Strategy - Our Life Insurance, Our Nature Capital: An EU Biodiversity Strategy (2011)	<p>The UN CBD led to 5 internationally agreed strategic goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Address underlying causes of biodiversity loss. 2. Reduce direct pressures and promote sustainable use. 3. Safeguard ecosystems, species and genetic diversity. 4. Enhance the benefits of ecosystems services to all. 5. Enhance implementation through participatory planning. <p>Building on this, the EU strategy outlines the vision that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · By 2050 European Union biodiversity and ecosystems services are protected, valued and appropriately restored: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For their intrinsic value. o For their essential contribution to human wellbeing and economic prosperity. o So that catastrophic changes caused by the loss of biodiversity are avoided. 	<p>The strategy identifies 5 target areas that will help to deliver, in part, on some of the goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Full implementation of EU legislation to protect biodiversity. · Better protection for ecosystems and more use of Green Infrastructure (GI). · Sustainable agriculture and forestry, and better management of fish stocks. · Tighter controls on invasive alien species. · A larger EU contribution to preventing global biodiversity loss. <p>The strategy also outlines 20 specific actions to help achieve the targets.</p>	<p>Seek opportunities for local planning strategies and policies to help achieve the strategic goals and target areas. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Policies to maximise GI coverage and the range and quality of the ecosystems services that the GI provides. · Policies to support agricultural and forestry practices, which are most sustainable.
EU Energy Performance of Buildings Directive (Directive 2002/91/EC on the Energy Performance of Buildings)	<p>Promotes improvements in the energy performance of buildings, taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Local conditions. · The requirements of the building. · Cost effectiveness. 	<p>In the UK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The timetable and methods for implementing the directive is established through BREEAM and the Code for Sustainable Homes. · The Baseline is set by Part L of the Building Regulations. 	<p>Seek to introduce CSDP policies to improve the energy performance of buildings through good design.</p>
European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (1992)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · To protect archaeological heritage, including for historical and scientific study. · Ensure that archaeologists participate in the development of planning policies to achieve well-balanced strategies for the protection, conservation and enhancement of archaeological interest. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Ensure that County Archaeologist participates in the development of relevant planning strategies and policies, and the identification of strategic development sites.
European Landscape Convention (The Florence Convention, 2000)	<p>Promotes the protection, management and planning of European landscapes and organises European co-operation on landscape issues.</p>		<p>Ensure that policies within the CSDP seek to protect and improve the management of landscapes within the city.</p>
EU (2009) Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC)	<p>This Directive establishes a common framework for the use of energy from renewable sources in order to limit greenhouse gas emissions and to promote cleaner transport. It encourages energy efficiency, energy consumption from renewable sources and the improvement of energy supply.</p>		<p>The CSDP should contribute towards increasing the proportion of energy from renewable energy sources where appropriate.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
A Resource Efficient Europe	<p>This flagship initiative aims to create a framework for policies to support the shift towards a resource-efficient and low-carbon economy which will help to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Boost economic performance while reducing resource use; · Identify and create new opportunities for economic growth and greater innovation and boost the EU's competitiveness; · Ensure security of supply of essential resources; and · Fight against climate change and limit the environmental impacts of resource use. 	<p>Each Member State has a target calculated according to the share of energy from renewable sources in its gross final consumption for 2020. The UK is required to source 15% of energy needs from renewable sources, including biomass, hydro, wind and solar power by 2020.</p> <p>From 1 January 2017, biofuels and bioliquids share in emissions savings should be increased to 50%</p>	<p>The CSDP policies should take into account the objectives of the Flagship Initiative.</p>
Noise Directive (Directive 2002/49/EC)	<p>The underlying principles of the Directive are similar to those underpinning other overarching environment policies (such as air or waste) i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Monitoring the environmental problem; by requiring competent authorities in Member States to draw up 'strategic noise maps' for major roads, railways, airports and agglomerations, using harmonised noise indicators Lden (day-evening-night equivalent level) and Lnight (night equivalent level). These maps will be used to assess the number of people annoyed and sleep disturbed respectively throughout Europe; and · Informing and consulting the public about noise exposure, its effects, and the measures considered to address noise, in line with the principles of the Aarhus Convention; · Addressing local noise issues by requiring competent authorities to draw up action plans to reduce noise where necessary and maintain environmental noise quality where it is good. <p>The directive does not set any limit value, nor does it prescribe the measures to be used in the action plans, which remain at the discretion of the competent authorities. Developing a long-term EU strategy, which includes objectives to reduce the number of people affected by noise in the longer term, and provides a framework for developing existing Community policy on noise reduction from source. With this respect, the Commission has made a declaration concerning the provisions laid down in Article 1.2 with regard to the preparation of legislation relating to sources of noise.</p>		<p>The CSDP will need to have regard to the requirements of the Environmental Noise Directive.</p>
EU Floods Directive (Directive 2007/60/EC)	<p>Aims to provide a consistent approach to managing flood risk across Europe.</p>	<p>This approach is based on a 6 year cycle of planning which include the publication of Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments, hazard and risk maps and flood risk management plans. The Directive is transposed into English law by the Flood Risk Regulations 2009.</p>	<p>The CSDP should recognise that development can impact vulnerability to flooding and increase risk due to climate change.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
National			
<p>The UK Sustainable Development Strategy (HM Government, 2005)</p>	<p>The strategy builds on the previous strategy from 1999, recognises changed governance arrangements in the UK as a result of devolution, and highlights a renewed global push for sustainable development following the World Summit in Johannesburg in 2002. It sets out five principles that form an overarching approach to achieving sustainable development, with a more explicit focus on environmental limits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Living within environmental limits. 2. Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society. 3. Achieving a sustainable economy. 4. Promoting good governance. 5. Using sound science responsibly. 	<p>Identifies four priority areas for action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainable consumption and production. 2. Climate change and energy. 3. Natural resources protection and environmental enhancement. 4. Sustainable communities. <p>Also identifies 68 indicators. Most relate to the priority areas above.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·The CSDP and its policies need to help deliver sustainable development as defined by the overarching principles. ·The CSDP needs to facilitate improvements in each of the four main priority areas.
<p>The Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013</p>	<p>Objectives or requirements of the plan or programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·The Act aims to cut the costs of doing business, boosting consumer and business confidence, and helping the private sector create jobs. ·The changes most relevant to planning are connected with heritage protection. Some of the reforms were promoted in the 2008 draft Heritage Protection Bill; others have been brought forward following the Penfold Review of Non-Planning Consents. 	<p>Relevant targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Conservation Area consent (previously required for demolition works) is replaced with planning permission. ·Heritage Partnership Agreements can be set up to outline works to listed buildings for which consent is granted. ·The extent of protection of a listed building can be better defined e.g. whether buildings within the curtilage are protected. ·National and local class consent orders are introduced where the works described will not require listed building consent. ·Lawful proposed works certificates are introduced. These confirm that the works described in the certificate do not need listed building consent. ·Certificates of immunity from listing can be applied for at any time. 	<p>Consider, in consultation with Conservation Officers, whether the changes require a different approach to developing policy related to heritage assets.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>The Plan for Growth (BIS, 2011)</p>	<p>The overall objective is to achieve strong, sustainable and balanced growth that is more evenly shared across the country and between industries. Identifies four ambitions: ·To create the most competitive tax system in the G20; ·To make the UK one of the best places in Europe to start, finance and grow a business; ·To encourage investment and exports as a route to a more balanced economy; and ·To create a more educated workforce that is the most flexible in Europe. Each ambition is supported by a number of measurable benchmarks.</p>	<p>The 'best place to start, finance and grow business' ambition includes the benchmark to: ·Increase the proportion of planning applications approved and dealt with on time. To achieve this, radical changes included: ·Presumption in favour of sustainable development. ·Identifying more land for development. ·Public sector land auctions. ·Liberalisation of the Use Classes Order. ·All applications to be dealt with within 12 months. The 'encourage investments' ambition includes: ·Creation of Enterprise Zones (less planning controls). ·Construction: Not introducing zero carbon homes from 2016. ·Planning rules to support superfast broadband rollout. The 'educated/flexible' workforce ambition includes: ·Promote labour mobility by boosting the supply of housing.</p>	<p>The plan should provide support for the growth of the city's economy: ·The presumption requires positive policies that clearly define and promote sustainable development. ·Inclusion of the NPPF model policy (or similar) relating to the presumption. ·Identification of sufficient land and positive policies to help ensure that planned development is delivered. ·Consider implications of changes to the Use Classes Order. ·Ensure that the need for superfast broadband in all communities is recognised and the plan positively seeks to find solutions where negative impacts are identified, e.g. in relation to heritage and conservation concerns.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England (HM Government, 2011)</p>	<p>Sets out a package of reforms aimed at:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increasing the supply of homes and stable growth. 2. Reforming Social and Affordable housing. 3. Creating a thriving private rented sector. 4. Bringing empty homes back into use more quickly. 5. Improving environmental standards and design quality. 	<p>Each objective is accompanied by a range of actions, including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Get Britain Building' scheme; Growing places fund; Free up public sector land; Community Right to Build; New Homes Bonus; Review housing, planning and construction regulations. 2. Social housing regulation, transfer of local authority housing stock to Registered Providers; Reinvigorated Right to Buy; Tackling anti-social behaviour. 3. Real Estate Investment Trust changes; Build to Rent pilots; Review of barriers to investment in private rented sector. 4. Extra Government funding; Council Tax changes for empty and second homes; Empty Dwelling Management Orders; Criminalising squatting. 5. Changes to Building Regulations Part L (conservation of fuel/power); Community-led design; Zero Carbon Homes; Green Deal 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increasing supply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Positively seek to deliver full objectively assessed need for housing including affordable housing –maximising new homes bonus. ·Suitable strategic policies to enable successful Neighbourhood Planning, including Community Right to Build Orders. 2. Social housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Consider implications for affordable housing supply of a reinvigorated 'Right to Buy' scheme. 4. Empty Homes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Develop policy within the plan to promote bringing empty homes back into use. 5. Environmental standards and design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Consider including policies requiring higher design standards whilst recognising the need to reduce carbon emissions, subject to viability.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods (DCLG, 2008)	<p>The UK Government consulted on a review of local housing standards in Autumn 2014. This may lead to new national policy/guidance.</p> <p>Plan housing and places so that people are not excluded by design as they grow older and more infirm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Create housing and places that can immediately accommodate the changing needs that many people have over their lifetime or housing and places that are able to be modified easily and cheaply. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Required all public housing to be built to lifetime homes standards by 2011. ·Aspired for all new housing to be built to this standard by 2013. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · To consider the appropriateness of including policy requiring this standard, or individual elements promoted by the standard. · Within this, consideration is to be given to the combined impact on delivery (in terms of viability) of requiring this standard and other standard which may overlap or conflict. <p>Further information available in: A Review of Local Standards for the Delivery of New Homes (Local Housing Delivery Group, 2012).</p>
Heritage Protection for the 21st Century: White Paper (DCMS, 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Developing a unified approach to the historic environment through creating a single system for national designations to replace listing, scheduling and registering. ·Maximising opportunities for inclusion and involvement. ·Supporting sustainable communities by putting the historic environment at the heart of an effective planning system. 		<p>No current implications (The Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013 made certain changes to the protection of heritage assets, no indication that legislation is going to be changed further).</p> <p>Develop policies which protect designated heritage assets based upon their significance.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>The UK Post 2010 Biodiversity Framework (JNCC, 2012)</p>	<p>Covers 2011-2020 and forms the joint response of the UK Governments to the strategic plan of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) held in Nagoya, Japan in 2010. Produced by the JNCC on behalf of DEFRA and equivalent bodies in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.</p> <p>The framework re-states the 5 strategic goals agreed internationally at the CBD in 2010:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Goal A: Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across the government and society. ·Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use. ·Goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity. ·Goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystems. ·Goal E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building. <p>The Framework identifies the extent of support in the EU Biodiversity Strategy (2011) for each of the goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Goal A: strongly supported by EU Biodiversity Strategy. ·Goal B: habitat loss, invasive species, and fisheries strongly supported by EU Biodiversity Strategy. ·Goal C: large role for EU Biodiversity Strategy and Natura 2000. ·Goal D: strongly supported by EU Biodiversity Strategy. ·Goal E: less relevant to the EU Biodiversity Strategy. 	<p>Also identifies a number of key activities (with a UK wide dimension) for each goal. These include:</p> <p>Goal A e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Identify, measure and integrate biodiversity values in accounting systems. <p>Goal B e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Improve targeting of EU direct payments for agriculture and forestry. ·Better understanding of the impacts of pollution. ·Addressing invasive alien species. ·Evidence base to assess vulnerability to climate change. <p>Goal C e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Consider review of UK policies to maintain diversity. ·Better identification of threatened species. ·Maintain SSSI and ASSI guidance and practice for reviewing species and habitat condition. <p>Goal D e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Further development of the 'ecosystem approach'. ·Share best practice of innovative approaches to planning and resources to help shape EU policy on climate change adaptation and Green Infrastructure. <p>Goal E e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Activities relate to actions on the international stage. 	<p>Seek opportunities for local planning strategies and policies to help achieve the strategic goals and target areas. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Policies to maximise GI coverage and the range and quality of the ecosystems services that the GI provides. ·Policies to support agricultural and forestry practices, which are more sustainable. ·Policies to protect international, national and locally designated nature site and assets.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's Wildlife and Ecosystem Services (DEFRA, 2011)</p>	<p>Sets out how EU and other international commitments will be implemented in England. Continues to be the focus for delivering biodiversity commitments in England post publication of the UK Post 2010 Biodiversity Framework.</p> <p>To halt overall biodiversity loss.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Support healthy well-functioning ecosystems. ·Establish coherent ecological networks, with more and better places for nature for the benefit of wildlife and people. 		<p>Ensure that development does not have a detrimental impact on biodiversity, and instead looks to protect and expand well-functioning ecosystems and deliver improved biodiversity.</p>
<p>The National Infrastructure Plan (2011)</p>	<p>The National Infrastructure Plan sets out the Government's ambitions to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve the performance, capacity, connectivity and environmental impacts of the UK's transport networks; - Achieve a secure, diverse and reliable energy supply for the UK while reducing the carbon intensity of electricity generation at least cost to consumers; - Maintain the security and performance of the water and sewerage system while reducing its environmental impacts; - Mitigate the impacts of flooding as part of a well-managed, co-ordinated and affordable risk management system; and - Reduce waste sent to landfill, increase recycling rates and move towards a zero waste economy. 		<p>The CSDP must consider the need to reduce the amount of waste that is produced and seek to ensure that the waste that is produced is dealt with sustainability in accordance with the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives that relate to issues such as sustainable transport, energy security, climate change, flooding, water quality and the sustainable use of resources.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>The National Heritage Protection Plan – English Heritage</p>	<p>The National Heritage Protection Plan (NHPP) sets out how English Heritage, together with partners in the heritage sector, will prioritise and deliver heritage protection from 2011 to 2015. Its objective is to make the best use of our resources so that England's vulnerable historic environment is safeguarded in the most cost-effective way.</p>		<p>The CSDP should seek to minimise the impact of development on the historic environment.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of an objective that relates to the protection of the historic environment and cultural assets.</p>
<p>Reducing and Managing Waste Policy (DEFRA, 2013)</p>	<p>The document is an overarching summary of the main directions and priorities for waste management. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Waste prevention, generically (see next entry below); - Preventing food waste; - Increasing the quantity and quality of material that is recycled; - Increasing focus on voluntary agreements particularly those relating to producer responsibility; - Working with businesses and waste companies to reduce commercial and industrial waste; - Supporting energy from waste where appropriate; - Continuing to review policy on landfill and which wastes should be banned from it; - Reducing waste crime 		<p>The CSDP should include policy references to deal with these issues as relevant to the waste management challenges facing Sunderland.</p> <p>Assess the extent to which the Local Plan reflects the policy priorities.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>The End-of-Life Vehicles (Amendment) Regulations (2010) amending End of Life Vehicles Regulations (2003)</p>	<p>These Regulations make a number of technical amendments to the original End-of-Life Vehicles Regulations (2003). They establish the mandatory requirement for the dismantling of vehicles on licensed sites which has corresponding implications for the need to ensure local capacity is available, and to integrating the licensing of such sites into the IPC regime.</p>		<p>The CSDP must consider the need to improve the sustainability of the waste produced and how it is managed within the area using the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives that relate to the minimisation of waste and promoting the prudent use of resources.</p>
<p>Household Waste Recycling Act 2003</p>	<p>The provisions of this Act came into force on 30 December 2003. It applies to England and Wales and amends the Environmental Protection Act 1990, by making arrangements for the separate collection of recyclable waste and recycling and composting duties.</p>		<p>The CSDP must consider the need to reduce the amount of waste that is produced and seek to ensure that the waste that is produced is dealt with sustainability in accordance with the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives on the prudent use of natural resources and the need to minimise volumes of waste produced.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Waste Incineration (England and Wales) Regulations 2002	This regulation implements the EU Waste Incineration Directive of 2000.		<p>Waste development, particularly incineration, could impact air quality. Regulation and monitoring of emissions is carried out by the Environment Agency. Consideration should still however be given to whether the location and scale of development will impact on air quality</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives on pollution, air quality and human health.</p>
The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2007	<p>The Regulations provide a consolidated system for environmental permits and exemptions for industrial activities, mobile plant, waste operations, mining waste operations, water discharge activities, groundwater activities and radioactive substances activities.</p> <p>The Environmental Permitting regime aims to protect the environment while simplifying the regulatory system. The Regulations transpose the provisions of 18 European Directives regulating emissions to air, water and soil, waste management and management of specific substances.</p>		<p>The CSDP must consider the impact of waste development on the natural environment.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives to protect air quality, soils, natural resources and the urban environment.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives that relate to the protection of the natural environment and human health.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>The Waste Electronic Equipment (Amendment) Regulations SI 2010/1155 amending The Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (Waste Management Licensing) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006</p>	<p>These Regulations transpose amendments to the WEEE Directive made by Council Directive 2008/112/EC. This provides that WEEE has to be treated in accordance with the requirements of Article 6 of the WEEE Directive. The regulations also provide an exemption from waste management licensing for the repair and refurbishment of WEEE for re-use and a further exemption from waste management licensing for storage of WEEE; exemptions must be registered with the Environment Agency.</p>		<p>The CSDP must consider the need to reduce the amount of waste that is produced and seek to ensure that the waste that is produced is dealt with sustainability in accordance with the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives on the prudent use of natural resources and the need to minimise volumes of waste produced.</p>
<p>The Producer Responsibility Obligations (Packaging Waste) Regulations 2007 (as amended in 2010)</p>	<p>Regulations which place a legal obligation on businesses which make or use packaging to ensure that a proportion of the packaging they place on the market is recovered and recycled. The regulations provide the recovery and recycling targets between the years 2010 and 2012.</p>	<p>New packaging recovery and recycling targets for 2013 to 2017, which apply under the Producer Responsibility Regulations, were announced in the March 2012 budget. These targets include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper/Card – 69.5% by 2017 • Glass - 81% by 2017 • Aluminum - 55% by 2017 • Steel - 76% by 2017 • Plastic - 57% by 2017 • Wood - 22% by 2017 • Total Recovery - 79% by 2017 • Of which recycling – 72.7% by 2017 	<p>The Local Plan must consider the need to reduce the amount of waste that is produced and seek to ensure that the waste that is produced is dealt with sustainability in accordance with the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives on the prudent use of natural resources and the need to minimise volumes of waste produced.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>The Hazardous Waste Regulations 2005 (England and Wales)</p>	<p>Widens the types of waste that are now classed as hazardous and strengthens controls on the management and disposal of hazardous waste. The regulations also increase the maximum limit of hazardous waste that can be produced in any year without registering with the Environment Agency.</p>		<p>The CSDP should consider whether there is a need for hazardous waste facilities.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives that relate to the protection of the natural environment and human health.</p>
<p>Hedgerow Regulations 1997</p>	<p>Act introduced to make provision for the protection of important hedgerows in England and Wales.</p>		<p>Local plans should consider the impact of development on the natural environment.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives to protect and enhance biodiversity and landscape character.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
The Protection of Badgers Act 1992	Provides protection for badgers and their setts.		<p>The CSDP must take into account the need to avoid harming protected species including badgers.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives to protect and enhance biodiversity.</p>
Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006)	<p>Confers power to a number of bodies concerned with the natural environment and rural communities in order to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make provision in connection with wildlife sites of special scientific interest, National Parks and the broads - To amend the law relating to rights of way - To make provision as to the Inland Waterways Amenity Advisory Council - To provide for flexible administrative arrangements in connection with functions relating to the environment and rural affairs and certain other functions - And for connected purposes. 		<p>The impacts of the CSDP on biodiversity must be considered in the plan-preparation process. The plan must also consider the impact of development on the natural environment.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives to protect and enhance biodiversity.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
The Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000)	Sets out legal provisions regarding rights of way and promotes conservation of habitats and species, as well as applying further protection to SSSIs.		<p>The CSDP should take into account the need to protect habitats, biodiversity and rights of way/access to the countryside.</p> <p>The CSDP should seek to avoid harm to designated sites, including SSSIs.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives to protect and enhance biodiversity, and rights of way/access to the countryside</p>
The Waste Regulations 2011 (England and Wales)	Implementation of the revised EU Waste Framework Directive, which requires and national waste management plan and waste prevention measures. Also required are strict controls over waste collection and promotion of waste use as a resource.	Requires waste prevention programmes to be established as well as the application of a waste hierarchy to deliver the best possible environmental outcome.	<p>The CSDP should seek to ensure that waste is dealt with as a resource. It must consider the need to reduce the amount of waste that is produced and seek to ensure that the waste that is produced is dealt with sustainability in accordance with the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives on the prudent use of natural resources and the need to minimise volumes of waste produced.</p>
Waste Prevention Programme for England (2013)	Sets out the roles and actions for government and others to reduce the amount of waste produced in England		<p>The CSDP should have reference to the roles local authorities have in order to reduce the amount of waste produced</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives on the prudent use of natural resources and the need to minimise volumes of waste produced.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Landfill Regulations 2002 (England and Wales, amended 2005)	Implements EU Landfill Directive into UK law. Bans certain wastes from being disposed of using landfills and sets limits on biodegradable materials that may be deposited at landfill.		<p>The CSDP must consider the need to reduce landfill waste and ensure that produced waste is dealt with sustainably.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives on the prudent use of natural resources and the need to minimise volumes of waste produced.</p>
Waste and Emissions Trading Act 2003 (Amended)	Primary objective to meet European landfill objectives and develop a system for the disposal of biodegradable waste.		<p>The CSDP must consider the need to reduce the amount of waste that is produced and seek to ensure that the waste that is produced is dealt with sustainability in accordance with the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Consider the inclusion of objectives on the prudent use of natural resources and the need to minimise volumes of waste produced.</p>
The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) and amendments (2012))	<p>The 2010 regulations replace The Conservation Regulations 1994 and consolidate their various amendments, in respect of England and Wales. They more clearly transpose the EU Habitats Directive into national law and incorporate the requirements of the EU Wild Birds Directive.</p> <p>The regulations aim to help protect biodiversity through the conservation of natural habitats and of wild flora and fauna.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Any strategy, policy, or site that will impact a designated or protected sites needs to undergo a Habitats Regulations Assessment. ·Strategies, policies or sites that are likely to have a significant impact on a SPA or SAC should undergo an 'Appropriate Assessment' of its implications.
The Air Quality Standards Regulations (2010) as amended	<p>Replaces the 2007 regulations and implements the 2008 EU Ambient Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC), as well as previous extant Directives, such as 2004/107/EC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·The 2008 Directive sets legally binding limits and alert thresholds for the concentration of major air pollutants that impact public health and the environment, such as fine particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) and nitrogen dioxide (NO2) in outdoor air. ·The 2004 directive sets maximum levels for certain toxic heavy metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon concentrations in outdoor air. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Limit values and alert thresholds for a number of air pollutants, including nitrogen dioxide. ·Consider the potential impacts of growth strategies and policies on air quality. ·Reduce exposure to PM2.5 to below 20µg/m3 in urban areas by 2015. In all areas respect the PM2.5 limit value of 25µg/m3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Ensure strategies and policies do not reduce air quality generally. ·Requires monitoring/reporting of air quality and the production of Area Plans where limits are exceeded.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Safeguarding our soils: A strategy for England (DEFRA, 2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·The strategy highlights the importance of soils as a resource, and provides a framework for policy making to ensure the sustainable management of soils. ·By 2030 the quality of soils will be improved and the ability of soils to provide essential services for future generations will be safeguarded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Agricultural soils will be better managed and threats to them will be addressed. ·Soils will play a greater role in the fight against climate change in helping us to manage its impacts. ·Soils in urban areas will be valued during development, and construction practices will ensure vital soil functions can be maintained. ·Pollution of our soils is prevented, and our historic legacy of contaminated land is being dealt with. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·The plan needs to take account of soil quality when considering suitable development locations, including where development could remediate damaged and/or contaminated soils. ·Consider whether planning policies could be an appropriate tool to deliver better management of soils through all stages of construction.
Agricultural Land Classification – Protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land (Technical Information Note 049: Agricultural Land Classification – protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land: second edition, Natural England, 2012)	<p>The classification gives a high grading to land that allows more flexibility in the range of crops that can be grown and which require lower inputs.</p> <p>The note sets out guidance on the protection of 'best and most versatile' agricultural land.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, poorer quality land should be used in preference to that of higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Ensure that strategy selection and site selection methodologies prioritise the use of previously developed land over green field land, where consistent with other sustainability considerations. ·Where development of agricultural land is being considered, ensure methodologies prioritise poorer quality land over the 'best and most versatile', where consistent with other sustainability considerations.
The Government's Water Strategy for England (DEFRA, 2008)	<p>Sets out the Government's plans for water and water supply looking ahead to 2030 by identifying long term objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Seeks the sustainable delivery of secure water supplies and an improved and protected water environment. ·Set out to improve rivers, canals, lakes and seas for people and wildlife, with benefits for angling, boating and other recreational activities, and where we continue to provide excellent quality drinking water. ·Valuing and protecting water as a resource. ·Develop the resilience to climate change, and coping with the predicated increase in population. ·Reducing Greenhouse emissions from the water industry. 		<p>CSDP should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Contribute to achieving water efficiency and address the management of surface water in connection with new development, including through Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs). ·Consider how development can be harnessed to contribute to responding to climate change, including sustainable flood risk management. ·Consider the impact of development on water bodies, and opportunities for increasing amenity and biodiversity value.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG, 2012)	<p>The NPPF identifies the Government's requirements for the planning system and sets out the national planning policies for England. It replaces a wide range of Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and Planning Policy Guidance notes (PPGs)</p> <p>At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This is underpinned by 12 core principles. Planning should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be genuinely plan led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. 2. Be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance places people live. 3. Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development. 4. Seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity. 5. Take account of different roles and character of areas. 6. Support the transition to a low carbon future. 7. Contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. 8. Encourage the effective use of land by reusing previously developed land. 9. Promote mixed use development. 10. Conserve heritage assets. 11. Actively manage growth to make the fullest use of non-car modes of transport. 12. Take account of and support local strategy to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing. 		Strategies and policies in the CSDP need to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development by meeting the 12 Core Planning Principles and being in accordance with the NPPF as a whole.
Planning Practice Guidance	<p>The Planning Practice Guidance is a live online resource which is continually updated.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance is designed to support the NPPF. It reflects the objectives of the NPPF which are not repeated here.</p>	The CSDP should reflect the Planning Practice Guidance.	
National Planning Policy for Waste (DCLG, 2014)	<p>Sets out the Government's planning policy for waste management and replaces PPSS10. The National Planning Policy for Waste should be considered alongside the Waste Management Plan for England.</p> <p>Sets out the Government's ambition towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management.</p>		The CSDP should include strategies to reduce the amount of waste generated and to ensure that waste is managed in the most sustainable way by pushing waste management types up the waste hierarchy. This includes providing infrastructure to increase recycling

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Waste Management Plan for England (DEFRA, 2013)	<p>Fulfils the mandatory requirements of the revised Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC)</p> <p>Provides an analysis of the current waste management situation in England for a range of waste streams, and sets out work required to achieve a zero waste economy. The plan does not introduce new policies; rather it brings together current waste management policies in one national plan. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Measures relating to packaging and packaging waste. ·Measures to promote high quality recycling. ·Measures to encourage the separate collection of bio-waste to enable greater levels of composting and digestion. ·Measures to encourage the re-use of products and preparing for re-use activities. 	<p>To ensure that by 2020:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 50% of waste from households is prepared for re-use or recycled. 2. At least 70% of construction and demolition waste is subjected to material recovery. 	<p>capabilities and promoting material and energy recovery.</p>
Meeting the Energy Challenge: A White Paper on Energy (DECC, 2007)	<p>Sets out the Government's international and domestic energy strategy to address the long term energy challenges faced by the UK.</p>	<p>The paper seeks to deliver four key policy goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To put the UK on a path to cut carbon dioxide emissions by some 60% by about 2050, with real progress by 2020. 2. To maintain reliable energy supplies. 3. To promote competitive markets in the UK and beyond, helping to raise the rate of sustainable economic growth and to improve productivity. 4. To ensure that every home is adequately and affordably heated. 	<p>Ensure that the CSDP puts strategies and policies in place to contribute towards the Government's target reduction in carbon dioxide emissions. Ensure that policies promote energy efficient buildings to help reduce energy costs.</p>
The Carbon Plan (DECC, 2011)	<p>The plan sets out how the UK will achieve decarbonisation within the framework of the Government's energy policy.</p>	<p>The plan sets out how the Government aims to achieve the following reductions in carbon emissions (based on 1990 levels):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First carbon budget (2008-12) 23% Second carbon budget (2013-17) 29% Third carbon budget (2018-22) 35% Fourth carbon budget (2023-27) 50% 	<p>Ensure that the CSDP seeks to reduce carbon emissions in the city to help the Government achieve its carbon emissions targets. This will also assist the Council in meeting its own carbon emissions targets.</p>
The UK Renewable Energy Strategy (HM Government, 2009)	<p>The strategy sets out to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Put in place the mechanisms to provide financial support for renewable electricity and heat worth around £30 billion between now and 2020; ·Drive delivery and clear away barriers; ·Increase investment in emerging technologies and pursue new sources of supply; and ·Create new opportunities for individuals, communities and business to harness renewable energy. 	<p>A vision is set out in the document whereby by 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·More than 30% of our electricity is generated from renewables; ·12% of our heat is generated by renewables and; ·10% of transport energy is from renewables. 	<p>The CSDP should include policies which promote the use of renewable technologies to contribute towards the strategy.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
The Pitt Review: Learning Lessons from the 2007 Floods (2008)	<p>To assess the flooding which took place in the summer of 2007 and make recommendations on flood risk management, the resilience and vulnerability of critical infrastructure, the emergency response, emergency planning and the recovery phase.</p> <p>The report made a total of 92 recommendations, 43 of which have been brought forward through subsequent legislation, including the Flood and Water Management Act (2010), the National Flood Emergency Framework (2010), the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy (2011), and the UK Climate Change Risk Assessment (2012).</p>	Amongst the changes resulting from the Pitt Review was creation of Lead Local Flood Authorities and the requirement for local authorities to produce Surface Water Management Plans.	Ensure that strategies and policies are put in place to ensure that development is directed towards areas at low risk of flooding.
Flood and Water Management Act (2010)	The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 makes provisions about water, including provision about the management of risks in connection with flooding and coastal erosion.	<p>Those related to water resources, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·To widen the list of uses of water companies can control during periods of water shortage and enable Government to add to and remove uses from the list. ·To encourage the uptake of sustainable drainage systems by removing the automatic right to connect to sewers and providing it for unitary and county councils to adopt SUDs for new developments. ·To reduce 'bad debt' in the water industry by amending the Water Industry Act 1991 to provide a named customer and clarify who is responsible for paying the water bill. ·To make it easier for water and sewerage companies to develop and implement social tariffs where companies consider there is a good cause to do so, and in light of guidance that will be issued by the Secretary of State following a full public consultation. 	The CSDP should promote the use of sustainable drainage systems.
The Environment Act (1995)	Requires local authorities (amongst other things) to monitor air quality in their area regularly. If it is deemed necessary, it can declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) where air quality exceeds pollution limits.	Monitoring of air quality and establishment of AQMAs where air quality exceeds limits.	Strategies and policies should be developed through the CSDP which seek to reduce air pollution.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
The Natural Environment White Paper (DEFRA, 2012)	Sets out the importance of a healthy, functioning natural environment to achieve sustained economic growth, prospering communities and personal well-being. It was in part a response to the UK's failure to halt and reverse the decline in biodiversity by 2010 and it signalled a move away from the traditional approach of protecting biodiversity in 'nature reserves' to adopting a landscape approach to protecting and enhancing biodiversity. The NEWP also aims to create a green economy in which economic growth and the health of our natural resources sustain each other and markets, business and Government better reflect the value of nature.	The report sets out 92 commitments which should be delivered under the plan. The Government regularly publishes implementation updates to demonstrate progress made against each of these commitments.	Establish strategies and policies through the CSDP which seek to preserve and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity resources of the city.
Local Growth: Realising every Place's potential (BIS, 2010)	This white paper sets out the Government's role in supporting locally driven growth, encouraging business investment and promoting economic development. For local communities this means ensuring that everyone has access to opportunities that growth brings and everyone is able to fulfil their potential. In particular, the policy seeks to rebalance the economy to achieve sustainable economic growth.		Support sustainable economic growth through strategies contained within the CSDP. Seek to broaden the employment base within the city to ensure sustainable growth. Ensure that sufficient land allocations are in place to support the levels of economic growth predicted over the plan period and ensure that the necessary infrastructure is also delivered.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
The Marmot Review	<p>The Health and Social Care Act (2012) transferred the responsibility for public health from the NHS to local authorities, giving them a duty to improve the health of the people living in their area.</p> <p>·The review investigated health inequalities in England and the actions needed in order to tackle them. Subsequently, a supplementary report was prepared providing additional evidence relating to spatial planning and health. It does so on the basis that there is: 'overwhelming evidence that health and environmental inequalities are inexorably linked and that poor environments contribute significantly to poor health and health inequalities.</p> <p>·It highlights the three main policy actions to ensure that the built environment promotes health and reduces inequalities. These should be applied on a universal basis, but with a scale and intensity that is proportionate to the level of disadvantage.</p> <p>·Specifically these actions are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Fully integrate the planning, transport, housing, environmental and health systems to address the social determinants of health in each locality; 2. 'Prioritise policies and interventions that both reduce health inequalities and mitigate climate change by: improving active travel; improving good quality open and green spaces; improving the quality of food in local areas; and improving the energy efficiency of housing'. 3. 'Support locally developed and evidence-based community regeneration programmes that remove barriers to community participation and action; and reduce social isolation.' 	<p>Relevant targets include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Improvements to public health. ·Reduction in health inequalities. ·Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. ·Promoting active lifestyles and improving green spaces. ·Improving energy efficiency of housing. 	<p>The CSDP should contain a range of policies aimed at improving public health. This should include policies to protect and enhance green spaces and accessibility, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve the energy efficiency of buildings.</p>
Manual for Streets (DfT, 2007)	<p>This should be read alongside the Manual for Streets 2 which was published in 2010.</p> <p>Aims to assist in the creation of high quality residential streets that builds and strengthens communities and attractive places.</p>	<p>Incorporate good design policies within the CSDP to improve the quality of residential environments.</p>	
The Health and Social Care Act (2012)	<p>The Act transferred the responsibility for public health from the NHS to local authorities.</p>	<p>Improving health outcomes.</p>	<p>Incorporate policies within the CSDP to assist the local authority in its responsibilities to improve public health outcomes and address health inequality.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Fixing our broken housing market: A Housing Whitepaper (DCLG, 2017)	<p>This whitepaper identifies a series of policy measures to improve the functioning of the UK's housing market, including to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simplify and increase transparency in plan-making; - Clarify the approach to identifying housing needs which must be met within Local Plans; - Maximise the contribution of brownfield and surplus public land, - Regenerate estates, - Release small and medium sized housing sites, and - Maintain exiting protection for Green Belts. 		The CSDP should include policies and site allocations to meet identified housing needs in full, whilst also supporting the creation of sustainable neighbourhoods and affording appropriate protection to the Green Belt.
The Government's Statement on the Historic Environment for England (2010)	Sets out the Government's vision for the historic environment. It calls for those who have the power to shape the historic environment to recognise its value and to manage it in an intelligent manner in light of the contribution that it can make to social, economic and cultural life.	Protection of designated and non-designated heritage assets.	Ensure that the CSDP sets out policies which value the historic environment and seek to protect heritage assets based on their significance.
The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979	Makes provision for the investigation, preservation and recording of matters of archaeological interest.	Ensure that all archaeological investigations are recorded on the Council's Historic Environment Record (HER).	Include a policy within the CSDP requiring the appropriate investigation, preservation and recording of any matters of archaeological interest in accordance with the Act.
The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990	Relates to special controls in respect of buildings and areas of special architectural interest. The Act requires local authorities to designate areas of 'special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance' as Conservation Areas and from time to time to formulate and publish proposals for their preservation and enhancement. However, the NPPF has signalled a move away from automatically preserving everything within a conservation area and instead basing the level of protection of heritage assets upon their significance.	Designation of conservation areas. The HER provides the starting point for establishing the significance of heritage assets.	Identify conservation area boundaries on the proposals map and include policies within the CSDP which seek to protect heritage assets based on their significance.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2012)</p>	<p>Planning Policy for Traveller sites was updated in August 2015 to incorporate changes to the definition of gypsies and travellers for planning purposes and to offer greater protection to the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) sets out the Government's planning policy framework for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople and provides guidance on how local authorities should plan to meet the needs for traveller sites and travelling showpeople yards within their area. The guidance indicates that local authorities should undertake a robust assessment in order to identify the need for pitches and plots within their area and plan to meet this need through their local plan. In addition, the policy introduces the requirement for local authorities to maintain a five-year deliverable supply of sites.</p> <p>Regional and Sub-Regional Context</p>	<p>Local authorities should set a requirement for sites and yards based on robust evidence. Local authorities should also identify a five year supply of sites/plots.</p>	<p>The CSDP should set a requirement for pitches/plots for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople based on needs identified through the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Study. The plan should also identify site allocations to address the needs identified.</p>
Regional			

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
LTP3: The Third Local Transport Plan for Tyne and Wear 2011-2021 (2011)	<p>Provides a strategic response to the spatial and transport patterns of the area, reflecting the policy objectives of the five authorities in Tyne and Wear (Gateshead, Newcastle, North Tyneside, South Tyneside, Sunderland) and the Passenger Transport Authority.</p> <p>The overall vision of the plan is for the Tyne and Wear to have a fully integrated and sustainable transport network, allowing everyone the opportunity to achieve their full potential and have a high quality of life. To ensure that the strategic networks will support the efficient movement of people and goods within and beyond Tyne and Wear, and a comprehensive network of pedestrian, cycle and passenger transport links will ensure that everyone has access to employment, training, community services and facilities. In order to achieve this vision, LTP3 sets out the following five goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·To support the economic development, regeneration and competitiveness of Tyne and Wear, improving the efficiency, reliability and integration of transport networks across all modes ·To reduce carbon emissions produced by local transport movements, and to strengthen our networks against the effects of climate change and extreme weather events ·To contribute to healthier and safer communities in Tyne and Wear, with higher levels of physical activity and personal security ·To create a fairer Tyne and Wear, providing everyone with the opportunity to achieve their full potential and access a wide range of employment, training, facilities and services ·To protect, preserve and enhance our natural and built environments, improving quality of life and creating high quality public places. 	<p>The plan highlights a number of key policies aimed at improving the transport network within the city, including the delivery of the Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor. It should be noted that the time period covered by this delivery plan has now ended, however its priorities remain relevant.</p>	<p>It is important that the CSDP is closely aligned to the LTP3 and its delivery plan.</p>
Accessibility Delivery Plan (2011)	<p>The plan identifies a series of barriers to accessibility (including affordability, availability, acceptability of facilities and services and public awareness of the different forms of public transport) that currently exist and identifies a number of actions to undertake to remove these barriers.</p>	<p>The plan identifies a number of actions to be undertaken to remove the barriers to accessibility identified.</p>	<p>Ensure that the CSDP seeks to address any identified barriers to accessibility and provide the necessary infrastructure requirements identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
The South of Tyne and Wear Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (2007)	<p>The strategy outlines objectives and targets for waste management, seeking to increase the amount of waste which is recycled and reduce the amount which is sent to landfill.</p>	<p>Targets include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·45% increase recycling/composting and 75% increase in waste recovery by 2020. ·Reduction in the amount of waste sent to landfill to less than 25% by 2025. 	<p>Provide strategies and policies in the CSDP which seek to increase the amount of waste which is recycled and reused and reduce the amount which is sent to landfill.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
The Durham Biodiversity Action Plan (2006)	Aims to help species and habitats that are considered to be under threat. The DBAP promotes the continued protection and enhancement of important sites and species.	The city has a number of European, national and locally designated sites.	The CSDP should include policies to: ·conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of wildlife and geology by sustaining and improving the quality and extent of natural habitats. The CSDP should also include policies to safeguard and where possible, enhance habitats and species considered to be under threat.
The Durham Heritage Coast Management Plan (2006)	The plan aims to promote, protect and enhance the natural beauty of the coast.	Part of the Durham Heritage Coast is located within the city. The Council should aim to protect the undeveloped qualities of the heritage coast.	The CSDP should include policies aimed at protecting and enhancing the undeveloped qualities of the section of the Durham Heritage Coast.
Northumbria River Basin District River Basin Management Plan 2015	<p>The Northumbria river basin district (Figure 1) covers an area of 9,000km², extending from the Scottish border in the north through Northumbria to Stockton-upon-Tees in the south. It includes parts of Cumbria to the west and extends to North Sea to the east.</p> <p>The RBMP sets out the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·current state of the water environment ·pressures affecting the water environment ·environmental objectives for protecting and improving the waters ·programme of measures, actions needed to achieve the objectives ·progress since the 2009 plan <p>It also informs decisions on land-use planning because water and land resources are closely linked. It consists of Part 1 the summary and Part 2 'Planning Overview and Additional Information'</p>	<p>The environmental objectives of the WFD are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to prevent deterioration of the status of surface waters and groundwater • to achieve objectives and standards for protected areas •to aim to achieve good status for all water bodies or, for heavily modified water bodies and artificial water bodies, good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status • to reverse any significant and sustained upward trends in pollutant concentrations in groundwater • the cessation of discharges, emissions and losses of priority hazardous substances into surface waters <p>•progressively reduce the pollution of groundwater and prevent or limit the entry of pollutants</p>	The CSDP should include policies aimed at protecting the water environment; this includes avoiding surface water runoff that could be polluted entering water bodies or groundwater, helping reverse physical modification of water bodies and ensure new development does not exceed treatment infrastructure (and helps in the delivery of new infrastructure where necessary).

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>More and Better Jobs: A Strategic Economic Plan for the North East ((NELEP, 2014))</p>	<p>The Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) sets out the vision of the North East Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for the sustainable economic growth within the north-east of England.</p> <p>The plan is broken down into the following six themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Innovation: Creating competitive advantage through innovation – building a platform for local businesses to contribute to their own future with the support to excel in whatever area they choose. ·Business Support & Access to Finance: Providing the framework for business to access the information, advice and finance they need to thrive and grow. ·Skills: Improving the North East skills base – making sure every subsequent workforce has the right skills to support business growth and to move forward in the most self-sufficient way. ·Economic Assets and Infrastructure: Developing the areas in which businesses can invest and grow, and people can train and excel. ·Employability & Inclusion: Sourcing the skills from within the North East by supporting those who can't easily access training and employment. ·Transport & Connectivity: Creating the best networks – connecting the North East to national and international economy. 	<p>To create 100,000 new jobs by 2024, the equivalent to an 11% increase from the 2014 baseline figure.</p> <p>This overall vision includes a key objective to at least halve the gap between the North East and the national average (excluding London) on three quantifiable measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Gross Value Added (GVA) per full time equivalent (FTE), with wages and profits rewarding workers and investors and sustaining high levels of employment. ·Private sector employment density, with more companies and jobs driving a high growth economy. ·Activity rate, with no one left behind, and those distant from disadvantaged in the labour market helped to take advantage of the opportunities created by a successful growing economy. 	<p>The CSDP should contain strategies and policies in place to help achieve the vision identified in the SEP. In particular, it should ensure that sufficient land is allocated for employment use and that the necessary infrastructure is delivered to secure economic growth.</p>
<p>The North East Strategic Economic Plan Refresh 2017</p>	<p>The SEP from 2014 (see above) was updated to respond to the changing economic climate and in light of the UK's decision to leave the EU. The refreshed SEP retains the same six themes as identified previously and sets out new actions and commitments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthening the employment rate; - Improving transport and digital infrastructure; and, - Increasing the density of high growth businesses by 50% 		

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Sunderland City Deal, in partnership with South Tyneside (2014)	The Sunderland City Deal will allow the city and the North East to build on its strength in advanced manufacturing, particularly around the automotive sector. The city deal outlines Government's support for the ambition to create a Combined Local Authority, bring forward the International Advanced Manufacturing Park, a new crossing over the Wear as part of the Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor and the development of a new Central Business District on the former Vaux Brewery site.	The City Deal aims to achieve the following outcomes by 2027: · Approximately 260,000m2 of developable floorspace over a 100-hectare advanced manufacturing park · 5,200 new jobs with the vast majority in the manufacturing sector. · An estimated £295m private sector investment in advanced manufacturing in the North East.	The CSDP should support the stated ambitions in the City Deal. In particular, the strategy should support the delivery of the Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor and the redevelopment of the former Vaux Brewery site. Whilst a separate Area Action Plan is being prepared to deliver IAMP, policies within the CSDP should also help to support its delivery.
National Character Area Profiles: North East England (2014)	Identifies landscapes and aims to raise awareness of the diversity of countryside character, increase the understanding of what contributes to that character and what may influence it in the future. There are a total of 15 different character areas in the north east, with two of these being located within the city; The Tyne and Wear Lowlands and Durham Magnesium Limestone Plateau.		The CSDP should take account of the area profiles and seek to protect and enhance important landscapes.
The European 'Covenant of Mayors' (2008)	The Covenant of Mayors is the mainstream movement involving local and regional authorities, voluntarily committing to increasing energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources on their territories. Sunderland City Council signed the covenant on 14 January 2009.	Commitment to aim to meet and exceed the European Union CO2 reduction objective by 2020	The CSDP should include policies to help the Council reduce CO2 emissions within the city and contribute towards meeting the EU target.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>Sunderland Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS) Accommodation Assessment (2017)</p>	<p>This draft study identifies the supply and need for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople pitches and plots within the SCC area.</p>	<p>The study identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are currently no permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches across Sunderland City 8.2Borough. - The 2017 GTAA has evidenced no need for pitches within Sunderland City over the Sunderland CSDP Period. - There is evidence of sustained levels of unauthorised encampment activity in 8.3Sunderland City. - A recommendation for a stop-over site of 5 pitches to be developed. This would be sufficient for 10 caravans (two per pitch). This size of stop-over site should accommodate the vast majority of unauthorised encampment activity. - There are currently 100 Travelling Showperson plots (including subdivisions) on five 8.4yards across Sunderland City. Of these, 95 plots are occupied and 5 are vacant. - There is a total need over the period 2016/17 to 2032/33 for 131 Travelling Showpeople plots, including need arising from emerging households. Taking into account the existing supply of 100 plots (including vacant), this results in a shortfall of 31 plots over the CSDP Period. <p>The study therefore concludes there is a need for 33 plots over the CSDP Period. However, this excludes any allowance for household dissolution which may result in an increase in pitches becoming available.</p>	<p>The CSDP should seek to meet the GTTS needs identified through the assessment.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>South Tyneside Local Development Framework</p>	<p>The South Tyneside Local Development Framework (LDF) comprises of five documents; the CSDP, Site Allocations, South Shields Town Centre and Waterfront AAP, Central Jarrow AAP and the Hebburn Town Centre AAP. South Tyneside Council have started the preparation of a new Local Plan which will replace the Local Development Framework. Consultation key issues and options for the Local Plan took place in early 2013, whilst consultation on the scale of growth took place in June/July 2015.</p> <p>The LDF documents set out the adopted development plan for the metropolitan borough of South Tyneside. The overall spatial vision for the LDF is to concentrate development on the key regeneration/development areas, but ensure that this is not at the expense of maintaining communities and providing full access to the major facilities and developments. The CSDP contains a total of 20 spatial objectives which the policies contained within the LDF will seek to achieve.</p> <p>South Tyneside Council undertook a Strategic Land Review in 2016 to support the preparation of the Borough's emerging Local Plan. The review identifies candidate sites which are considered to be the most suitable and sustainable for allocation.</p>	<p>Housing 2004-2011 – No further housing land required to meet RSS allocation. 2011-2016 – Average of 240 dwellings per annum, 2016-2021 – Average of 330 dwellings per annum. Economy 40 hectares of land allocated to meet economic development requirements.</p>	<p>The Council should work closely with South Tyneside Council to ensure that both development plans are compatible. This will be particularly important with regard to the emerging South Tyneside Local Plan and the development of the IAMP AAP.</p>
<p>Planning for the Future – CSDP and Urban Core Plan for Gateshead and Newcastle upon Tyne 2010-2030</p>	<p>The plan sets out the spatial planning framework to deliver economic prosperity and create lifetime neighbourhoods from 2010-2030. It is the central document in the Gateshead Local Plan, containing an overall spatial vision, objectives, strategy and policies. The plan covers the whole area within Gateshead and Newcastle's administrative boundaries including strategic policies for the Urban Core, Sub-Areas and sites.</p> <p>The overall vision of the plan is that by 2030 Gateshead and Newcastle will be prosperous and sustainable cities that are unique and distinctive places – where people choose to live, work and visit because everyone can realise their full potential and enjoy a high quality lifestyle. The plan contains a total of 12 strategic objectives which will help to deliver the overall vision.</p>	<p>The plan seeks to deliver approximately 30,000 new homes, 22,000 jobs and a minimum of 150 hectares of employment land.</p>	<p>The Council should work closely with Gateshead Council to ensure that both development plans are compatible. This will be particularly important with employment land, taking into account the land allocation at Follingsby close to the boundary with Sunderland.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Durham Local Plan	The adopted Durham Local Plan currently consists of a number of saved Local Plans from the district authorities, however these will be replaced by a new Local Plan which is currently being prepared. The new County Durham Local Plan was proceeding through Examination in Public, however this process was stopped after the Planning Inspector published an interim report which cast doubts over the soundness of the plan. The Inspector's interim report has subsequently been quashed and Durham Council have withdrawn the plan, with the intention of resubmitting a revised plan in for Examination in 2016. A revised Publication Draft Local Plan was consulted on in Summer 2016 however a decision was then taken to delay future stages pending publication of the UK Government's Housing Whitepaper.	The new Local Plan will provide broad strategic direction, a spatial expression of Durham Sustainable Community Strategy and will provide guidance and policy on the scale and distribution of new development, infrastructure provision and use of land and buildings to 2033. Its aim is to create a good balance of housing, jobs and other services that all can access.	The Council should work closely with Durham County Council to ensure that both development plans are compatible. There is greater opportunity to do this now that the Durham Local Plan is to be revised prior to resubmission and that this has been delayed.
Delivery Plan for the North East Regional Biodiversity Habitat Targets (2006)	Sets out actions and activities needed to ensure that the region meets its contribution to UK BAP targets. It assesses progress towards meeting the targets, proposes delivery mechanisms for achieving the targets, sets milestones for the delivery of the targets, creates linkages between delivery of the target and landscape-scale biodiversity projects, and identifies specific actions and accountabilities for delivering the regional targets.		The CSDP should include policies to: · conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of wildlife and geology by sustaining and improving the quality and extent of natural habitats. The CSDP should also include policies to safeguard and where possible, enhance habitats and species considered to be under threat.
A Biodiversity Audit of the North East (2001)	Provides information on those species and habitats which occur within the North East Region that are regionally, nationally or internationally important to inform local action plans.		
Tyne and Wear Air Quality Delivery Plan	Governance and monitoring arrangements to drive improvement forward; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current air quality levels and measures in the region, • New air quality indicators and targets for Tyne and Wear; • Challenges to our proposed objectives and solutions, and how these can be overcome, • Examples of national and regional best practice which can be used to improve Tyne and Wear air quality levels, and • Proposed actions to improve area specific and overall Tyne and Wear air quality levels which affects us all. 		Strategies and policies should be developed through the CSDP which seek to reduce air pollution.
Local			
The Sunderland Climate Change Action Plan (2008)	The original action plan was refreshed in 2010 through the Climate Change Action Plan: Progress Report. Objectives or requirements of the plan or programme	Relevant targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms Reduce carbon dioxide emissions in Sunderland by 34% by 2020 and by 80% by 2050.	CSDP response/implications The CSDP should include strategies and policies which seek to reduce carbon

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
	<p>Demonstrates how Sunderland City Council is aiming to support the UK Climate Change Act. The updated action plan indicates that Sunderland is still aiming to cut its carbon emissions by 80% by 2050, but the revised action plan is now aiming to reduce emissions by 34% by 2020. This revision aligns Sunderland's carbon emissions target both with the UK Low Carbon Transition Plan and the EU Covenant of Mayors initiative.</p>		<p>emissions to help achieve the targets set out in the Climate Change Action Plan.</p>
<p>The Sunderland Strategy 2008 – 2025</p>	<p>The Sunderland Strategy sets out the vision for how those who live, work and study in the city would like to see Sunderland evolve by 2025 and how partners will work together to achieve these aims. The strategy has the following five key aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · To create an enterprising and productive global city with a strong and diverse economy providing jobs and careers for generations to come. A city where everyone has the opportunity to contribute to and benefit from the regional economy, to fulfil their potential to be skilled, motivated and wealth creating without losing the special characteristic of Sunderland's balanced way of life. · To create a city where everyone can be supported to make healthy life and lifestyle choices – a city that provides excellent health and social care services for all who need them. Everyone in Sunderland will have the opportunity to live long, healthy, happy and independent lives. · To make Sunderland the place where everyone feels welcome and can be part of a safe and inclusive community where people will feel secure and can enjoy life without worrying about becoming a victim of crime. · To create a city with a thriving culture where everyone can be involved in learning in a cohesive and inclusive city that is committed to social justice, equality and prosperity: where creativity flourishes and where individuals can have all they need to thrive in the global economy. · To ensure that Sunderland becomes a clean, green city with a strong culture of sustainability, protecting and nurturing both its built heritage and future development ensuring that both the built and natural environments will be welcoming, accessible, attractive and of high quality. 	<p>The strategy includes detailed information on how each of these goals will be achieved and what will be seen on the ground and when.</p>	<p>It is essential that the CSDP aligns to the priorities identified in the Sunderland Plan to assist in delivering its priorities. This will include policies to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Support economic growth · Help facilitate healthy lifestyles · Help make Sunderland a safe place through good design · Support the city's culture · Improve the city as a learning hub · Protect and enhance the city's natural and built environment.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Sunderland Green Infrastructure Strategy Framework (2011)	<p>The key issues identified within the Green Infrastructure Strategy Framework are set out below:</p> <p>Distribution and quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The spatial distribution and quality of green space is quite varied across the city. The ongoing green space audit will identify mismatches between provision and needs. · New developments and the people who use them generally have a detrimental impact on wildlife, though through careful design and mitigation provisions a positive outcome should be possible. <p>Landscape issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The coast and River Wear are identified as key assets to the future prosperity of the city, supporting culture, leisure and tourism opportunities, where improvements to the environment are crucial to success. · 'Brownfield' land is a priority for new built development but its potential to contribute to green infrastructure should also be recognised, particularly where it has been naturalised. <p>Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Barriers to linking some corridors into a complete network for both people and wildlife are major roads, particularly the A19 and A1, also the River Wear is a natural feature of the city's wildlife ecology. <p>Provision, maintenance and resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The major issue for the protection of species and habitats and the improvement and management of the countryside and urban spaces is, simply, a shortage of resources. 		<p>The CSDP should seek to improve the quantity and quality of green spaces within the city to address deficiencies identified through the Green Infrastructure Strategy Framework and Green Space audit. The CSDP should seek to protect existing green spaces and improve the accessibility to and connections between these.</p>
Sunderland Waste Needs Assessment (July 2017)	<p>This report presents a detailed assessment of need for future waste management capacity over the period up to 31st December 2035 for SCC. The report addresses the following waste streams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW) - Commercial and Industrial (C&I) Waste; - Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CD&E) Waste; - Hazardous Waste; - Agricultural Waste; - Low Level (Non-Nuclear) Radioactive (LLR) Waste; and - Water Waste/Sewage Sludge. 		<p>The CSDP should include strategies to reduce the amount of waste generated and to ensure that waste is managed in the most sustainable way by pushing waste management types up the waste hierarchy. This includes providing infrastructure to increase recycling capabilities and promoting material and energy recovery.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
The Sunderland Economic Masterplan (2010)	<p>The EMP sets out a vision for the Sunderland Economy to become 'An entrepreneurial University City at the heart of a low-carbon regional economy'. The EMP states that the vision will be achieved by meeting five aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · A new kind of university city · A national hub of the low-carbon economy · A prosperous and well-connected waterfront city centre · An inclusive city economy – for all ages · A one city approach to economic leadership <p>In order for Sunderland to become prosperous the EMP proposes a focus on a small number of important sectors, the city centre and making more use of four assets, namely;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Nissan – and the economic potential from the production of electric vehicles; · The University of Sunderland; · The port, to enable the servicing of offshore wind farms; and · Using specific development sites to create a new CBD in the city centre, more retail provision and an electric vehicle technopole (a centre of high-tech manufacturing and information-based industry). 	<p>Progress is being measured against a number of other cities, three of which are considered to be comparable; three of which have outperformed Sunderland in the past; and three of which have increased populations and are therefore set on a growth trajectory.</p>	<p>Ensure that the CSDP is aligned with this Economic Masterplan and helps to deliver its goals.</p>
Economic Leadership Boards 3,6,9 Vision (2015)	<p>The 3, 6, 9 Vision sets out an overarching plan to improve the SCC area up to 2024, based on 3 key themes; infrastructure, vibrancy and sector and skills.</p>	<p>The document states that by 2024, there will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Over £1bn of investment into the city's infrastructure and industrial assets; - About 20,000 new jobs created across a range of sectors, increasing our productivity and reducing our unemployment levels - A more vibrant and attractive city with more happening in terms of events, entertainment and culture; - A significant increase in our levels of education, training and skills. 	<p>Ensure that the CSDP is aligned with this vision and helps to deliver the targets set out within it..</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
The Sunderland Centre for Cities Report (2009)	<p>The report recognises that the city has not participated in the recent country-wide rebirth of city centres and that parts of the city centre are run down or underutilised, and the area is lacking in modern work, retail and living space.</p> <p>The report made the three following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The phased regeneration of the city centre must be pursued for Sunderland's economy to return to its recent growth trajectory. · The Working Neighbourhoods Strategy should be pursued along with the introduction of an integrated bus network to bind Sunderland into the wider city region economy. · Policy and financial resources should be invested to create the infrastructure for a local enterprise and innovation network. 		<p>The CSDP should take into account the findings of the report and help to deliver the recommendations through the inclusion of strategies and policies to regenerate the city centre and improving connectivity with the surrounding areas.</p>
Sunderland Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2017	<p>The SHMA provides an overview of the housing market within the city. The SHMA provides an analysis of housing stock by sub-area and compares this to demand to identify where there are shortfalls in a particular type of housing stock within an area. The assessment also identifies the need for affordable housing over the next five years.</p>	<p>The SHMA identifies that the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs for the city over the plan period, 2015-2033, is a minimum of 13,824 net additional dwellings.</p> <p>The SHMA indicates that there is a net imbalance of 542 affordable houses per annum. It also identifies areas of the city where there is an imbalance between the supply and demand for certain house types. The SHMA identifies that in particular there is a shortfall of larger family and older persons housing within all subareas.</p>	<p>The CSDP should seek to address identified deficiencies in housing stock within the city, such as larger family housing and older persons housing. With regard to affordable housing, the CSDP will include a policy requiring a certain proportion of housing on new residential developments to be delivered as affordable housing, however it is recognised that it is unlikely that the affordable housing needs identified through the SHMA will be able to be met in full due to viability and deliverability constraints.</p>
Enabling Independence: Long term housing solutions Delivery Strategy (2013)	<p>This strategy provides information required by Registered Providers; Housing Organisations and Developers from a 'business perspective'. It highlights the needs of the City for supported housing solutions; it forecasts demand providing the analysis from a broad based review of demographics, research, surveys of relevant populations, carer and patient needs outlining the key aspects of conditional demand to be addressed i.e. unresolved needs of the population, and identifies the priorities and outcomes that the strategy is trying to achieve.</p>		<p>The CSDP should ensure that it is aligned to the strategy and that it delivers appropriate living accommodation for an ageing population. The plan should also seek to deliver housing which is built to lifetime homes standards.</p>

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
Ecological Assessment, Management Plan and Design Strategy for the Sunderland South Growth Area (TNEI for CVV, 2013)	Recommended that a range of design, mitigation and compensation measures are likely to be required to ensure development works in South Sunderland do not have a negative impact upon the ecological interests of the area.		The CSDP will include a strategic site allocation for the South Sunderland Growth Area. A separate SA incorporating SEA has been undertaken for the SSGA SPD, meaning that this allocation does not also need to be appraised in this SA report. The CSDP must secure all mitigation required through the SSGA SPD SA.
Sunderland Contaminated Land Strategy (2001, reviewed 2006)	Sets out a strategic approach to inspection and remediation of contaminated sites. It prioritises sites based on likelihood of contamination and the likelihood of significant harm to human health, controlled waters, animals/livestock, the environment, the historic environment and property. It set out how these sites have been identified and should be inspected, risk assessed and remediated.		The CSDP must set out an appropriate framework to encourage and control the remediation of contaminated sites.
Sunderland Local Air Quality Management Strategy (2011)	<p>The overall aim is to outline air quality conditions across Tyne and Wear, to show where potential problems lie and finally to outline what can be done to improve air quality and thus the quality of life for the people of Tyne and Wear. In doing so, the plan sets out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background to air quality issues and air quality objectives in Tyne and Wear; • Governance and monitoring arrangements to drive improvement forward; • Current air quality levels and measures in the region; • New air quality indicators and targets for Tyne and Wear; • Challenges to our proposed objectives and solutions, and how these can be overcome; • Examples of national and regional best practice which can be used to improve Tyne and Wear air quality levels; and • Proposed actions to improve area specific and overall Tyne and Wear air quality levels which affects us all. 	The key issues raised by the plan are an emphasis on action and a clear commitment that we must, wherever possible, prevent further areas in Tyne and Wear from becoming AQMAs – areas where air quality had been recognised as being especially poor.	The CSDP must include policies to protect air quality from adverse effects from development proposals.

	Relevant Context and PPS Objectives or requirements	Relevant PPS targets, indicators or delivery mechanisms	Implications for the Sunderland CSDP and associated SA
<p>A Housing Strategy for Sunderland 2017-2022: Growth, Choice, Quality</p>	<p>Sets out the direction over the next five years in offering more choice in housing by developing new homes, improving existing homes and neighbourhoods.</p> <p>It establishes the housing priorities, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maximising housing growth and increasing the choice of housing; - Making the best use of existing homes and improving neighbourhoods; and - Supporting vulnerable people to access and maintain housing. <p>Actions grouped under these headings aim to address key challenges, in particular: land supply, outward migration, demand for affordable housing, aging populations, empty homes, housing decline, housing standards in the private sector, homelessness, health and accommodation for those with needs.</p>		<p>The CSDP must set out a housing land strategy, sufficient housing sites to meet OAN and a suite of development management policies to bring forward residential development on appropriate sites.</p>
<p>IAMP Area Action Plan (Submission Draft, 2017)</p>	<p>Document provides a guide to the comprehensive delivery of the IAMP within administrative areas of Sunderland and South Tyneside. It establishes policies regarding the protection of Green Belt and Safeguarded Land; land uses; transport; masterplanning, public realm & landscape; transport infrastructure & utilities; flooding; ecology; green infrastructure & amenities; and delivery & mitigation.</p>		<p>The CSDP must dovetail with this AAP, including by supporting suitable development proposals within the AAP's defined area.</p>

Appendix C Sunderland CSDP Sustainability Appraisal Framework

C.1.1 Table C.1 below details the full Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework which underpins this SA of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. The Framework has been updated to take account of responses received to the Sunderland Core Strategy SA Scoping consultation (October 2016).

Table C.1 Sunderland CSDP SA Framework

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Indicators	SEA Directive Topic(s)
<p>1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network.</p>	<p>Will it conserve and enhance international and national designated nature conservation sites (Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, Ramsars and Sites of Special Scientific Interest)?</p> <p>Will it ensure no net loss of designated habitats?</p> <p>Will it conserve and enhance Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites and Ancient Woodland?</p> <p>Will it avoid damage to, and protect, geologically important sites?</p> <p>Will it protect and enhance existing priority habitats and species and provide for appropriate long term management of wildlife habitats?</p> <p>Will it enhance ecological connectivity and maintain and improve the green infrastructure network?</p> <p>Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives?</p> <p>Will it promote, educate and raise awareness of the enjoyment and benefits of the natural environment and biodiversity and promote access to wildlife on appropriate sites?</p>	<p>Greenspaces lost to development.</p> <p>Reported levels of damage to designated sites.</p> <p>Reported condition of nationally and locally important wildlife sites.</p> <p>Number/Area of nature conservation sites.</p> <p>Number of designated Local Nature Reserves.</p> <p>Number of parks awarded Green Flag status.</p> <p>Area of city which meets the Woodland Trust's Access Standard.</p> <p>Area of city which meets the ANGST criteria.</p> <p>Population of wild birds.</p> <p>Achievement of Biodiversity Action Plan targets.</p>	<p>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</p> <p>Human Health</p>
<p>2. Housing: To meet the housing needs of the Sunderland City area.</p>	<p>Will it make housing available to people in need?</p> <p>Will it stop out-migration?</p> <p>Will it improve the quality of housing stock?</p> <p>Will it improve energy efficiency/insulation in housing?</p> <p>Will it increase the use of sustainable building practices?</p> <p>Will it reduce homelessness?</p> <p>Will it deliver pitches and plots required for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?</p>	<p>% of housing stock judged unfit to live in.</p> <p>Average energy efficiency of housing.</p> <p>House price/earnings affordability ratio.</p> <p>Housing completions (including size and type).</p> <p>Affordable housing completions.</p> <p>Starter home completions.</p> <p>Households accepted in priority need.</p> <p>Population figures.</p> <p>Homelessness figures.</p> <p>No. of pitches/plots available.</p>	<p>Population</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Indicators	SEA Directive Topic(s)
<p>3. Economy and Employment: To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities for everyone.</p>	<p>Will it provide employment opportunities for local people? Will it contribute to improving the diversity of employment opportunities? Will it support existing businesses? Will it support economic growth and inward investment? Will it help create higher value permanent jobs? Will it help to create a low carbon economy? Will it provide for the needs of business (such as a range of premises, land and infrastructure)?</p>	<p>% of individuals of working age in employment. GDP per head. % of businesses surviving three years. % increase or decrease in the number of VAT registered businesses. % of resident population in higher grade occupations Average unemployment rate in the city. Amount of employment floorspace permitted/developed. Shop vacancy rates within designated centres.</p>	<p>Population</p>
<p>4. Learning and Skills: To improve the educational attainment and skills of Sunderland City's residents and its workforce.</p>	<p>Will it improve lifelong learning and widen participation in lifelong learning activities? Will it improve levels of basic skills and/or information/communication technology (ICT)? Will it ascertain skills/skills training gaps and/or promote specialised training for areas in transition? Will it contribute to meeting identified skills shortage? Will it support the development of high education institutions within the city?</p>	<p>% of 16 year olds attaining 5 GCSEs at Grade A*-C. % of adults with NVQ level 4 qualifications or above. % of employees undertaking work related training in last 13 weeks. % of employers with hard to fill vacancies. Amount of higher education development taking place.</p>	<p>Population</p>
<p>5. Sustainable Communities: To promote sustainable communities within the Sunderland City area.</p>	<p>Will it improve and increase access to community facilities? Will it ensure that everyone has access to essential services (e.g. employment, education, health services and shops) and resources to serve communities are within reasonable non-car based travelling distance? Will it reduce the potential for social isolation with particular regard to potentially disadvantaged groups? Will it reduce crime and disorder through design measures? Will it address the causes of crime disorder and/or reduce crime through intervention? Will it reduce fear of crime?</p>	<p>% of people satisfied with their local area as a place to live. Geographical access to services. Areas of the city with low earnings and high dependency. Indices of Multiple Deprivation rankings. % of residents surveyed who feel safe outside. Crime rate. Domestic burglaries per 100 households.</p>	<p>Population Human Health</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Indicators	SEA Directive Topic(s)
<p>6. Health and Wellbeing: To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Sunderland City area.</p>	<p>Will it improve equitable access to health services? Will it improve positive health and prevent ill health? Will it address health inequalities? Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? Will it support and protect greenspaces for leisure activities? Will it meet the needs of an ageing population? Will it support those with disabilities? Will it maintain and enhance healthcare facilities and services? Will it align investment in healthcare facilities and services with growth? Will it avoid locating development where environmental circumstances could negatively impact on people's health?</p>	<p>Vehicle crimes per 1000 population. Violent crimes per 1000 population. Proportion of the city's LSOAs within the 20% most deprived in the country. Geographical access to services. Death rate from: heart disease and stroke; all cancers; hospital admission rate for accidents; suicide and undetermined injury. Number of years of expected healthy life. % or people who regularly participate in walking, swimming, cycling and keep fit/aerobics. Number of people accessing greenspace for leisure activity. Quantity and quality of greenspaces.</p>	<p>Population Human Health</p>
<p>7. Transport and Communication: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of travel, improve telecommunications infrastructure and align investment in infrastructure with growth.</p>	<p>Will it improve road safety? Will it reduce causes of accidents? Will it increase access to key resources and services by means other than the car (e.g. health, education, work and food shopping)? Will it ease congestion on the road/rail network? Will it improve access to opportunities and facilities for all groups, particularly those without access to a car? Will it make the transport/environment attractive to non-car users (e.g. pedestrians and cyclists)? Will it encourage freight transfer from road to rail and water? Will it provide integrated transport services? Will it increase provision of public transport where needed? Will it improve rail services and facilities? Will it reduce environmental impacts of traffic? Will it ensure that necessary improvements are made to the telecommunications infrastructure to allow access for all, including access to superfast broadband?</p>	<p>Number of people killed or seriously injured on the city's roads. Levels of car ownership. Usage of non-car transport. Freight transport by mode. Availability of cycle networks (km) Increase in passenger numbers (bus, rail and metro). Improvements for pedestrians. Completion of transport improvement schemes (e.g. Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor). Air quality monitoring.</p>	<p>Population Human Health Air Climatic Factors</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Indicators	SEA Directive Topic(s)
<p>8. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.</p>	<p>Will it clean up contaminated land? Will it make efficient use of land (appropriate density, protect good agricultural land, use brownfield land in preference to greenfield sites)? Will it avoid the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?</p>	<p>Area of contaminated land. Amount of development on 'best and most versatile agricultural land'. Amount of development completed on previously developed land.</p>	<p>Material Assets Soil</p>
<p>9. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.</p>	<p>Will it protect and enhance the region's rivers, estuary and coastal waters to achieve good ecological status? Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality? Will it increase efficiency in water use?</p>	<p>Water usage. Bathing water quality. Groundwater quality</p>	<p>Water</p>
<p>10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion: To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change.</p>	<p>Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments? Will it manage effectively, and reduce the likelihood of, flash flooding, taking into account the capacity of sewerage systems? Will it discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding? Will it ensure that new development does not give rise to flood risk elsewhere? Will it deliver sustainable drainage systems (SuDs) and promote investment in flood defences that reduce vulnerability to flooding? Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from coastal erosion? Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?</p>	<p>Number of properties at risk from flooding. Number of permissions granted against Environment Agency's advice on flooding.</p>	<p>Climatic Factors Water</p>
<p>11. Air: To improve air quality.</p>	<p>Will it maintain and where possible improve air quality? Will it avoid locating development in areas of existing poor air quality? Will it minimise emissions to air from new development? Will it raise awareness about pollution and its effects?</p>	<p>Air quality monitoring. Number of AQMAs.</p>	<p>Air Human Health</p>
<p>12. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse</p>	<p>Will it minimise energy use and reduce or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions?</p>	<p>Greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>Climatic Factors</p>

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Indicators	SEA Directive Topic(s)
gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change.	Will it plan or implement adaptation measures for the likely effects of climate change? Will it support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and reduce dependency on non-renewable sources? Will it promote sustainable design that minimises greenhouse emissions and is adaptable to the effects of climate change?	Installed capacity of renewable energy schemes. Capacity of renewable energy schemes permitted.	
13. Waste and Natural Resources: To promote the movement up the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources.	Will it minimise the demand for raw materials? Will it promote the use of local resources? Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported? Will it reduce waste arisings? Will it increase prevention, re-use, recovery and recycling of waste? Will it increase awareness and provide information on resource efficiency and waste?	Amount of waste arisings and their management type. % of household waste recycled. Local Aggregates Assessment.	Material Assets
14. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	Will it increase availability and accessibility of culture, leisure and recreation (CLR) activities/venues? Will it provide support for CLR providers and/or creative industries? Will it protect and enhance features and areas of historical and cultural value? Will it promote sensitive re-use of historic or culturally important buildings where appropriate? Will it conserve the character of heritage assets and conservation areas? Will it preserve, and where appropriate enhance, features of archaeological importance?	Total tourist visitors to the city. % of people who regularly participate in walking, swimming, cycling and keep fit/aerobics. Number of people accessing greenspace for leisure activity. Location and condition of features of cultural heritage. Number of listed buildings, ancient monuments and conservation areas. Number of entries on the Heritage at Risk Register. Loss or damage to listed buildings and their settings. Loss or damage to scheduled ancient monuments and their settings. Loss or damage to historic parks and gardens and their settings.	Cultural Heritage Landscape

SA Objective	Guide Questions	Indicators	SEA Directive Topic(s)
<p>15. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscape.</p>	<p>Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character? Will it conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes? Will it promote high quality design in context with its urban and rural landscape? Will it avoid inappropriate development in the Green Belt and ensure the Green Belt endures? Will it avoid inappropriate erosion to the Settlement Breaks?</p>	<p>% of conservation area demolished or otherwise lost. Development in Greenbelt. Development in Settlement Breaks. Development in most sensitive landscape areas. Buildings for Life 12 Assessments.</p>	<p>Landscape Cultural Heritage</p>



Appendix D SA of Draft Strategic Priorities

Draft Sunderland CSDP Sustainability Appraisal

Appendix D – Sustainability Appraisal of Draft Strategic Priorities

On behalf of **Sunderland City Council**



Project Ref: 36447/003 | Rev: B | Date: July 2017



Document Control Sheet

Project Name: Sustainability Appraisal of the Sunderland Core Strategy

Project Ref: 36447

Report Title: Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Draft Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan – Appendix D: SA of Draft Strategic Priorities

Doc Ref: 36447R003ADi2

Date: July 2017

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Lauren Park	Senior Planner	LP	14.07.2017
Reviewed by:	Duncan Smart	Senior Planner	DS	19.07.2017
Approved by:	Nick Skelton	Equity Director	NS	20.07.2017
For and on behalf of Peter Brett Associates LLP				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
B	26.07.2017	Final Report including amendments to respond to client comments	LP	DS	NS

This report has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP ('PBA') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which PBA was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). PBA accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	SA of Draft Policies Overview	1
1.2	Key/Assessment Symbols	1
2	SA of Draft Strategic Priorities	2

Tables

Table D.1	SA Scoring System	1
Table D.2:	SA of Strategic Priorities	2

This page is intentionally blank

1 Introduction

1.1 SA of Draft Policies Overview

1.1.1 This appendix provides a detailed appraisal of predicted effects from the draft strategic priorities identified within the Draft Sunderland Core Strategy & Development Plan ('the Draft Sunderland CSDP'). This appraisal is consistent with the Sustainability Appraisal Framework and methodology defined within the Sunderland Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2016), as amended to take account of SA Scoping consultation responses.

1.2 Key/Assessment Symbols

1.2.1 The symbology and scoring system shown in Table D.1 is used throughout this SA, which is presented in Table D.2.

Table D.1 SA Scoring System

Score	Description	Symbol
Significant Positive Effect	The proposed option/policy contributes significantly to the achievement of the objective.	++
Minor Positive Effect	The proposed option/policy contributes to the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	+
Neutral	The proposed option/policy does not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.	0
Minor Negative Effect	The proposed option/policy detracts from the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	-
Significant Negative Effect	The proposed option/policy detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective.	--
No Relationship	There is no clear relationship between the proposed option/policy and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.	~
Uncertain	The proposed option/policy has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?

2 SA of Draft Strategic Priorities

Table D.2: SA of Strategic Priorities

Theme		SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	Commentary
Spatial Strategy	SP1	-	+	++	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	The strategic priority directly promotes sustainable growth within the SCC area to meet all identified development needs, including employment needs. As such the priority supports inward investment, existing businesses and the creation of new employment opportunities. Positive effects are also possible in relation to housing, learning and skills and communities.
	SP2	?	+	+	-	++	+	++	++	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	This strategic priority supports the creation of sustainable new communities and support to existing communities, with the potential for significant beneficial effects on multiple SA objectives public service and transport infrastructure provision. on the commitment to maximise the use of previously developed land would contribute to the efficient and sustainable use of land, resulting in a Major Positive effect on SA A.. Positive effects are also possible in relation to issues such as employment and housing, although the objective is not clear on quantum of development.
Health and Wellbeing	SP3	-	?	?	++	++	++	?	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	?	This strategic priority specifically refers to the importance of learning and skills development and therefore has clear and potentially significant beneficial effects on SA objective 4, as well as on linked SA objectives 5 and 6 through supporting health, wellbeing and sustainable communities. However, this is quite a mixed strategic priority covering two different issues in one, which may be better presented separately – despite learning and education being part of the wider determinants of health. There also may be a lack of specific detail in the policy given the wide range of issues that can have health and wellbeing effects e.g. access to health services, active travel, good quality housing, access to jobs, access to health food, freedom from pollution, involvement in local decision making – and could therefore be improved by more specific detail. For this reason, there are many uncertainties identified for this strategic priority.
Homes	SP4	?	++	?	-	++	+	?	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	?	This strategic priority has clear and potentially significant beneficial effects on SA objective 2, which is closely related to health and wellbeing and sustainable communities. The focus on providing land to meet housing need may have the potential for some adverse effects on the natural environment and resource use, although this will depend on implementation. The effect on health and wellbeing is positive – although the priority could give equal weight to the provision of affordable homes.
	SP5	-	-	-	+	++	++	++	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	This strategic priority has clear and potentially significant beneficial effects on many of the sustainability objectives, including SA objectives 5 and 6 through the commitment to development sustainable neighbourhoods. The strategic priority should also help support walkable neighbourhoods that reduce the need to travel by car, which can also have air and climate change benefits. Positive effects related to learning and skills will also come from having local schools that people can walk to.
Economic Prosperity	SP6	-	-	++	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	This strategic priority sets out an economic development strategy for the SCC area, resulting in clear and potentially significant beneficial effects on SA objective 3. Related to this may be positive effects on learning and skills (though provision of a strong employment base) and health and wellbeing, which would be achieved by increasing the proportion of people in meaningful employment.
	SP7	-	?	++	-	++	+	++	+	-	-	+	+	-	?	?	This strategic priority seeks to develop the economic functions of Sunderland City Centre and enhance the economic prospects of other defined areas. The focus on employment, retail and office uses would directly contribute to SA Objective 3, whilst beneficial effects are also predicted on SA objective 7 as the strategic priority directs high footfall and main town centre uses to accessible locations. This has associated benefits from climate change and air quality. The impact of proposed growth on the City Centre townscape and cultural heritage is not clear from this priority in isolation. The strategic priority does not mention the residential role of the City Centre, which could be part of creating a sustainable and vibrant place, so long as it does not preclude the necessary retail and office provision. Therefore, an uncertain effect is identified. Consideration should also be given to the leisure use potential of this area, as a focus for mixed trips for all residents of the City area.
Environment	SP8	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	++	Through directly supporting urban design quality and the protection of the historic environment, this strategic priority has clear and potentially significant beneficial effects on SA objectives 14 and 15. There may also be associated positive effects related to people's sense of pride in the place where they live with sustainability communities and wellbeing benefits. In addition, a more attractive built environment will be a greater draw for businesses investment and other economic benefits such as attracting visitors.
	SP9	++	-	-	-	+	++	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	++	This strategic priority seeks to protect and enhance the city's biodiversity, geological resource, countryside and landscapes, resulting in significant beneficial effects on related SA objectives. Indirect positive effects on SA objectives 5 and 6 are also predicted.

Theme		SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	Commentary
Climate Change	SP10	+	-	?	-	-		?	++	-	+	++	++	++	+	-	<p>This strategic priority has clear potential positive effects on SA objectives related to climate change, including flooding, air quality and transport. There is also the potential for associated benefits for ecology, water resources and waste in relation to climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>There is potential for conflict of the objective with achieving economic growth, as this may have adverse impacts on climate change, depending on the type of employment. However, the cause effect relationship for this impact is not clear and may depend on dominant employment sectors and the location of development.</p>
	SP11	-	-	+	-	+		+	++	-	-	-	++	++	-	+	<p>This strategic priority has clear and potentially significant beneficial effects on the SA objectives relating to transport and communication, air quality and climate change – which are all closely related to achieving a greater proportion of trips by sustainable travel. There is also the potential for positive effects for the economy through reducing congestion, sustainable communities and health and wellbeing through improving connectivity for all residents and encouraging active travel. Reduced cars on the roads can also have benefits for cultural heritage and landscape/townscape.</p>
Minerals and Waste	SP12	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	+	++	-	<p>This strategic priority has clear and potentially significant beneficial effects on the waste and natural resources objective, which may have associated benefits against objectives for climate change. However, it is not clear on how the Core Strategy will achieve this through policy.</p>
	SP13	?	?	++	-	?		?	-	?	?	?	-	?	?	?	<p>This strategic priority has clear and potentially significant beneficial effects on the economy. However, all other effects identified are uncertain as the impacts will very much depend on implementation and location of any future mineral workings and their final restoration.</p>
Infrastructure	SP14	-	-	++	-	-		-	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>This strategic priority identifies the need for infrastructure provision to facilitate economic growth and meet identified needs, resulting in clear and potentially significant beneficial effects on SA objectives 3 and 7..</p>



Appendix E SA of Draft Spatial Strategies

Draft Sunderland CSDP Sustainability Appraisal

Appendix E – Sustainability Appraisal of Draft Spatial Strategies

On behalf of **Sunderland City Council**



Project Ref: 36447/003 | Rev: B | Date: July 2017



Document Control Sheet

Project Name: Sustainability Appraisal of the Sunderland Core Strategy

Project Ref: 36447

Report Title: Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Draft Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan – Appendix E: SA of Draft Spatial Strategies

Doc Ref: 36447R003AEi2

Date: July 2017

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Lauren Park	Senior Planner	LP	14.07.2017
Reviewed by:	Duncan Smart	Senior Planner	DS	19.07.2017
Approved by:	Nick Skelton	Equity Director	NS	20.07.2017
For and on behalf of Peter Brett Associates LLP				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
B	26.07.2017	Final Report including amendments to respond to client comments	LP	DS	NS

This report has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP ('PBA') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which PBA was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). PBA accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	SA of Draft Policies Overview	1
1.2	Key/Assessment Symbols	1
2	SA of Draft Spatial Strategies	2

Tables

Table E.1	SA of Policies Scoring System.....	1
Table E.2:	SA of Spatial Strategies Matrix	2

This page is intentionally blank

1 Introduction

1.1 SA of Draft Policies Overview

1.1.1 This appendix provides a detailed appraisal of predicted effects from the draft spatial strategies contained within the Draft Sunderland Core Strategy & Development Plan ('the Draft Sunderland CSDP'). This appraisal is consistent with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework and methodology defined within the Sunderland Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2016), as amended to take account of SA Scoping consultation responses.

1.2 Key/Assessment Symbols

1.2.1 The symbology and scoring system shown in Table E.1 is used throughout this SA, which is presented in Table E.2.

Table E.1 SA of Scoring System

Score	Description	Symbol
Significant Positive Effect	The proposed option/policy contributes significantly to the achievement of the objective.	++
Minor Positive Effect	The proposed option/policy contributes to the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	+
Neutral	The proposed option/policy does not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.	0
Minor Negative Effect	The proposed option/policy detracts from the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	-
Significant Negative Effect	The proposed option/policy detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective.	--
No Relationship	There is no clear relationship between the proposed option/policy and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.	~
Uncertain	The proposed option/policy has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?

2 SA of Draft Spatial Strategies

Table E.2: SA of Spatial Strategies Matrix

SA Objective	Draft Spatial Strategies		Commentary
	Spatial Strategy for Delivering Growth (SSDG)	Spatial Strategy for the Urban Core (SSSUC)	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network.	0	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDG states that housing release sites will be delivered without adverse impacts on significantly high quality habitat areas, which indirectly protects biodiversity and geodiversity. However, the strategy also supports the release of Green Belt land to meet housing needs without setting out or cross-referencing detailed acceptability criteria to assess proposals, which could result in adverse impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity. A neutral effect is predicted. There is no clear relationship between SSSUC and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure that this strategy does not inadvertently support the release of Green Belt land in appropriate locations, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the strategy should be amended to clarify that Green Belt land release must be in accordance with the policy principle (policy SS3) of directing development to sustainable locations. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
2. Housing: To meet the housing needs of the Sunderland City area.	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDG promotes access to decent and secure homes and seeks to improve the quality of, quantity, and choice of each type, location and price of housing across the SCC area. Specific housing renewal areas are identified as priorities where regeneration of the housing stock will take place. The strategy also notes that urban strategic scale mixed use sites and housing release sites presently within the Green Belt are being allocated to ensure that identified housing needs can be met. By pro-actively helping to meet housing needs in accessible locations the strategy would have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. SSSUC provides explicitly support for the growth of residential uses in Sunderland City Centre. It further suggests that such developments should be flexible and adaptable accommodation to meet a range of needs. This would have a Major Positive effect on this objective through improving the quality and choice of housing in accessible areas including Sunderland City Centre. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified

SA Objective	Draft Spatial Strategies		Commentary
	Spatial Strategy for Delivering Growth (SSDG)	Spatial Strategy for the Urban Core (SSSUC)	
3. Economy and Employment: To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities for everyone.	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDG notes that the emerging Sunderland CSDP includes Key and Primary employment land allocations to ensure a sufficient employment land supply in appropriate locations, in particular where there is known demand for employment land. This would have a Major Positive effect on this objective through support for existing businesses, inward investment, economic development and the creation of new employment opportunities in viable and appropriate locations. SSSUC identified the importance of the city centre as a sub-regional retail destination. The strategy indicates support for existing businesses and new investment to improve the streetscape of shopping areas. Overall the strategy would have a Major Positive effect on this objective through supporting the development of key economic sectors, new employment opportunities and inward investment in Sunderland City Centre. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
4. Learning and Skills: To improve the educational attainment and skills of Sunderland City's residents and its workforce.	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDG identifies the University of Sunderland and other education and training establishments as central to ensuring that the workforce is equipped to drive the economy. This would directly result in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. SSSUC promotes the growth of the education sector in the city centre, which would directly result in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
5. Sustainable Communities: To promote sustainable communities within the Sunderland City area.	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDG states that neighbourhoods should be sustainable, with high quality local infrastructure and services that increase access to community facilities. However, delivery mechanisms for this are not clearly defined within the strategy or associated policy SS3, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between SSSUC and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address the uncertainty noted below, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP it is recommended that the word "utilised" is removed and further clarification is provided as to the intended delivery mechanisms for the provision of high quality infrastructure. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is uncertainty regarding the range of mechanisms proposed to deliver high quality infrastructure.

SA Objective	Draft Spatial Strategies		Commentary
	Spatial Strategy for Delivering Growth (SSDG)	Spatial Strategy for the Urban Core (SSSUC)	
6. Health and Wellbeing: To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Sunderland City area.	~	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between SSDG and this SA objective. SSSUC identifies the Stadium Village as an Area of Change which will provide leisure-led regeneration to accommodate large footprint sports which cannot be hosted elsewhere in the SCC area. This would have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective through providing facilities to encourage physical activities which contribute to healthy lifestyles. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
7. Transport and Communication: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of travel, improve telecommunications infrastructure and align investment in infrastructure with growth.	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDG supports a range of transport improvements to ensure that the city has a world class transport network that is delivered in the most sustainable way. This would have a Major Positive effect on this objective. SSSUC recognises the important role that the city centre plays as a transport hub. It emphasises the need for improved connectivity and permeability and for routes to accommodate a range of users. The strategy also notes the need to provide sufficient and convenient parking. The strategy is therefore aligned with meeting identified transport needs, sets out a coherent transport strategy for the Urban Core and would have a Major Positive effect on this objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
8. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDG promotes the redevelopment of brownfield land however also supports Green Belt land to meet housing needs without consideration of available brownfield sites or potential impacts on agricultural land. On balance the strategy is predicted to result in a Minor Positive impact on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between SSSUC and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure that this strategy does not inadvertently support the release of Green Belt land in appropriate locations, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the strategy should be amended to clarify that Green Belt land release must be in accordance with the policy principle (policy SS3) of directing development to sustainable locations. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified

SA Objective	Draft Spatial Strategies		Commentary
	Spatial Strategy for Delivering Growth (SSDG)	Spatial Strategy for the Urban Core (SSUC)	
9. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the proposed spatial strategies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion: To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change.	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSSDG notes that housing release sites allocated to meet housing needs should not be in areas at significant risk of flooding, although the strategy does not explicitly refer to flood risk management. The strategy would therefore indirectly help to minimise flood risks, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between SSSUC and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
11. Air: To improve air quality.	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the proposed spatial strategies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
12. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change.	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the proposed spatial strategies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified

SA Objective	Draft Spatial Strategies		Commentary
	Spatial Strategy for Delivering Growth (SSDG)	Spatial Strategy for the Urban Core (SSSUC)	
13. Waste and Natural Resources: To promote the movement up the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources.	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the proposed spatial strategies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
14. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.	~	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between SSDG and this SA objective SSSUC identifies Minster Quarter as a key area of change focused on the restoration of the area's important heritage. This would directly result in a Major Positive effect on the SA. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified
15. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscape.	0	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDG directs development to sustainable locations, which whilst not explicitly defined could indirectly help to protect landscape and townscape character. However, the strategy also supports the release of Green Belt land to meet housing needs, which could result in adverse landscape impacts and could affect the functioning and integrity of the Green Belt. On balance, taking account of the weak relationship between the strategy and this SA objective, a Neutral effect is predicted. SSSUC supports high design quality and integration of new development with the existing environment, as well as promoting improvements to public realm. This would directly contribute to the enhancement of the City Centre's townscape and visual amenity, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified



Appendix F SA of Draft Strategic Site Allocations

Draft Sunderland CSDP Sustainability Appraisal

Appendix F – SA of Strategic Site Allocations

On behalf of **Client Name**



Project Ref: 36447/003 | Rev: B | Date: July 2017



Document Control Sheet

Project Name: Sustainability Appraisal of the Sunderland Core Strategy

Project Ref: 36447

Report Title: Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Draft Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan – Appendix G: SA of Strategic Site Allocations

Doc Ref: 36447R003AFi2

Date: July 2017

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Thomas Fleming	Graduate Planner	TF	14.07.2017
	Duncan Smart	Senior Planner	DS	
	Cicely Postan	Principal Planner	CP	
	Clive Greenwood	Senior Planning Policy Officer (SCC)	CG	
Reviewed by:	Nick Skelton	Equity Director	NS	19.07.2017
	John Baker	Partner	JB	
Approved by:	Nick Skelton	Equity Director	NS	20.07.2017
For and on behalf of Peter Brett Associates LLP				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
B	26.07.2017	Final Report including amendments to respond to client comments	TF	DS	NS

This report has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP ('PBA') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which PBA was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). PBA accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.



Contents

1 Introduction 1

 1.1 Overview..... 1

 1.2 Key/Assessment Symbols..... 1

2 SA of Proposed Green Belt Housing Release Site Allocations..... 2

 2.1 Introduction..... 2

 2.2 Green Belt Housing Release Site Selection Process..... 2

 2.3 Methodology 2

 2.4 SA Results & Mitigation Requirements 12

3 SA of Proposed Key and Primary Employment Areas 20

 3.1 Overview..... 20

 3.2 Approach to Assessment 20

 3.3 SA Results & Mitigation Requirements 23

4 SA of Proposed Gypsy Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations 42

 4.1 Introduction..... 42

 4.2 Methodology 42

 4.3 SA Results and Mitigation Requirements..... 47

Tables

Table 1.1 SA of Scoring System..... 1

Table 2.1: Relationship between Sustainability Appraisal objectives and Site Assessment Criteria 4

Table 2.2: Greenbelt Housing Release Sites Assessment Criteria 7

Table 2.3 Candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites Shorthand References 11

Table 2.4: Greenbelt Housing Release Sites Sustainability Appraisal Matrix 13

Table 2.5: Green Belt Housing Release Sites Sustainability Appraisal Commentary..... 14

Table 3.1 SA of KEA/PEA Assessment Criteria 22

Table 3.2 Candidate KEA and PEA Sustainability Appraisal Matrix 24

Table 3.3 KEA and PEA Reasoned Conclusions and Potential Mitigation Requirements..... 39

Table 4.1 Appraisal Criteria for SA of candidate TGTS Sites 43

Table 4.2 Candidate TSGTTSGT Sites Sustainability Appraisal Matrix..... 48

Table 4.3 Candidate TGTS Sites - Reasoned Conclusions and Potential Mitigation Requirements for Proposed Allocations..... 54

This page is intentionally blank

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 This appendix provides a detailed appraisal of predicted effects from the proposed allocation of a number of strategic sites within the emerging Sunderland Core & Strategy & Development Plan ('the Draft Sunderland CSDP'), as detailed within the Draft Sunderland CSDP. Separate sections of this appendix provide appraisals of specific types of proposed site allocations, namely:

- Section 2 – SA of Proposed Green Belt Housing Release Sites;
- Section 3 – SA of Proposed Primary and Key Employment Allocations (PEA and KEA); and
- Section 4 – SA of Proposed Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers (TSGT) SitesTSGTTSGT.

1.1.2 Each of these appraisals examines likely significant effects from the proposed site allocations and all identified reasonable alternatives on the 15 sustainability objectives defined within the Sunderland CSDP SA Framework (see Appendix C).

1.2 Key/Assessment Symbols

1.2.1 The symbology and scoring system shown in Table 1.1 is used throughout this SA.

Table 1.1 SA of Scoring System

Score	Description	Symbol
Significant Positive Effect	The proposed option/policy contributes significantly to the achievement of the objective.	++
Minor Positive Effect	The proposed option/policy contributes to the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	+
Neutral	The proposed option/policy does not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.	0
Minor Negative Effect	The proposed option/policy detracts from the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	-
Significant Negative Effect	The proposed option/policy detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective.	--
No Relationship	There is no clear relationship between the proposed option/policy and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.	~
Uncertain	The proposed option/policy has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?

2 SA of Proposed Green Belt Housing Release Site Allocations

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 This section of Appendix F presents a SA of proposed Green Belt Housing Release Sites and reasonable alternatives.

2.2 Green Belt Housing Release Site Selection Process

- 2.2.1 As part of the site selection process for the emerging Sunderland CSDP, Sunderland City Council (SCC) have identified a housing land requirement for the SCC area through a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (last updated 2017) and have undertaken site selection processes to ensure that the Sunderland CSDP meets these requirements. Site selection processes have included consideration of potential Green Belt Housing Release sites, as documented in the 'Stage 3 Green Belt Site Selection Report' (SCC, June 2017).
- 2.2.2 The Green Belt Review Stage 1 report published alongside the Sunderland Core Strategy Growth Options consultation (March 2016) identified that the majority of Sunderland's Green Belt should be retained as it was fundamental to the purposes of the Green Belt, with remainder (37%) carried forward for review at Stage 2. For Stage 2 the earlier Stage 1 was reviewed and Category 1 were constraints¹ applied, which reduced the area of Green Belt with potential for release to 33%.
- 2.2.3 Running alongside the work on Green Belt, the SHLAA has been further examined during 2016-17. This has identified 138 sites as deliverable and developable for housing over the remainder of the plan period (2017-2033), with a total combined capacity for 10,868 potential homes. This has been compared with the housing requirement of 13,824 (minus the housing completions for 2015-16 and 2016-17) leaving a target figure of 12,225 homes for the remaining plan period. There is therefore a shortfall of 1,357 homes.
- 2.2.4 In line with Government guidance, all development site options to address the identified housing land supply shortfall have been considered, including: reviewing housing site projected densities; releasing employment land for housing; releasing low-value greenspace; releasing marginal Settlement Break land, and; reviewing the city's White Land. Further sites have been identified and added to the SHLAA, but SCC has concluded that the remaining shortfall must now be met by Green belt release in order to meet the necessary housing trajectory.
- 2.2.5 In Spring 2017, all Green Belt sites submitted in response to the Growth Options consultation were reviewed by Sunderland City Council (SCC) officers. Of the 60 sites submitted, 30 had a major Green Belt impact or would have an adverse impact on a Category 1 criteria and most were removed (with some minor exceptions where it was evident the impact could be mitigated). The remaining 30 sites therefore constitute proposed site allocations or reasonable alternatives and have been considered in this SA.

2.3 Methodology

- 2.3.1 Based on the site selection process outlined above, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of all candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites, comprising proposed allocations and reasonable alternatives, has been completed and is reported in this Appendix. This SA was

¹ Covering: Nature conservation designations (SSSI, Ramsar Sites, Special Protection Areas, Special Conservation Areas, National Nature Reserves); Heritage Designation (Scheduled Ancient Monuments); Health and Safety Executive: Inner Zones and areas identified as Flood Zone 3B.

carried out by SCC officers with advice and external review provided by the SA team within Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA).

- 2.3.2 The SA uses criteria and data gathered in the site selection process which align with the sustainability objectives defined within the Sunderland CSDP SA Framework (see Appendix C). The fit between the selected criteria and the SA objectives is shown in Table 2.1 and the thresholds used to appraise each site against each of the selected criteria is detailed in Table 2.2. For some SA objectives there are no corresponding assessment criteria identified (shown as a greyed-out row) as for these issues it is not possible to identify site characteristics that would clearly demonstrate performance against the objective as these issues would be dependent on policy implementation e.g. climate change mitigation and waste management.
- 2.3.3 Owing to the length of some site names and the amount of information which required to be presented in this assessment, for brevity each candidate Green Belt Housing Release Site has been allocated a letter reference number, as detailed in Table 2.3.
- 2.3.4 The assessment is completed for each candidate site in Table 2.4, which includes a commentary for each site, potential for mitigation of effects and justification as why it is being accepted or rejected for inclusion in the emerging Sunderland CSDP as an allocation. In addition to the sustainability criteria, additional criteria have been included that provide a further layer of evidence on how sites are selected for allocation, as this cannot be made on the basis of sustainability alone. These additional criteria are:
- ‘Green Belt Purpose’ – an output from the Green Belt Assessment undertaken by SCC, this that shows the extent to which any sites contribute to the stated policy purpose of Green Belt;
 - ‘Site Availability’ - this indicates where there is evidence that the site is available for development, for instance, green shows where a site is being actively promoted for development, so is likely to help meeting housing supply. Sites shown as red have had no recent active promotion; and
 - ‘Site Achievability’ - this directly relates to the viability assessment of sites undertaken as part of the evidence base for the emerging Sunderland CSDP. This viability assessment has identified that due to low land values and mitigation requirements some sites are not financially viable and therefore if allocated these sites could be relied on to come forward for development within the expected plan period.
- 2.3.5 When considering the relative sustainability of all candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites, this is not a simple aggregation of the ‘scores’ for each site, as not all issues have equal weight in delivering sustainable development. In addition, some issues such as ‘access’ are covered by numerous criteria where as others only one, such as housing (see Table 2.1). The purpose of Table 2.4 is therefore to provide quick visual comparison of all sites on individual criteria to allow relative performance to be identified and help identify where mitigation may be necessary. More information on their overall performance, including consideration of deliverability issues, is included in the commentary and end of the table.

Table 2.1: Relationship between Sustainability Appraisal objectives and Site Assessment Criteria

	Quantum of development	Access to public transport	Proximity to Primary School	Proximity to Secondary School	Proximity to convenience store	Proximity to GP surgery	Proximity to Pharmacy	Proximity to open space	Greenfield/Brownfield	Allotment site	Agricultural land	Biodiversity and wildlife	Landscape: heritage coast or sett break	Designated open space/playing field	Flood Zone 2 and 3a	Surface water flooding or critical drainage area	Critical Drainage Area	Groundwater Flooding	Source Protection Zone	Historic Environment	Ground conditions and contamination	Safe access	Infrastructure – sewage	Infrastructure – schools	Infrastructure – Health	Adjacent land use has the potential for adverse effect
SA Objective																										
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity: To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network.																										
2. Housing: To meet the housing needs of the Sunderland City area.																										
3. Economy and Employment: To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities for everyone.																										
4. Learning and Skills: To improve the educational attainment and skills of Sunderland City's residents and its workforce.																										
5. Sustainable Communities: To promote sustainable communities within the Sunderland City area.																										

	Quantum of development	Access to public transport	Proximity to Primary School	Proximity to Secondary School	Proximity to convenience store	Proximity to GP surgery	Proximity to Pharmacy	Proximity to open space	Greenfield/Brownfield	Allotment site	Agricultural land	Biodiversity and wildlife	Landscape: heritage coast or sett break	Designated open space/playing field	Flood Zone 2 and 3a	Surface water flooding or critical drainage area	Critical Drainage Area	Groundwater Flooding	Source Protection Zone	Historic Environment	Ground conditions and contamination	Safe access	Infrastructure – sewage	Infrastructure – schools	Infrastructure – Health	Adjacent land use has the potential for adverse effect
SA Objective																										
6. Health and Wellbeing: To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Sunderland City area.																										
7. Transport and Communication: To reduce the need to travel, promote sustainable modes of travel, improve telecommunications infrastructure and align investment in infrastructure with growth.																										
8. Land Use and Soils: To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils.																										
9. Water: To conserve and enhance water quality and resources.																										
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion: To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change.																										
11. Air: To improve air quality.																										

SA Objective	Quantum of development	Access to public transport	Proximity to Primary School	Proximity to Secondary School	Proximity to convenience store	Proximity to GP surgery	Proximity to Pharmacy	Proximity to open space	Greenfield/Brownfield	Allotment site	Agricultural land	Biodiversity and wildlife	Landscape: heritage coast or sett break	Designated open space/playing field	Flood Zone 2 and 3a	Surface water flooding or critical drainage area	Critical Drainage Area	Groundwater Flooding	Source Protection Zone	Historic Environment	Ground conditions and contamination	Safe access	Infrastructure – sewage	Infrastructure – schools	Infrastructure – Health	Adjacent land use has the potential for adverse effect
12. Climate Change: To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change.																										
13. Waste and Natural Resources: To promote the movement up the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources.																										
14. Cultural Heritage: To conserve and enhance the historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.																										
15. Landscape and Townscape: To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscape.																										

Table 2.2: Greenbelt Housing Release Sites Assessment Criteria

Assessment Criteria	Scoring Criteria
Biodiversity and wildlife	+1 Site is clear of local and national wildlife designations 0 site is within 6km of SAC/SPA OR adjacent to local wildlife designations - site contains a local wildlife designation or adjacent to a national designation or within 3km of an international designation - - site includes an area designated as nationally or internationally importance for nature conservation (should be discounted already)
Quantum of development	++ Capacity for 100+ new homes + Capacity for <100 new homes
Proximity to open space	+ + The site is within 800m walking distance of an open space + The site is within 800-1200m walking distance of an open space - The site is more than 1200m from an open space
Greenfield/Brownfield	+ Brownfield 0 Mix of green and brownfield - Greenfield
Allotment site	0 Not an allotment - The site is on underused allotment - - the site is a well-used allotment
Agricultural land	+ + brownfield site 0 Site agricultural land (not best and most versatile OR classification not known) - Site is agricultural land (including best and more versatile quality land of under 2ha in total) - - Site is agricultural land (including best and most versatile quality land of over 2ha in total)

Assessment Criteria	Scoring Criteria
Infrastructure – schools	0 no specific capacity constraint identified - specific capacity constraint identified
Proximity to Primary School	++ The site is within 500m walking distance of a primary school. + The site is within 500-1000m walking distance of a primary school. - The site is more than 1000m from a primary school
Proximity to Secondary School	++ The site is within 1000m walking distance of a secondary school + The site is within 1000-2000m walking distance of a secondary school - The site is more than 2000m from a secondary school
Proximity to convenience store	+ + The site is within 400m walking distance of a convenience store + The site is within 400m-800m walking distance of a convenience store - The site is within 800-1200m walking distance of a convenience store - - The site is more than 1200m from a convenience store
Proximity to GP surgery	+ + The site is within 800m walking distance of a GP surgery + The site is within 800-1200m walking distance of a GP surgery - The site is more than 1200m from a GP surgery
Proximity to Pharmacy	+ + The site is within 800m walking distance of a Pharmacy + The site is within 800-1200m walking distance of a Pharmacy - The site is more than 1200m from a Pharmacy
Designated open space/playing field	0 site does not contain open space - - designated as an open space, identified playing field or covered by a Village Green designation

Assessment Criteria	Scoring Criteria
Access to public transport	<p>Requires re-assess the proximity measures against the SA framework, which would require access to scoring spreadsheets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + + 400m bus stop on regular/frequent route or 800m of train station + 400m of bus stop on less regular route, 800 regular bus route, 1,200m of a train station - 800m from all bus route over 1,500m from a rail station - - More than 1200m from a bus stop over 2km from a railway station
Safe access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + the site has been identified as having or having the potential for a safe road access - site would need specific mitigation to manage access issues
Adjacent land use – potential for amenity affect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 the site is away from an industrial site, motorway, large car park or other potential source of amenity impacts - the site is adjacent to an industrial site, motorway, large car park or other potential source of amenity impacts
Flood Zone 2 and 3a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + 75% of the site or more in Flood Zone 1 0 Less than 50% of the site in flood zone 2 or 3a - More than 50% of the site in flood zone 2 or 3a - - more than 75% in flood zone 2 or 3a
Surface Water Flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 zero impacts or minor (<10%) of land affected by 1:100 or 1:1000 incidence surface water flooding - affected by 1:30 incidence surface water flooding (<5% of site area), or >10% land affected by 1:100 incidence surface water flooding - - affected by 1:30 incidence surface water flooding (>5% of site area)
Critical Drainage Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 not in Critical Drainage Area Within Critical Drainage Area

Assessment Criteria	Scoring Criteria
Groundwater Flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 not affected by groundwater flooding - affected by lower or medium groundwater flooding - - affected by high level groundwater flooding
Source Protection Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 site is not within Groundwater Source Protection Zones - site is within or partially within an outer Groundwater Source Protection Zone (Zone 2) or Catchment (Zone 3) - - site is within or partially within an inner Groundwater Source Protection Zone (Zone 1)
Ground conditions and contamination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 site not within area of contamination - site is in a known area of contamination
Infrastructure – sewage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 no sewage capacity or diversions required - sewage capacity or diversions required
Historic Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 site lies away from historic elements - site is in (or partly within) as conservation area or adjacent to a listed building or Scheduled Monument, or covered by a local archaeological area designation - - site contains a listed building or Scheduled Monument
Landscape character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 identified as an area for landscape enhancement - area identified for a mix of landscape protection and enhancement - site directly includes Tree Preservation Orders, and/or lies adjacent to ancient woodland or other key landscape feature - - identified as being of higher landscape value (identified for landscape protection)
Landscape: heritage coast or sett break	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 lies outside of a heritage coast or Settlement Break - within a heritage coast of settlement break

Table 2.3 Candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites Shorthand References

Site		Shorthand Reference	Site		Shorthand Reference
Peareth Hall / Trust SP11 (299-300)		A	Warren Lea SP10 (354)		Q
South of Stoney Lane SP15 (424)		B	Uplands Way SP10 (415)		R
NE of Mount Lane 407C		C	Mount La / Windsor SP13 (407 and 408)		S
Pitch & Putt, Stone Cellar Lane US1 (567)		D	George Wash Golf	US1 (405A and 405B)	T
West of Waterloo Rd US6 (463A)		E	W of Waterloo Rd (west) US3 (463B)		U
Southern Area PF FA1-2-3 (671)		F	East of Witherwack RE7 (672)		V
James Steel Park FA5-6 (673)		G	North of Hillcrest MD4 (419)		W
Glebe House Farm PA3 (646)		H	Middle Herrington (SW) MD4-5-6 (648B)		X
NW of Ferryboat La HY2 (416)		I	Middle Herrington (NE) MD2-4 (648D)		Y
Newcastle Road RE17 (675)		J	West of Cherry Knowle BU4 (674)		Z
Land at West Park MD8 (676)		K	W of Biddick Woods FA12 FA13 (444)		AB
Beside Herrington CP HE8-9 (465)		L	N of Market Place IE WA23 (423)		AC
New Herrington WMC H01 (113)		M	E of Seaham Road WA33 (645)		AD
Granaries, Offerton CO31 (464B)		N			
Philadelphia Comp. Ho11-12-13 (330B)		O			
N of Nissan Ph 1	NI5-6-10-11-12-13 401	P			

2.4 SA Results & Mitigation Requirements

- 2.4.1 Table 2.4 below provides an assessment each site pre-mitigation, in order to identify likely significant environmental effects (whether beneficial or adverse, denoted by ++ and – scoring respectively). Mitigation required to address significant environmental effects or otherwise recommended to reduce not significant effects is identified within Table 2.5. Table 2.5 also provides a sustainability appraisal commentary and a reasoned justification on why each site is either proposed for allocation, safeguarding or rejection in the Draft Sunderland CSDP.

Table 2.4: Greenbelt Housing Release Sites Sustainability Appraisal Matrix

		Candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites																													
Assessment Criteria																															
SA Objectives	Shorthand Site References	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AB	AC	AD	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Biodiversity and wildlife	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	+	+	+	-	0	0	+	0	-	+	-	0	-	-	-	0	0	0	
2. Housing	Quantum of development	+	+	+	+	++	++	+	+	++	+	++	++	+	+	++	++	+	+	++	++	+	+	++	++	++	++	+	+	++	
3. Economy and Employment																															
4. Learning and Skills	Proximity to Primary School	+	++	++	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	++	++	-	-	-	+	++	+	++	+	-	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	
	Proximity to Secondary School	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	++	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
	Infrastructure – schools	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
5. Sustainable Communities	Proximity to Primary School	+	++	++	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	++	++	-	-	-	+	++	+	++	+	-	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	
	Proximity to Secondary School	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	++	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	
	Proximity to convenience store	-	-	-	--	--	-	-	+	--	+	++	+	++	--	+	-	++	+	+	--	--	++	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	
	Proximity to open space	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	-	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
	Allotment site	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	--
6. Health and Wellbeing	Infrastructure – schools	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
	Proximity to GP surgery	-	-	-	-	-	++	++	-	++	+	-	+	+	-	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	++	+
	Proximity to Pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	++	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	++	+
	Proximity to open space	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	-	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
	Allotment site	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	--
	Designated open space/playing field	0	0	0	--	0	--	--	0	0	--	--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Adjacent land use – potential for amenity affect	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	-	0	
7. Transport and Communication	Access to public transport	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	+	+	++	++	++	++	+	+	+	++	+	+	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	
	Proximity to Primary School	+	++	++	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	++	++	-	-	-	+	++	+	++	+	-	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	
	Proximity to Secondary School	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	++	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
	Proximity to convenience store	-	-	-	--	--	-	-	+	--	+	++	+	++	--	+	-	++	+	+	--	--	++	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	
	Proximity to GP surgery	-	-	-	-	-	++	++	-	++	+	-	+	+	-	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	++	+
	Proximity to Pharmacy	-	-	-	-	-	++	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	++	+
	Proximity to open space	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	-	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
	Safe access	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	
	Infrastructure – schools	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
8. Land Use and Soils	Greenfield/Brownfield	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Allotment site	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	--	
	Agricultural land	++	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	--	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	--	--	--	0	0	0	0	
	Ground conditions and contamination	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Water	Source Protection Zone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	--	0	-	0
	Ground conditions and contamination	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Infrastructure – sewage	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	Flood Zone 2 and 3a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Surface water flooding	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	-	-	0	-	--	0	-	-	0	0	
	Critical Drainage Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	0
	Groundwater Flooding	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	-	-
11. Air	Access to public transport	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	+	+	++	++	++	++	+	+	+	++	+	+	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	
12. Climate Change																															
13. Waste and Natural Resources																															
14. Cultural Heritage	Historic Environment	--	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	
16. Landscape and Townscape	Greenfield/Brownfield	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Landscape: heritage coast or sett break	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SA Objectives	Assessment Criteria	Candidate Green Belt Housing Release Sites																												
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AB	AC	AD
	Landscape character	-	-	-	0	0	0	--	--	--	-	-	0	-	--	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	--	--	--	0	0	--	--
	Landscape: heritage coast or sett break	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Designated open space/playing field	0	0	0	--	0	--	--	0	0	--	--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	--	--	--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Consideration – Not related to sustainability appraisal but associated with potential for delivery																														
	Green Belt purpose																													
	Site availability																													
	Site achievability																													
<p>Green Belt purpose: Minor = Green, Moderate = Amber, Major = Red</p> <p>Site availability and achievability: Green = no constraints; Amber is potentially available/achievable; Red is not available or achievable</p>																														

Table 2.5: Green Belt Housing Release Sites Sustainability Appraisal Commentary

Site Ref	Name	Commentary	Potential Mitigation	Reasoned justification for inclusion / exclusion as allocated site
SP11 (299-300)	Peareth Hall Farm and Gospel Hall Trust Meeting Houses	The location (and setting) of Grade II listed Usworth House on site will have a significant impact in terms of appropriate development density and design. The proximity of the A194(M) will also require appropriate buffering. Both these constraints (and other issues) can be mitigated for.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design is needed in order to minimise further impact to the wildlife corridor and to the Grade 2 listed Usworth House Buffer zone required to minimize noise/air/vibration from nearby motorway School and other infrastructure issues to resolve.	Allocated site – significant impacts can be mitigated for. The scale of development will be limited by the constraints, particularly by the need to respect the aspect of the Grade II listed building. However, part of the site is considered to be brownfield land and overall the site is considered to have limited impact to Green Belt purpose, offering opportunity for rounding-off of the Green Belt boundary. The scale of development limits the impact to local school capacity, and the site is considered to be located in an accessible location, and is considered to be achievable and available for development.
SP15 (424)	Stoney Lane, Springwell	The location of 5 public sewers on site will have a significant impact in terms of appropriate development density and design. The proximity of the A194(M) will also require appropriate buffering. Both these constraints (and other issues) can be mitigated for.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design is needed in order to minimise further impact to the wildlife corridor and impact to local views School and other infrastructure issues to resolve including noise/air/vibration issues relating to the adjacent motorway, and public sewers on site.	Allocated site – significant impacts can be mitigated for. The scale of development will be limited by the need to mitigate for public sewers and buffering to motorway. However, the site is considered to have limited/moderate impact to Green Belt purpose. The scale of development limits the impact to local school capacity, and the site is considered to be located in an accessible location, and is considered to be achievable and available for development.
407C	North of Mount Lane, Springwell	Access to site and potential impacts to Mount Lane need to be resolved, as well as design that minimises impact to local wildlife corridor.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design is needed in order to minimise further impact to the wildlife corridor and impact to local views School and other infrastructure issues to resolve, including suitable highways access.	Allocated site – impacts can be mitigated for. The site is considered to have limited/moderate impact to Green Belt purpose, and with sensitive design can limit impact to wildlife corridor. The scale of development limits the impact to local school capacity, and the site is considered to be achievable and available for development.
US1 (567)	George Washington Hotel Golf Course (Pitch & Putt)	Site forms part of the Golf Course, but provides the pitch & putt element and therefore does not impact on the main Golf Course site. Area already has very high levels of greenspace. The proximity of the A194(M) will require appropriate buffering but can be mitigated for. Access to some local facilities is limited, but the site already effectively forms part of the urban area.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design is needed in order to minimise further impact to the wildlife corridor and impact to local views School and other infrastructure issues to resolve including noise/air/vibration issues relating to the adjacent motorway.	Allocated site – significant impacts can be mitigated for. The scale of development will be limited by the need to provide buffering to motorway. However, the site is considered to have limited impact to Green Belt purpose, offering opportunity for rounding-off of the Green Belt boundary. The loss of private golf land is considered to be acceptable in terms of greenspace loss, and impact to existing business. The scale of development limits the impact to local school capacity, and the site is considered to be located within the urban area, and is considered to be achievable and available for development.

Site Ref	Name	Commentary	Potential Mitigation	Reasoned justification for inclusion / exclusion as allocated site
US6 (463A)	Farmland to the west of Waterloo Road, Usworth	Much of the site provides high grade agricultural land. The area is partly affected by surface water flooding and has limited accessibility to services, though it forms part of the urban fringe.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design to minimise impact to Green Belt gap between Washington and Follingsby and wildlife/GI corridor, and to avoid Flood Risk Zones on eastern boundary of site and address surface water flooding to north-west of site Impact to Green Belt defensible boundary – a new robust boundary would need to be created across an otherwise open field Access to be agreed across City Council land The site is remote from facilities, and needs to better connect to the public transport network to demonstrate access sustainability School and other infrastructure issues to resolve	Allocated site – significant impacts can be mitigated for. The developable area has already been reduced to avoid flood zones to the east, which also provides a buffer to the Leamside Line. Further constraints relating to surface water flooding can be mitigated for but may reduce overall developable area. While there are other impacts to mitigate for, including the impact to Green Belt purpose, this is an opportunity to provide a large site on the urban fringe, in relatively close proximity to the public transport network, and all issues can be resolved. The site will result in the inevitable loss of agricultural land.
FA1-2-3 (671)	Southern Area Playing Fields, Rickleton	Site primarily forms outdoor sports pitches, and a proportion of land has been previously landfilled and used for coalmining purposes (site is also a Coal Referral Area). Also forms part of a wildlife corridor and lies in close proximity to ancient woodland. With suitable buffering and sensitive design, it is considered that these constraints can be mitigated for.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt, greenspace and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design would be needed, particularly with regards to ancient woodland at General's Wood, and upgrading of Rickleton Park to ensure the greenspace quality is improved in village. Ground conditions - Coal Referral Area / previous landfill affects part of site School and other infrastructure issues to resolve	Allocated site – impacts can be mitigated for. The loss of sports fields is being addressed via the city's Playing Pitch Strategy and in conjunction with Sport England and is believed to be surplus to requirements. The site is considered to have moderate impact to Green Belt purpose, and with sensitive design and buffering it is considered that the constraints can be mitigated for, including upgrading adjacent area greenspace, and supporting additional school capacity as required. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location, and both available and achievable for development.
FA5-6 (673)	Greenspace at James Steel Park, Fatfield	Site forms part of James Steel Park, though part of it consists of car parking. Site also lies within an Area of Higher Landscape Value. Area already has very high levels of greenspace. The proximity of the A182 will require the retention of woodland buffering on site. The impact to landscape character can be minimised through sensitive design and greenspace loss can provide enhancements to neighbouring greenspace.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt, greenspace and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design would be needed, particularly with regard to the rest of the parkland and to the setting of the River Wear Need to avoid any flood risk zones School and other infrastructure issues to resolve	Allocated site – significant impacts can be mitigated for. The site is considered to have limited/moderate impact to Green Belt purpose, and with sensitive design can limit impact to wildlife corridor and landscape, and compensate for greenspace loss (area has very high levels of existing greenspace, and the loss of this land can be considered to be acceptable in terms of the remaining provision to be provided for the area). The scale of development limits the impact to local school capacity, and the site is considered to be in a sustainable location, and both achievable and available for development.
PA3 (646)	Land at Glebe House Farm, Staithes Road, Pattinson	Site lies within an Area of Higher landscape Value, and within the wildlife corridor of the River Wear. Small scale, sensitive design can minimise the impact to the landscape and corridor. Other issues relating to access and neighbouring amenity can be mitigated for.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design to minimise impact to Green Belt purpose, River Wear wildlife/GI corridor and high landscape value of area. This will include measures to ensure that a new defensible Green Belt boundary is secured. Minimising nuisance from industrial estate and potential bad neighbour uses, as well as vehicular traffic and pedestrian safety issues Improved pedestrian access to local facilities and public transport stops School and other infrastructure issues to resolve	Allocated site – significant impacts can be mitigated for. The site is considered to have moderate impact to Green Belt purpose, and with sensitive design can limit impact to wildlife corridor and landscape. Site is considered to be both achievable and available for development.
HY2 (416)	Land north and west of Ferryboat Lane, North Hylton	Site lies within an Area of Higher landscape Value, and within the wildlife corridor of the River Wear. The proximity of the A231/A19 will also require appropriate buffering. It is considered that these constraints (and other issues) can be mitigated for.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design to minimise impact on the landscape character of the River Wear wildlife corridor Design to minimise noise/air/vibration issues relating to the adjacent motorway Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) impact	Allocated site – significant impacts can be mitigated for. The scale of development will be limited by the buffering constraints, and need to limit impact to the wildlife corridor. The site is considered to be achievable and available for development.
RE17 (675)	Land at Newcastle Road, Fulwell	Site forms amenity greenspace and a playing pitch, though the latter is mothballed and presently no longer required. The proximity of the coast (in terms of Habitats Regulations Assessment) is significant. These constraints (and other issues) can be mitigated for.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt, greenspace and ensure ecological net gain Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) impact School and other infrastructure issues to resolve.	Allocated site – significant impacts can be mitigated for. The loss of sports fields is being addressed via the city's Playing Pitch Strategy and in conjunction with Sport England, and is believed to be surplus to requirements. HRA impacts are being addressed as part of a local area 'masterplan' that seeks improvements to the neighbouring Fulwell Quarries area. Site is in a sustainable location and is considered to be achievable and available for development.

Site Ref	Name	Commentary	Potential Mitigation	Reasoned justification for inclusion / exclusion as allocated site
MD8 (676)	Land at West Park, Middle Herrington	Site provides amenity greenspace as well as historic farmland that belonged to nearby mediaeval villages of The Herringtons. The impact to this historic landscape is significant. The loss of amenity greenspace could be compensated for by improving other nearby greenspaces in area, though the impact to the historic landscape is more complex and would need very sensitive design.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Loss of greenspace – improvements to surrounding greenspace would be needed as compensation Highly sensitive design necessary as site contains ridge & furrow and hydrology issues Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) impact Impact to A690/A19 roundabout	Allocated site – significant impacts can be mitigated for. Sensitive design and layout will be required to minimise the impact to this historic landscape. The loss of amenity greenspace will impact on overall provision for the area, though it is proposed that compensation could be provided by improvements to neighbouring greenspaces in the locality. Other issues including hydrology and impacts to the local highway network can be mitigated for. Site is in a sustainable location and is considered to be achievable and available for development.
HE8-9 (465)	Land adjacent to Herrington Country Park, Penshaw	Buffering will be required to mitigate against pylons crossing the site, and in relation to the Herrington Burn (and wildlife corridor).	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Mitigate for pylons cutting through the centre of the site Create a strong defensible Green Belt boundary to north and east Sensitive design to minimise impact to wildlife/GI corridor and to avoid Flood Risk Zones on eastern boundary School and other infrastructure issues to resolve	Allocated site – impacts can be mitigated for. The site is considered to have limited/moderate impact to Green Belt purpose, and with sensitive design can limit impact to wildlife corridor and pylons. The size of development (together with other proposed developments in area) could necessitate creation of a new school for area. Site is in a sustainable location and is considered to be achievable and available for development.
H01 (113)	New Herrington Workingmens Club, Houghton-le-Spring	Site includes a bowling green, though this may be preserved as part of the development design. Site forms part of the urban area and has little relation to Green Belt purpose.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) on a number of existing trees	Allocated site – impacts can be mitigated for. The site is considered to have very limited impact to Green Belt purpose, and with sensitive design can limit impact to TPOs. Site is in a sustainable location and is considered to be achievable and available for development. Proposed development would not impact upon bowling green.
CO31 (464B)	Land to the east of The Granaries, Offerton	Site lies within an area of higher landscape value, on the edge of the historic village of Offerton. The proximity of the A194(M) will also require appropriate buffering. It is considered that mitigation is feasible due to the small scale of development proposed, on brownfield land.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design in order to fit in with the historic village of Offerton (and its setting within the Green Belt), and the high landscape value afforded by the Magnesian Limestone Escarpment Design to minimise noise/air/vibration issues relating to the adjacent A19.	Allocated site – significant impacts can be mitigated for. The site is on brownfield land and overall is considered to have limited impact to the Green Belt – indeed the site will most probably remain ‘washed-over’. Though distanced from facilities, this proposal is considered acceptable in scale to the hamlet of Offerton, with appropriate buffering land available adjacent to the A19, and opportunity for sensitive design to minimise landscape impact. The site is considered to be achievable and available for development.
Ho11-12-13 (330B)	Redevelopment of Philadelphia Complex	Site forms an extension to the Philadelphia Complex redevelopment (already granted outline planning approval). Part of the site provides high grade agricultural land. Considerable infrastructure issues are already in-hand by the Complex development.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Creating a strong defensible boundary to south and east Sensitive design to blend with the historic Philadelphia Complex and to the adjacent countryside School and other infrastructure issues to resolve in line with the existing planning approval.	Allocated site – impacts can be mitigated for. The site is considered to have limited/moderate impact to Green Belt purpose, and with sensitive design can limit impact to wildlife corridor and landscape, together with limiting any impact from nearby industrial operations. Site is considered to be in a sustainable location and is considered to be achievable and available for development. The site will result in the inevitable loss of agricultural land.
N15-6-10-11-12-13 401 – Phase 1	Land north of Washington Road, Sulgrave	The site has been proposed as a Garden Village, though the density proposed is too high and will need to be considerably reduced to match the Garden Village concept. Area forms a sensitive wildlife corridor with priority species and habitat in and beside the site. Considerable hydrology issues would also need to be resolved, together with impacts to local highway network. Supporting infrastructure and facilities would be necessary on site to compensate from the physical detachment that this site has from the residential area of Washington (Leamside Line and neighbouring employment land does not lend itself to a residential environment).	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Facilities/infrastructure to be created on-site Resolve impact on Spire Road and Leamside Line level crossing Sensitive design to enable wildlife corridors to perform and to safeguard protected species and habitat Appropriate flood mitigation Suitable design / mitigation with regards to pylons.	Area proposed for safeguarding. At present this site is not considered suitable for development, being physically detached from the residential area and remote from facilities. However, the area is proposed for safeguarding in the longer term. The site would have to accommodate facilities on site, potentially including school provision. Impact to wildlife corridor, to protected species and areas prone to flooding would require considerable land offset as mitigation. Further buffering required from pylon alignments. Significant road infrastructure required, not only into site but to alleviate impacts to highway network in Sulgrave area.
SP10 (354)	Land at Warren Lea, Springwell Village	Site not selected for Green Belt deletion because the availability of the site is not fully known – no further updates to site have been submitted in recent years. Otherwise the site is sustainable and achievable, and provides the opportunity to provide a straight defensible boundary between the urban area and the Bowes Railway Museum boundary.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design is needed in order to minimise further impact to the wildlife corridor and impact to local views, impact to adjacent listed building Red Hill House, and impact to setting of Bowes Railway Scheduled Ancient Monument Water main and sewer crosses site School and other infrastructure issues to resolve	Excluded as an allocated site. Site not selected for Green Belt deletion because the availability of the site is not fully known – no further updates to site have been submitted in recent years.

Site Ref	Name	Commentary	Potential Mitigation	Reasoned justification for inclusion / exclusion as allocated site
SP10 (415)	North of Uplands Way, Springwell Village	Site as proposed would have a fundamental impact on Green Belt purpose (merging of settlements, urban sprawl, countryside openness). Furthermore, a new Green Belt boundary would need to be created to replace the existing strong and defensible boundary. A further factor is that access to the site has not been clarified.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Mitigate against significant impact to Green Belt purpose Mitigate against loss of existing strong and defensible Green Belt boundary Sensitive design is needed in order to minimise further impact to the wildlife corridor and impact to local views and impact to setting of Bowes Railway Scheduled Ancient Monument School and other infrastructure issues to resolve including site access	Excluded as an allocated site. Site not selected for Green Belt deletion principally because it would fundamentally impact on Green Belt purpose (merging of settlements, urban sprawl, countryside openness). Furthermore, a new Green Belt boundary would need to be created to replace the existing strong and defensible boundary. A further factor is that access to the site has not been clarified.
SP12/13 (407/408)	Mount Lane and Windsor Road, Springwell Village	Site not selected for Green Belt deletion. The site is not considered to be suitable or achievable because the operational and noise issues associated with substrate extraction from adjacent Thompson's quarry render the site unsuitable for housing development at this point in time. Whilst this is felt to be the key determining reason, here, the impact to Green Belt purpose, to the adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument and to priority species/wildlife corridor are also significant cumulative factors to be considered.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Resolve noise issues relating to adjacent recycling site Mitigate against impact to Scheduled Ancient Monument Mitigate against impact on protected species and proximity to Local Wildlife Site Address issues relating to landfill and surface water flooding Sensitive design is needed in order to minimise further impact to the wildlife corridor and impact to local views School and other infrastructure issues to resolve, including suitable highways access.	Excluded as an allocated site. Site not selected for Green Belt deletion. The site is not considered to be suitable or achievable because the operational and noise issues associated with substrate extraction from adjacent Thompson's quarry render the site unsuitable for housing development at this point in time. Whilst this is felt to be the key determining reason, here, the impact to Green Belt purpose, to the adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument and to priority species/wildlife corridor are also significant cumulative factors to be considered.
US1 (405A/405B)	Part of George Washington Golf Course, High Usworth	Sites not selected for Green Belt deletion. Sites are not considered to be suitable, available or achievable principally because there does not appear to be a viable highway access into either site, and it is not clear if this proposal is supported by the landowner in the first instance.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Mitigate against impact to existing Golf Course, together with impact to wildlife corridor Mitigate against impacts to Tree Preservation Orders School and other infrastructure issues to resolve including site access	Excluded as an allocated site. Sites not selected for Green Belt deletion. Sites are not considered to be suitable, available or achievable principally because there does not appear to be a viable highway access into either site, and it is not clear if this proposal is supported by the landowner in the first instance.
US3 (463B)	Northern Area Playing Fields, Washington	Site not selected for Green Belt deletion- not deliverable as landowner does not support the proposal.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Sensitive design to minimise impact to Green Belt gap between Washington and Follingsby and wildlife/GI corridor, and to avoid Flood Risk Zones on eastern boundary of site and address surface water flooding to north-west of site Impact to Green Belt defensible boundary – a new robust boundary would need to be created across an otherwise open field Mitigate against loss of sports pitches The site is remote from facilities, and needs to better connect to the public transport network to demonstrate access sustainability School and other infrastructure issues to resolve	Excluded as an allocated site. Site not selected for Green Belt deletion- not deliverable as landowner does not support the proposal.
RE7 (672)	Land east of Witherwack	Amenity greenspace. Site not considered for Green Belt deletion. Not an available site, landowner not supporting proposal for development.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Mitigate against greenspace loss Mitigate against area affected by landfill Mitigate against potential impact to nearby SSSI and in relation to Habitats Regulations Assessment School and other infrastructure issues to be resolved	Excluded as an allocated site. Site not considered for Green Belt deletion. Not an available site, landowner not supporting proposal for development.
MD4 (419)	Farmland to the north of Hillcrest, Middle Herrington	Site not selected for Green Belt deletion because of cumulative issues that affect (or potentially affect) site suitability, availability and achievability. In particular: road access into the site has not been resolved and there is also concern from Highways England regarding impact to the nearby A690/A19 junction; impact to Green Belt purpose and the need to create a strong, new defensible Green Belt boundary when one already exists; the need to provide a suitable buffer to the adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument; the potential loss of high quality agricultural land; impact to wildlife corridor and area biodiversity.	Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain Mitigate against significant impact to Green Belt purpose Mitigate against loss of existing strong and defensible Green Belt boundary Mitigate against impact to adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument Mitigate against loss of high quality agricultural land Mitigate against impact to wildlife corridor and area of higher landscape value associated with the Magnesian Limestone Escarpment Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) impact Impact to A690/A19 roundabout Satisfactory site access to be resolved	Excluded as an allocated site. Site not selected for Green Belt deletion because of cumulative issues that affect (or potentially affect) site suitability, availability and achievability. In particular: road access into the site has not been resolved and there is also concern from Highways England regarding impact to the nearby A690/A19 junction; impact to Green Belt purpose and the need to create a strong, new defensible Green Belt boundary when one already exists; the need to provide a suitable buffer to the adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument; the potential loss of high quality agricultural land; impact to wildlife corridor and area biodiversity.

Site Ref	Name	Commentary	Potential Mitigation	Reasoned justification for inclusion / exclusion as allocated site
MD4-5-6 (648B)	Green Belt land at Foxcover Road, Middle Herrington (south-west portion)	Site is not considered for Green Belt deletion. This proposal is not considered to be suitable because there are a number of constraints that cumulatively affect site suitability and achievability, most notably the significant impact to Green Belt purpose (merging of settlements, urban sprawl, countryside openness), the high proportion of land affected by 1:30 incidence surface water flooding, impact to wildlife corridor, requirement to provide buffer to adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument, ridge and furrow on site, access to site and impact to highway network (notably the A690/A19 roundabout).	<p>Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain</p> <p>Mitigate against significant impact to Green Belt purpose</p> <p>Mitigate against loss of existing strong and defensible Green Belt boundary</p> <p>Mitigate against Flood Zones and significant areas of 1:30 incidence surface water flooding</p> <p>Mitigate against impact to adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument</p> <p>Mitigate against impact to mediaeval ridge and furrow farmland</p> <p>Mitigate against loss of high quality agricultural land</p> <p>Mitigate against impact to wildlife corridor and area of higher landscape value associated with the Magnesian Limestone Escarpment</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) impact</p> <p>Impact to A690/A19 roundabout</p> <p>Satisfactory site access to be resolved</p>	<p>Excluded as an allocated site.</p> <p>Site is not considered for Green Belt deletion. This proposal is not considered to be suitable because there are a number of constraints that cumulatively affect site suitability and achievability, most notably the significant impact to Green Belt purpose (merging of settlements, urban sprawl, countryside openness), the high proportion of land affected by 1:30 incidence surface water flooding, impact to wildlife corridor, requirement to provide buffer to adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument, ridge and furrow on site, access to site and impact to highway network (notably the A690/A19 roundabout).</p>
MD2-4 (648D)	Farmland to the west of Grindon	Site not selected for Green Belt deletion because of cumulative issues that affect (or potentially affect) site suitability, availability and achievability. In particular: road access into the site has not been resolved; impact to Green Belt purpose and the need to create a strong, new defensible Green Belt boundary when one already exists; the need to provide a suitable buffer to the adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument; the potential loss of high quality agricultural land; impact to wildlife corridor and area biodiversity.	<p>Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain</p> <p>Mitigate against significant impact to Green Belt purpose</p> <p>Mitigate against loss of existing strong and defensible Green Belt boundary</p> <p>Mitigate against impact to adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument</p> <p>Mitigate against impact to adjacent SSSI</p> <p>Mitigate against loss of high quality agricultural land</p> <p>Mitigate against impact to wildlife corridor and area of higher landscape value associated with the Magnesian Limestone Escarpment</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) impact</p> <p>Impact to A690/A19 roundabout</p> <p>Satisfactory site access to be resolved</p>	<p>Excluded as an allocated site.</p> <p>Site not selected for Green Belt deletion because of cumulative issues that affect (or potentially affect) site suitability, availability and achievability. In particular: road access into the site has not been resolved; impact to Green Belt purpose and the need to create a strong, new defensible Green Belt boundary when one already exists; the need to provide a suitable buffer to the adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument; the potential loss of high quality agricultural land; impact to wildlife corridor and area biodiversity.</p>
BU4 (674)	Land west of Ryhope and Cherry Knowle Hospital	Site is not considered for Green Belt deletion. This proposal is not considered to be suitable because of the fundamental impact that Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) would have on either the site in question, or the adjacent development proposed within the South Sunderland Growth Area (SSGA) Masterplan. The site in question has already been put forward to provide Sustainable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANGS) to enable the Cherry Knowle Hospital redevelopment to satisfy HRA requirements. To additionally develop this site would have a major knock-on effect to the feasibility of this portion of the SSGA.	<p>Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain</p> <p>Mitigate for Habitats Regulations Assessment</p> <p>Mitigate for pockets of land affected by past quarrying, and for surface water flooding</p> <p>Infrastructure issues to resolve</p>	<p>Excluded as an allocated site.</p> <p>Site is not considered for Green Belt deletion. This proposal is not considered to be suitable because of the fundamental impact that Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) would have on either the site in question, or the adjacent development proposed within the South Sunderland Growth Area (SSGA) Masterplan. The site in question has already been put forward to provide Sustainable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANGS) to enable the Cherry Knowle Hospital redevelopment to satisfy HRA requirements. To additionally develop this site would have a major knock-on effect to the feasibility of this portion of the SSGA.</p>
FA12 FA13 (444)	Land to the west of Biddick Woods, Houghton-le-Spring	Site is not considered for Green Belt deletion. This proposal is not considered to be achievable because of the requirements to provide a buffer to the Leamside Line as well as delivering appropriate access into the site, which considerably compromise the potential housing layout.	<p>Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain</p> <p>Mitigate against proximity of Leamside Line</p> <p>Mitigate against proximity to ancient woodland and priority species</p> <p>Achieve suitable design layout with appropriate access into site</p> <p>School and infrastructure issues to be resolved</p>	<p>Excluded as an allocated site.</p> <p>Site is not considered for Green Belt deletion. This proposal is not considered to be achievable because of the requirements to provide a buffer to the Leamside Line as well as delivering appropriate access into the site, which considerably compromise the potential housing layout.</p>
WA23 (423)	Land to the north of Market Place Industrial Estate, Houghton-Le-Spring	Site not selected for Green Belt deletion because the availability of the site is not fully known – no further updates to site have been submitted in recent years. Furthermore, site deliverability is subject to a ransom strip, and the site is also located beside Market Place Industrial Estate, which may affect marketability. The site also falls within an area of higher landscape character.	<p>Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain</p> <p>Mitigate against potential impact to nearby SSSI, LWS and LGS</p> <p>Sensitive design is needed in order to minimise further impact to the wildlife corridor and impact to local views</p> <p>School and other infrastructure issues to resolve, including suitable highways access.</p>	<p>Excluded as an allocated site.</p> <p>Site not selected for Green Belt deletion because the availability of the site is not fully known – no further updates to site have been submitted in recent years. Furthermore, site deliverability is subject to a ransom strip, and the site is also located beside Market Place Industrial Estate, which may affect marketability.</p>

Site Ref	Name	Commentary	Potential Mitigation	Reasoned justification for inclusion / exclusion as allocated site
WA33 (645)	Land east of Seaham Road, Racecourse Estate, Houghton-Le-Spring	Site is not considered for Green Belt deletion. This proposal is not considered to be suitable due to the combined impact on Green Belt purpose as well as to landscape and wildlife impacts. The impact to Green Belt purpose is moderate/major and there would be loss of an existing strong and defensible Green Belt boundary. Furthermore, the impact to the wildlife / GI corridor, to the ecology and to an area of High Landscape Value is also highly significant.	<p>Mitigate against loss of Green Belt and ensure ecological net gain</p> <p>Mitigate against significant impact to Green Belt purpose</p> <p>Mitigate against loss of existing strong and defensible Green Belt boundary</p> <p>Sensitive design is needed in order to minimise further impact to the wildlife corridor and the high landscape value afforded by the Magnesian Limestone Escarpment</p> <p>School and other infrastructure issues to resolve, including suitable highways access.</p>	<p>Excluded as an allocated site.</p> <p>Site is not considered for Green Belt deletion. This proposal is not considered to be suitable due to the combined impact on Green Belt purpose as well as to landscape and wildlife impacts. The impact to Green Belt purpose is moderate/major and there would be loss of an existing strong and defensible Green Belt boundary. Furthermore, the impact to the wildlife / GI corridor, to the ecology and to an area of High Landscape Value is also highly significant.</p>

3 SA of Proposed Key and Primary Employment Areas

3.1 Overview

- 3.1.1 This section provides an appraisal of potential effects from the allocation of proposed Key Employment Areas (KEA), Primary Employment Areas (PEA) and reasonable alternatives.

3.2 Approach to Assessment

- 3.2.1 This appraisal is consistent with the Sustainability Appraisal Framework and is generally aligned with the methodology defined within the Sunderland Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2016) ('the Scoping Report'). The appraisal was carried out by PBA on behalf of SCC.

Need for SA of Proposed KEAs, PEAs and Reasonable Alternatives

- 3.2.2 At the time of writing the Scoping Report it was envisaged that the next Sunderland Core Strategy would only contain a limited number of strategic site allocations. A detailed approach to the assessment of proposed allocations, including the proposed KEAs and PEAs, was not included in the Scoping Report. The approach to assessment therefore requires to be defined below before the assessment results are presented.
- 3.2.3 The starting point for identifying potential KEAs, PEAs and reasonable alternatives was to consider re-allocating existing employment sites from the adopted Sunderland Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 1998 and the adopted UDP alteration No. 2 (Central Sunderland) 2007. These existing allocations, together with other potential employment sites, were examined within the Sunderland Employment Land Review (the 'ELR') undertaken by Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners (NLP) on behalf of Sunderland City Council (SCC) in 2016. Appendix 3 of the ELR identified a total of 102 sites within SCC's current employment land supply, although a number of these sites overlap or comprise potential mixed use allocations where only part of the site was identified for employment use. 94 individual site areas were therefore examined in the ELR and have been taken forward in this SA and either proposed KEAs, proposed PEAs or reasonable alternatives. Table 3.2 states SCC's proposed approach to the allocation or non-allocation of each site as forming part of proposed KEAs or PEAs.
- 3.2.4 All KEAs and PEAs proposed for allocation within the Draft Sunderland CSDP comprise existing site allocations, meaning that their re-allocation would not itself generate new or different likely significant environmental effects. In addition, a number of the proposed KEAs and PEAs were subject to SA and SEA through the preparation of the UDP alteration No. 2 (Central Sunderland) 2007, although others are historic employment allocations which predate the introduction of SA and SEA legislative requirements and therefore have not previously been subject to SA or SEA in accordance with statutory requirements.
- 3.2.5 Appendix 3 of the ELR provides high level information regarding the viability and overall sustainability of all assessed employment sites, although this information is not disaggregated by environmental topic and does not meet the information requirements prescribed within the SEA Regulations. To ensure full compliance with SA and SEA statutory requirements throughout the preparation of the Sunderland CSDP, a proportionate appraisal of all proposed KEAs, PEAs and reasonable alternatives was therefore carried out by PBA on behalf of SCC.

Application of the SA Framework

- 3.2.6 The generic SA Framework contained within the Sunderland Core Strategy SA Scoping Report (2016) was not designed for use in assessing 'topic specific' site allocations such as

KEAs and PEAs, where only a limited number of environmental and sustainability effects are likely to occur. For example, the proposed re-allocation of existing employment sites as KEAs and/or PEAs would have no effect on housing provision, climate change, waste generation or natural resource use, whilst the indicators listed within the SA Framework against other sustainability objectives are also of limited relevance. It was therefore necessary to develop a bespoke suite of assessment criteria to ensure sufficient coverage against relevant sustainability objectives defined within the SA Framework, whilst keeping the assessment of proposed KEAs, PEAs and reasonable alternatives proportionate.

- 3.2.7 The site assessment criteria and scoring thresholds applied to assess each of the 94 candidate employment site areas from the ELR against the sustainability objectives defined within the SA Framework are detailed in Table 3.1 below. Some SA objectives have not been considered and thus no corresponding assessment criteria are identified as at this early stage it is not possible to identify site or development characteristics relevant to these objectives. In addition, at this stage some SA objectives cannot be considered in the assessment as the performance of candidate employment sites against these objectives is dependent upon how proposed policies within the emerging Sunderland CSDP are implemented, which cannot be known at this stage. The symbology and scoring system used are the same as shown in Table 1.1 of this appendix.

Table 3.1 SA of KEA/PEA Assessment Criteria

SA1 Score	SA1 Commentary	SA2	SA3 Score	SA3 Commentary	SA4 Score	SA5 Score	SA5 Commentary	SA6	SA7 Score	SA7 Commentary	SA8 Score	SA8 Commentary	SA9 Score	SA9 Commentary	SA10 Score	SA10 Commentary	SA11 Score	SA11 Commentary	SA12	SA13	SA14 Score	SA14 Commentary	SA15 Score	SA15 Commentary
0	Outwith 2km of designated site	N/A	++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area	N/A	++	within 2km of strategic transport network (A roads, motorways, metros and train stations) AND not within 2km of identified traffic congestion	++	Site is all brownfield land	0	Site is outwith 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++	Site is outwith 2km of AQMA	N/A	N/A	0	Outwith 2km of designated site	0	Development within existing settlement/urban envelopes
-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site		+	Up to 5ha site size		+	Within 2km of identified residential area		+	Within 5km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified traffic congestion	+	Site is partially brownfield land and partially greenfield	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	-	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 2	+	Site is within 1 – 2km of AQMA			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	--	Development within Greenbelt or Settlement Break
--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site		?	Site area / employment component of wider allocation unknown		-	Within 2-5km of identified residential area		-	Not within 5km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified traffic congestion	-	Site is all greenfield /undeveloped land	--	Site is within 0 – 500m of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	-	Site is within 500m – 1km of AQMA			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site		
						--	Outwith 5km of identified residential area		--	Within 2km of identified traffic congestion	--	Site is prime agricultural land					--	Site is within 0 – 500m of AQMA						

3.3 SA Results & Mitigation Requirements

- 3.3.1 Table 3.2 below provides an assessment each site pre-mitigation, in order to identify likely significant environmental effects (whether beneficial or adverse, denoted by ++ and -- scoring respectively). Mitigation required to address significant environmental effects or otherwise recommended to reduce not significant effects is identified within Table 3.3. Table 3.3 also provides a reasoned justification on why each site is either proposed for allocation, safeguarding or rejection in the Draft Sunderland CSDP.

Table 3.2 Candidate KEA and PEA Sustainability Appraisal Matrix

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
Groves	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Claxheugh Rock and Ford Limestone Quarry SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hylton Dene LNR (LWS) , Claxheugh Riverside LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is adjacent to green or settlement break however Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Lisburn triangle	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Pallion Shipyard	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Baron's Quay and Timber Beach LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East End, Russell Street/ West Wear Street	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Monkwearmouth Anglo-Saxon monastery and medieval priory Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Stadium Park	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Sheepfolds	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Monkwearmouth Anglo-Saxon monastery and medieval priory Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
Bonnarsfield	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Monkwearmouth Anglo-Saxon monastery and medieval priory Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Former Corning warehouse, Deptford Ter	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
West of Azure Court, Camberwell Way (2)	-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Herrington Hill SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Houghton Hill, Cut and Scarp LGS (LWS) , Burdon Dene LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; World War I early warning acoustic mirror on Namey Hill, 570m north of Carley Hill Cricket Ground Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Sea View/Stockton Road, Ryhope	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Durham Coast SAC , Durham Coast SPA (SSSI) (SAC) , Durham Coast SSSI (SPA) (SAC) ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Ryhope Beach LGS (LWS) , Halliwell Banks LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hasting Hill curus and causewayed enclosure, 600m south of Hasting Hill Farm Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is adjacent to green or settlement break however Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Salterfen	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Durham Coast SAC , Durham Coast SPA (SSSI) (SAC) , Durham Coast SSSI (SPA) (SAC) ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Ryhope Beach LGS (LWS) , Hendon Cliffs LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
North Hylton Enterprise Park (5)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hylton Dene LNR (LWS) , Baron's Quay and Timber Beach LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Ryhope pumping engines Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Trafford Road (8)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Former Armstrong House	-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Princess Anne Park LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; World War I early warning acoustic mirror on Namey Hill, 570m north of Carley Hill Cricket Ground Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Tower Road (2)	-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Princess Anne Park LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Northern entrance to Industrial Road	-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Princess Anne Park LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Colliery engine house at Washington F Pit, Albany Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Hillthorn Farm (6)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Severn Houses LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Colliery engine house at Washington F Pit, Albany Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Hillthorn Farm (7)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Severn Houses LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Colliery engine house at Washington F Pit, Albany Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
Turbine Business Park (3) - east of pub	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Hylton Plantation LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	+	Within 2km of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (3) - east of Spine Road	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Peepy Plantation LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	+	Within 2km of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (3) - south of WBC	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Peepy Plantation LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	+	Within 2km of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (3) - south-east of FTC	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Barmston Pond LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	+	Within 2km of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (3) - west of Vantec	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Hylton Plantation LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	+	Within 2km of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (3) - south of test track	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Hylton Plantation LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	+	Within 2km of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Turbine Business Park (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hylton Plantation LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
North of Campanile Hotel	-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; General's Wood LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hylton Castle: a medieval fortified house, chapel, 17th and 18th century country houses and associated gardens Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Silverstone Road, Sulgrave	-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , River Don Streambank LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Blackthorn Way (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Colliery engine house at Washington F Pit, Albany Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Houghton Colliery	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Houghton Hill, Cut and Scarp LGS (LWS) , Houghton Hill LWS (LGS)		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Biffa landfill site	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Houghton Hill, Cut and Scarp LGS (LWS) , Houghton Hill LWS (LGS)		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	--	Site is within Green Belt or Settlement Break
Sunderland Enterprise Park East	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Baron's Quay and Timber Beach LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
East of gasometers depot, Spelter Works Road (2)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Ryhope Beach LGS (LWS) , Hendon Cliffs LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Gasometers (3)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Ryhope Beach LGS (LWS) , Hendon Cliffs LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
I J Dewhurst (6)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Plumb Centre, Sandmere Road	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Tunstall Hills & Ryhope Cutting SSSI (LNR) ; Tunstall Hills LNR (SSSI) ,		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		+	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Monkwearmouth Anglo-Saxon monastery and medieval priory Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
South-west of Carmere Road	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Tunstall Hills & Ryhope Cutting SSSI (LNR) ; Tunstall Hills LNR (SSSI) ,		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		+	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Ryhope pumping engines Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Former Purdy Hose, Wellmere Road	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hendon Railway LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
South East corner of Pennywell Industrial Estate	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Ryhope pumping engines Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
Rear of nursery units (2)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hasting Hill cursum and causewayed enclosure, 600m south of Hasting Hill Farm Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
West of Eastern Way (9)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Former Vishay factory, Pallion Way (8)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
West of Luxembourg Road (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Claxheugh Rock and Ford Limestone Quarry SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Claxheugh Riverside LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hylton Castle: a medieval fortified house, chapel, 17th and 18th century country houses and associated gardens Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East End, Scotia Quay	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Monkwearmouth Anglo-Saxon monastery and medieval priory Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East End, High Street East/ Low Street	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Monkwearmouth Anglo-Saxon monastery and medieval priory Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
Barrack Street (3)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Sunderland South Docks LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Monkwearmouth Anglo-Saxon monastery and medieval priory Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Prospect Road (2)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Sunderland South Docks LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Disused Hendon railway sidings, Moor Terrace	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)*	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
West of petrol filling station, Pallion New Road	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Lisburn Terrace adjoining former Corning site	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Wear Street/Camden Street (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Crown Road (East of Quay West) (5)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
Crown Road (West of Quay West) (4)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Wear Street (land beside Q A Bridge) (3)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Woodbine Terrace (3)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Woodbine Terrace (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Baron's Quay and Timber Beach LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Crowther Road (1)	-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Princess Anne Park LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hylton Castle: a medieval fortified house, chapel, 17th and 18th century country houses and associated gardens Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Crowther Road (3)	-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Princess Anne Park LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Bowes Railway Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
West of Walton Road (5)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) ,		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Bowes Railway Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
South of Faraday Close (6)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Barmston Pond LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)*	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Screen Print, North of Alston Rd/Walton Rd (11)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Barmston Pond LNR (LWS) , Barmston Pond LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)*	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Low Barmston Farmhouse (10)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hylton Plantation LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	+	Within 2km of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
James Steel, Site 1 (7)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Washington Wildfowl and Wetlands Centre		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Front of James Steel (8)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Washington Wildfowl and Wetlands Centre		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade I)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Holystone Waste, adjoining Railway	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Pattinson South Pond LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade I)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
West of Sterling Close (3)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade I)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
North of Sterling Close (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade I)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Stephenson Road (2)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Usworth Pond LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Stephenson Road (3)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Former Northumbria Centre (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Usworth Pond LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is adjacent to green or settlement break however Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Hankyu (6)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Princess Anne Park LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Colliery engine house at Washington F Pit, Albany Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
South of Sedling Road (2)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Vigo Wood & Railway Embankment LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)*	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
West of Cherry Way (4)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
South of Techniks	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Cherry Way (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is adjacent to green or settlement break however Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Vaux and Farrington Row	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Wearmouth Riverside LWS		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	-	Site is within 1km of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Farrington, west of silksworth way	-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Gilley Law Quarry SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Newport Railway Cutting LGS , Blakeney Woods LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Farrington, East of North moor lane (2)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Gilley Law Quarry SSSI ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	-	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 2	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hasting Hill curus and causewayed enclosure, 600m south of Hasting Hill Farm Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Farrington, East of North moor lane	-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Gilley Law Quarry SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Newport Railway Cutting LGS , Tunstall Hills LNR (SSSI) , Newport Dene LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Hasting Hill curus and causewayed enclosure, 600m south of Hasting Hill Farm Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
Gilpin Wood (former Glebe Farm Sewage Works) (6)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Land to west of former Sumitomo factory (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Joe's Pond SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Redburn Marsh LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Seven Sisters round barrow, Copt Hill, Houghton-le-Spring Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is adjacent to green or settlement break however Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Cygnet Way (5)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Joe's Pond SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
South of Cygnet Way (5)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Hetton Bogs SSSI (LNR) ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		++	5ha or greater site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Seven Sisters round barrow, Copt Hill, Houghton-le-Spring Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Gadwall Road (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Joe's Pond SSSI ; Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Rainton Meadows LWS (PLNR)		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II) ; Seven Sisters round barrow, Copt Hill, Houghton-le-Spring Scheduled Ancient Monument	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Colliery Lane (4)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Hetton Lyons Country Park LWS (PLNR)		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Land east of Parkgate (2)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Eppleton Railway LWS		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		--	Within 2km of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
South of Gatehouse	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
North of Gatehouse	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Small scrap yard (4)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of TKT Cosyfoam (3)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Former Main waste transfer station (5)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	++	Brownfield Site	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
East of Main waste transfer station (6)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ;		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	--	Site is within 500m of identified waterbody	--	Site is within or adjoins Flood Zone 3	++			-	Within 500m - 2km of designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Allotments (3)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Houghton Hill, Cut and Scarp LGS (LWS) , Houghton Hill LWS (LGS)		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	+	Site is partially brownfield and partially greenfield / undeveloped	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Site Name	SA1	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA2	SA3	Commentary	SA4	SA5	Commentary	SA6	SA7	Commentary	SA8	Commentary	SA9	Commentary	SA10	Commentary	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	Commentary	Relevant Designations	SA15	Commentary
Adjoining Readycrete site (4)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Houghton Hill, Cut and Scarp LGS (LWS) , Houghton Hill LWS (LGS)		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes
Northern extension (1)	--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Regional Wildlife Corridor ; Houghton Hill, Cut and Scarp LGS (LWS) , Houghton Hill LWS (LGS)		+	Up to 5ha site size	+	++	Within 500m of identified residential area		++	Within 500m of strategic transport network AND not within 2km of identified area of traffic congestion / pinch point	-	Greenfield / Undeveloped Site	0	Site is outside 1km of identified waterbody	+	Site is within Flood Zone 1	++			--	Within 500m of designated site OR proposed site includes designated site	Listed Building (Grade II)	0	Site is adjacent to green or settlement break however Site is within existing settlement/urban envelopes

Table 3.3 KEA and PEA Reasoned Conclusions and Potential Mitigation Requirements

Site Name	Reasoned Conclusion	Potential Mitigation Requirements ²
Groves	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Flood Risk Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Lisburn triangle	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Pallion Shipyard	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Flood Risk Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East End, Russell Street/ West Wear Street	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Stadium Park	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Sheepfolds	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Bonnersfield	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Flood Risk Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Former Corning warehouse, Deptford Ter	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
West of Azure Court, Camberwell Way (2)	Primary Employment Allocation	Transport Assessment;
Sea View/Stockton Road, Ryhope	No employment allocation	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Salterfen	Key Employment Area	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North Hylton Enterprise Park (5)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Trafford Road (8)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Former Armstrong House	No employment allocation	No Mitigation Required
Tower Road (2)	Primary Employment Area	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey;
Northern entrance to Industrial Road	Key Employment Area	No Mitigation Required
Hillthorn Farm (6)	Primary Employment Area	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Hillthorn Farm (7)	Primary Employment Area	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Turbine Business Park (3) - east of pub	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Turbine Business Park (3) - east of Spine Road	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Turbine Business Park (3) - south of WBC	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Turbine Business Park (3) - south-east of FTC	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Turbine Business Park (3) - west of Vantec	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Turbine Business Park (3) - south of test track	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Turbine Business Park (1)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North of Campanile Hotel	No employment allocation	No Mitigation Required
Silverstone Road, Sulgrave	No employment allocation	No Mitigation Required
North of Blackthorn Way (1)	No employment allocation	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Houghton Colliery	No employment allocation	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Biffa landfill site	No employment allocation	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;

² These potential mitigation requirements are subject to detailed site specific consideration, applicable CSDP policy requirements and would depend upon the circumstances and characteristics of development proposals.

Site Name	Reasoned Conclusion	Potential Mitigation Requirements ²
Sunderland Enterprise Park East	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East of gasometers depot, Spelter Works Road (2)	Key Employment Area	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Gasometers (3)	Key Employment Area	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
I J Dewhirst (6)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North of Plumb Centre, Sandmere Road	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
South-west of Carrmere Road	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Former Purdy Hose, Wellmere Road	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
South East corner of Pennywell Industrial Estate	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Rear of nursery units (2)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
West of Eastern Way (9)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Former Vishay factory, Pallion Way (8)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
West of Luxembourg Road (1)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East End, Scotia Quay	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Flood Risk Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East End, High Street East/ Low Street	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Barrack Street (3)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Prospect Road (2)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Disused Hendon railway sidings, Moor Terrace	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
West of petrol filling station, Pallion New Road	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Lisburn Terrace adjoining former Corning site	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Wear Street/Camden Street (1)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Crown Road (East of Quay West) (5)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Crown Road (West of Quay West) (4)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Wear Street (land beside Q A Bridge) (3)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East of Woodbine Terrace (3)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Flood Risk Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North of Woodbine Terrace (1)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Flood Risk Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East of Crowther Road (1)	Key Employment Area	No Mitigation Required
North of Crowther Road (3)	Key Employment Area	No Mitigation Required
West of Walton Road (5)	Primary Employment Area	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
South of Faraday Close (6)	Primary Employment Area	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Screen Print, North of Alston Rd/Walton Rd (11)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North of Low Barmston Farmhouse (10)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
James Steel, Site 1 (7)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Front of James Steel (8)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;

Site Name	Reasoned Conclusion	Potential Mitigation Requirements ²
Holystone Waste, adjoining Railway	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
West of Sterling Close (3)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North of Sterling Close (1)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East of Stephenson Road (2)	Primary Employment Area	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East of Stephenson Road (3)	Primary Employment Area	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Former Northumbria Centre (1)	Primary Employment Area	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North of Hankyu (6)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
South of Sedling Road (2)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
West of Cherry Way (4)	Key Employment Area	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
South of Techniks	Key Employment Area	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East of Cherry Way (1)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Flood Risk Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Vaux and Farringdon Row	Part Strategic Allocation/ Part No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Flood Risk Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Farringdon, west of silksworth way	No employment allocation	Transport Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey;
Farringdon, East of North moor lane (2)	No employment allocation	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Farringdon, East of North moor lane	No employment allocation	No Mitigation Required
Gilpin Wood (former Glebe Farm Sewage Works) (6)	No employment allocation	Flood Risk Assessment; Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Land to west of former Sumitomo factory (1)	Primary Employment Area	Flood Risk Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North of Cygnet Way (5)	Primary Employment Area	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
South of Cygnet Way (5)	Primary Employment Area	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North of Gadwall Road (1)	Primary Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North of Colliery Lane (4)	Key Employment Area	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Land east of Parkgate (2)	Key Employment Area	Transport Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
South of Gatehouse	No employment allocation	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
North of Gatehouse	No employment allocation	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Small scrap yard (4)	No employment allocation	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East of TKT Cosyfoam (3)	No employment allocation	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Former Main waste transfer station (5)	No employment allocation	Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
East of Main waste transfer station (6)	No employment allocation	Flood Risk Assessment; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Allotments (3)	No employment allocation	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Adjoining Readycrete site (4)	Key Employment Area	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;
Northern extension (1)	No employment allocation	Cultural Heritage Assessment or Archaeological Survey; Protected Species and/or Habitat Surveys;

4 SA of Proposed Gypsy Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 This section provides a SA of potential effects from the allocation of proposed Gypsy Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (TSGTTSGT) sites and reasonable alternatives. This SA was carried out by SCC officers with advice and external review provided by the SA team within Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA).

4.2 Methodology

- 4.2.1 As part of the development of the emerging Sunderland CSDP a site selection process was undertaken to identify potentially suitable sites for new TSGT allocations in order to meet identified needs from the TSGT community. This site selection process identified a total of 117 potential sites, of which 74 were discounted due to major viability constraints including site size and landownership. The 43 remaining candidate sites were considered to be potentially suitable and have been taken forward in this SA, either as proposed TSGT site allocations or reasonable alternatives.
- 4.2.2 The criteria used to undertake the SA of the candidate TSGT sites are identified in Table 4.1 below with reference to the sustainability objectives defined within the Sunderland CSDP SA Framework (see Appendix C).

Table 4.1 Appraisal Criteria for SA of candidate TGTS Sites

Topic (only stated where multiple criteria are identified)	Appraisal Criteria	Scoring Thresholds
	Biodiversity and wildlife	+1 Site is clear of local and national wildlife designations 0 site is within 6km of SAC/SPA OR adjacent to local wildlife designations - site contains a local wildlife designation or adjacent to a national designation or within 3km of an international designation - - site includes an area designated as nationally or internationally importance for nature conservation (should be discounted already)
	Quantum of development	++ 15+ plots for showpeople OR 5+ pitches for gypsy and travellers + 0-14 plots for showpeople OR 0-4 pitches for gypsy and travellers
	Economy and Employment	N/A
Education	Proximity to Primary School	++ The site is within 500m walking distance of a primary school. + The site is within 500-1000m walking distance of a primary school. - The site is more than 1000m from a primary school
	Proximity to Secondary School	++ The site is within 1000m walking distance of a secondary school + The site is within 1000-2000m walking distance of a secondary school - The site is more than 2000m from a secondary school
	Infrastructure – schools	0 no specific capacity constraint identified - specific capacity constraint identified
Sustainable Communities	Proximity to Key Employment Centres, City Centres and Town Centres	++ <500m of a Primary or Key Employment Centre, or City Centre or town centre + 500<1000m of a Primary or Key Employment Centre, or City Centre or town centre - 1000<2000 of a Primary or Key Employment Centre, or City Centre or town centre -- 2000m of a Primary or Key Employment Centre, or City Centre or town centre
	Proximity to convenience store	+ + The site is within 400m walking distance of a convenience store + The site is within 400m-800m walking distance of a convenience store - The site is within 800-1200m walking distance of a convenience store - - The site is more than 1200m from a convenience store

Topic (only stated where multiple criteria are identified)	Appraisal Criteria	Scoring Thresholds
	Allotment site	0 Not an allotment - The site is on underused allotment - - the site is a well-used allotment
Health & Well Being	Proximity to GP surgery	+ + The site is within 800m walking distance of a GP surgery + The site is within 800-1200m walking distance of a GP surgery - The site is more than 1200m from a GP surgery
	Proximity to Pharmacy	+ + The site is within 800m walking distance of a Pharmacy + The site is within 800-1200m walking distance of a Pharmacy - The site is more than 1200m from a Pharmacy
	Adjacent land use – potential for amenity affect	0 the site is away from an industrial site, motorway, large car park or other potential source of amenity impacts - the site is adjacent to an industrial site, motorway, large car park or other potential source of amenity impacts
Transport	Proximity to Strategic Route Network	++ <500m of the primary routes of the strategic route network (A1M, A194M, A1231, A19, A690, A1018) + 500<1000m of the primary routes of the strategic route network (A1M, A194M, A1231, A19, A690, A1018) - 1000<1500m of the primary routes of the strategic route network (A1M, A194M, A1231, A19, A690, A1018) -- >1500m of the primary routes of the strategic route network (A1M, A194M, A1231, A19, A690, A1018)
	Proximity to Bus Routes	+ + 400m bus stop on regular/frequent route or 800m of train station + 400m of bus stop on less regular route, 800 regular bus route, 1,200m of a train station - 800m from all bus route over 1,500m from a rail station - - More than 1200m from a bus stop over 2km from a railway station
Land use	Proximity to Public Open Space	+ + The site is within 800m walking distance of an open space + The site is within 800-1200m walking distance of an open space - The site is more than 1200m from an open space

Topic (only stated where multiple criteria are identified)	Appraisal Criteria	Scoring Thresholds
	Land Type	+ Brownfield 0 Mix of green and brownfield - Greenfield
	Ground conditions and contamination	0 site not within area of contamination - site is in a known area of contamination
Water Environment	Groundwater Source Protection Zones	0 site is not within Groundwater Source Protection Zones - site is within or partially within an outer Groundwater Source Protection Zone (Zone 2) or Catchment (Zone 3) - - site is within or partially within an inner Groundwater Source Protection Zone (Zone 1)
Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	Flood Zones	+ 75% of the site or more in Flood Zone 1 0 Less than 50% of the site in flood zone 2 or 3a - More than 50% of the site in flood zone 2 or 3a - - more than 75% in flood zone 2 or 3a
	Surface Water Flooding	0 zero impacts or minor (<10%) of land affected by 1:100 or 1:1000 incidence surface water flooding - affected by 1:30 incidence surface water flooding (<5% of site area), or >10% land affected by 1:100 incidence surface water flooding - - affected by 1:30 incidence surface water flooding (>5% of site area)
	Critical Drainage Areas	0 Not in Critical Drainage Area - - Within Critical Drainage Area
	Groundwater Flooding	0 Not affected by groundwater flooding - Affected by lower or medium groundwater flooding - - Affected by high level groundwater flooding
Air Quality	Proximity to Bus Routes	+ + 400m bus stop on regular/frequent route or 800m of train station + 400m of bus stop on less regular route, 800 regular bus route, 1,200m of a train station - 800m from all bus route over 1,500m from a rail station - - More than 1200m from a bus stop over 2km from a railway station

Topic (only stated where multiple criteria are identified)	Appraisal Criteria	Scoring Thresholds
Climate Change		N/A
Waste and Natural Resources		N/A
Cultural Heritage	Proximity to historic assets	0 site lies away from historic elements - site is in (or partly within) as conservation area or adjacent to a listed building or Scheduled Monument, or covered by a local archaeological area designation - - site contains a listed building or Scheduled Monument
Landscape character	Landscape character and identified landscape features	0 identified as an area for landscape enhancement - area identified for a mix of landscape protection and enhancement - site directly includes Tree Preservation Orders, and/or lies adjacent to ancient woodland or other key landscape feature - - identified as being of higher landscape value (identified for landscape protection)
	Settlement Breaks and Heritage Coasts	0 Lies outside of a designated Heritage Coast or Settlement Break - - Within a Heritage Coast or Settlement Break

4.3 SA Results and Mitigation Requirements

- 4.3.1 Table 4.2 below provides an assessment each candidate TSGTTSST site pre-mitigation, in order to identify likely significant environmental effects (whether beneficial or adverse, denoted by ++ and -- scoring respectively). Mitigation required to address significant environmental effects or otherwise recommended to reduce not significant effects from proposed TSGTTSST allocations is identified within Table 4.3. Table 4.3 also provides a reasoned justification on why each candidate TSGTTSST site is either proposed for allocation, safeguarding or rejection in the Draft Sunderland CSDP.

Table 4.2 Candidate TSGTSGT Sites Sustainability Appraisal Matrix

Site Name	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA 4			SA 5			SA6			SA7			SA8			SA9	SA10				SA 11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	
	Distance to wildlife designations	Plots and Pitches Capacity	No threshold	Access to primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Schools capacity (infrastructure)	Access to employment centre	Access to convenience store	Access to allotment site	Proximity to GP Surgery	Proximity to Pharmacy	Adjacent land use (e.g. motorway)	Access to primary routes	Access to bus stops or Metro stations	Access to open space	Brownfield / greenfield	Contamination	Source Protection Zones	Impact from Flood Zones	Surface Water Flooding	Critical Drainage Area	Groundwater Flooding	Access to bus stop or Metro station	N/A	N/A	N/A	Proximity to historic designations	Landscape character impact	Heritage Coast and Settlement Break
11. Land at Ferryboat Lane (opp no. 163), Castletown	+	++		++	+	0	++	+	0	-	+	-	++	++	++	-	0	0	+	-	0	-	++			0	0	0	
12. Land at Ferryboat Lane (opp no.11), Castletown	+	++		+	++	0	++	-	0	++	+	-	++	++	++	-	0	0	+	0	0	0	++			0	0	0	
90. Land to the rear of The Buffs, Southwick	0	++		++	++	-	++	+	0	++	++	0	+	++	++	0	0	0	+	0	0	-	++			0	0	0	
17. Land at Stephenson Road	+	++		++	+	-	++	++	0	+	++	-	-	++	++	-	-	0	+	0	0	-	++			-	-	0	
18. Land to the west of Donvale Rd, Donwell.	+	++		+	+	-	++	+	0	+	+	-	++	++	++	-	0	0	+	0	0	-	++			0	0	0	
19. Land east of Craggyknowe, Blackfell	+	++		+	+	-	++	+	0	-	-	-	++	++	++	-	0	0	+	0	-	-	++			0	0	0	
22. Land at Bonemill Lane	+	++		++	+	-	++	-	0	++	++	0	+	++	++	-	-	0	+	0	0	-	++			-	0	0	

	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA 4			SA 5			SA6			SA7			SA8			SA9	SA10			SA 11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	
23a.Land at Crowther Industrial Estate	+	++		+	++	-	++	--	0	-	-	-	++	++	++	-	0	0	+	0	-	-	++			0	-	0
60. Land to the west of Waterloo Walk, Sulgrave	+	++		++	+	-	++	++	0	+	++	0	-	++	++	-	0	0	+	0	0	-	++			0	0	0
98. Land at Herburn Industrial Estate	+	++		+	++	-	++	+	0	++	++	-	++	++	++	-	0	0	+	0	0	-	++			0	0	0
24. Land to the rear of Penistone Rd, Pennywell	0	++		+	++	0	++	++	0	++	++	-	++	++	++	-	-	0	+	0	0	-	++			0	0	0
25. Rear of South Hylton House, Hylton Bank	0	++		++	++	0	+	++	0	++	++	0	+	++	++	-	0	0	+	-	0	-	++			0	0	0
34. Land west of Silksworth Way, Silksworth	0	++		++	++	0	++	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	-	-	-	+	0	-	0	++			-	0	0
35. Land east of Clinton Place	0	++		++	++	0	++	+	0	-	++	0	+	++	++	-	-	-	+	-	-	0	++			-	0	0
36. Land east of Silksworth Lane, High Newport	0	++		+	+	0	-	++	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	-	0	0	+	-	-	-	++			0	-	-

	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA 4			SA 5			SA6			SA7			SA8			SA9	SA10				SA 11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	
65. Land adjacent to Littlewoods Home shopping group, Commercial Rd, Hendon	-	++		++	++	0	++	+	0	++	++	-	++	++	++	+	-	0		+	0	-	0	++			0	0	0
67. Land at North Moor Lane	0	++		++	++	0	-	++	0	++	++	0	++	++	++	+	0	0		+	0	-	-	++			0	0	0
68. Ivor Street, Grangetown	-	++		++	+	0	++	+	0	-	+	0	++	++	++	-	0	0		+	0	0	-	++			-	0	0
69. Land to the rear of former Sportsmans Arms P.H, Silksworth	0	++		+	+	0	-	+	0	+	++	0	-	++	++	-	0	0		+	0	0	-	++			0	0	0
101.Land at Hendon Road East	-	++		+	+	0	++	+	0	++	++	-	++	++	++	-	0	0		+	0	0	0	++			-	0	0
111. Land at Sandmere Rd, Leechmere Ind Estate	-	++		++	++	0	++	++	0	+	++	-	-	++	++	+	0	0		+	0	0	0	++			0	-	0
112.Land to the rear of allotments at Hollycarrside Road	-	++		++	++	0	++	+	0	++	++	0	-	++	++	-	0	0		+	0	0	-	++			-	-	0
38. Land north of Shiney Row Centre, Shiney Row	+	++		++	-	-	+	+	-	++	++	0	-	++	++	-	0	0		+	-	-	-	++			0	0	-

	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA 4			SA 5			SA6			SA7			SA8			SA9	SA10			SA 11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	
41. Land east of Harle Close, Sunnyside	+	++		++	+	-	++	++	0	++	++	0	+	++	++	-	0	0	+	-	-	-	++			0	0	0
45. Land at Lyons Ave, Easington Lane	+	++		++	+	0	++	+	0	-	++	0	--	++	++	-	0	-	+	0	-	--	++			0	0	0
47. Land north of Moorsley Rd, High Moorsley -Site 1	0	++		+	++	0	-	+	0	-	-	0	-	+	++	-	0	0	+	0	-	-	+			-	--	0
48. Land north of Moorsley Rd, High Moorsley -Site 2	0	++		+	++	0	-	+	0	-	-	0	-	++	++	-	-	0	+	0	-	-	++			-	--	0
49. Land South Valley View, Moorsley Rd, High Moorsley	-	++		-	+	0	-	--	0	-	-	0	-	+	++	-	0	-	+	0	-	0	+			-	--	0
50. Site of former Easington lane Primary School.	+	++		++	-	0	-	++	0	-	++	0	--	++	++	0	0	-	+	0	-	0	++			0	0	0
51. Land east of North View, (former Forest Estate) Easington Lane	+	++		++	-	0	+	++	0	-	++	0	--	++	++	-	0	-	+	0	-	-	++			0	0	0
74. Land north of Collingwood Drive, Shiney Row	+	++		++	-	-	-	++	0	++	++	0	--	++	++	-	0	0	+	0	-	-	++			-	0	0
76. Britannia Terrace Allotments, Fence Houses	+	++		++	+	-	++	++	--	-	++	0	-	++	++	-	0	0	+	-	-	-	++			-	0	0

	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA 4			SA 5			SA6			SA7			SA8			SA9	SA10			SA 11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	
79. Site of former Fence houses Primary School	+	++		++	+	-	++	++	0	-	++	0	-	++	++	+	0	0	+	0	-	-	++			0	0	0
93. Land at South Hetton Road, Easington Lane	+	++		+	-	0	-	+	0	-	+	-	-	++	++	-	0	-	+	0	-	-	++			0	0	0
94. Car Park at Hetton Lyons Ponds	0	++		+	+	0	++	-	0	+	+	0	-	+	++	+	-	-	+	0	0	-	+			0	-	0
95. Land at Forest Estate, Easington Lane	+	++		++	-	0	-	++	0	-	++	0	-	++	++	-	0	-	+	0	-	-	++			0	0	0
102.Low Moorsley Road, Low Moorsley	+	++		-	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	++	++	-	0	-	+	0	-	-	++			-	-	0
105.Council Depot, Gravel Walks, Market Place Industrial Estate	+	++		++	++	-	++	+	0	++	++	-	++	++	++	+	0	0	+	-	-	-	++			-	0	0
106.Gilpin House, Blind Land, Houghton-le-Spring	+	++		++	+	-	++	++	0	++	++	0	+	++	++	+	0	0	+	0	-	-	++			0	0	0
107.Land to the north of Pearson's Industrial estate	+	++		++	++	0	++	++	0	++	++	0	-	++	++	-	0	0	+	0	-	-	++			0	0	0

	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA 4			SA 5			SA6			SA7		SA8		SA9	SA10			SA 11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15		
113.Land at Lorne St/Elemore Lane	+	-		-	+	0	-	-	0	-	+	0	--	+	++	-	0	-	+	0	-	+			-	--	0
114.Land at Gadwall Road, Rainton Bridge Ind Estate	0	++		+	+	-	++	-	0	-	+	-	-	++	++	-	0	0	+	0	-	++			-	0	0
115.Land at Mercantile Road, Rainton Bridge Ind Estate	0	++		+	+	-	++	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	-	0	+	-	-	++			-	0	0

Table 4.3 Candidate TGTS Sites - Reasoned Conclusions and Potential Mitigation Requirements for Proposed Allocations

Site Ref	Name	Commentary	Potential Mitigation for Proposed TSGTSGT Allocations Only	Reasoned justification for inclusion / exclusion as allocated site
Sunderland North				
11	Land at Ferryboat Lane (opp no. 163), Castletown	The site forms part of a larger woodland buffer, providing noise attenuation to the nearby residential properties from Washington Road and the A19. The site is also very visible and would not lend itself to being fenced off without being visually intrusive. Possible highway safety issues with accessing the site for both vehicles and pedestrians as currently no access point.		Discounted site due to the visual impact removing part of the woodland would have in such close proximity to residential properties and creating a fenced off site. Potential highways safety issues and viability issues with costs of providing access point.
12	Land at Ferryboat Lane (opp no.11), Castletown	The site forms part of a larger woodland buffer, providing noise attenuation to the nearby residential properties from the A19. The site is also very visible and would not lend itself to being fenced off without being visually intrusive. Possible highway safety issues with accessing the site for both vehicles and pedestrians, as no vehicular access to the site and visibility and speed issues.		Not suitable due to highway safety issues. Visually intrusive and amenity impacts to nearby residential properties as in very close proximity and as tree belt acts as a noise attenuation buffer from nearby A19 to residential properties.
90	Land to the rear of The Buffs, Southwick	The site is a small area of land that previously housed garages for residential area as such site is bounded by residential properties on all sides. Access to the site is limited.		Not suitable due to the impact on amenity of existing residential properties, with being in such close proximity. Access to the site is also limited, with one way in and out and the site, making the site very concealed.
Washington				
16	Land at Stephenson Road	The site is on a former pit site and shale surface. The topography of the site is such that it has the appearance of a mound with a plateau within the middle of the site. The site has no vehicular access and is limited in where this could be taken from due to visibility.		Not suitable due to being a very prominent site. The costings associated with delivering the site access and significant ground works to re-grade the site make it unviable for this particular use.
18	Land to the west of Donvale Rd, Donwell.	The site forms part of a larger woodland buffer, providing noise attenuation to the nearby residential properties from the A194 (M). Site is within close proximity to existing residential properties. No vehicular access point and potential highway Safety in relation to visibility / junction issues.		Not suitable due to incursion into woodland area and impact on existing residential amenity. Woodland acts as a noise attenuation buffer between residential properties and A1(M).
19	Land west of Craggyknowe, Blackfell	The site forms part of a larger woodland buffer, providing noise attenuation to the nearby residential properties from the A194 (M). Site is within close proximity to existing residential properties. Site has no vehicular access and potential highway Safety in relation to visibility / junction issues.		Not suitable due to incursion into woodland area and impact on existing residential amenity. Woodland acts as a noise attenuation buffer between residential properties and A1(M).
22	Land at Bonemill Lane	Large area of open space, surrounded by residential properties. Public footpaths running across the site. Potential conflict with access onto Bonemill lane and roundabout.		Not suitable as the site forms Rickleton Park, which is protected from development.
23a	Land at Crowther Industrial Estate	The site forms part of a larger woodland buffer, providing noise attenuation to the nearby residential properties from the A194 (M). Site is within close proximity to existing residential properties. No vehicular access.		Not suitable as the site provides dense woodland which acts as a noise attenuation buffer from A1(M) to residential properties.
60	Land to the west of Waterloo Walk, Sulgrave	Large area of exposed open space surrounded by residential properties. Visible location would make it difficult to screen.		Not suitable due to location and inappropriate surroundings. Highly residential area, privacy issues for proposed users of site due to overlooking from existing residential properties. Site unsuitable to be fenced off as visually intrusive.
98	Land at Hertburn Industrial Estate	Visible site, due to raised topography. Site isolated from facilities and difficult to access surrounding areas due to proximity of surrounding roads.		Not suitable – site is very prominent at road junction (Northumberland Way) and access into site would prove difficult. There would be no privacy for residents.
Sunderland South				
24	Land to the rear of Penistone Rd, Pennywell	Wooded area and open space. Trees would need to be removed. Close proximity to residential properties.		Not suitable due to close proximity to existing residential properties and the site forms local amenity and natural greenspace (Pennywell Children's Forest).
25	Rear of South Hylton House, Hylton Bank	Large area of open space, visually intrusive to fence part of site off. Adjacent to densely populated residential area. No vehicular access to site.		Not suitable due to highway safety issues and steep topography.
34	Land west of Silksworth Way, Silksworth	Large area of natural greenspace. Adjacent to densely populated area. No vehicular access to land. Access onto Doxford Park Way / Silksworth Way would conflict with safe operation of link road / close proximity of junctions. Public footpaths located on the site.		Not suitable due to site having no vehicular access. This would be costly to put in place. Previous landfill site, therefore potential contaminations issues. Prominent site- residents using site would have little privacy.
35	Land east of Clinton Place	Large area of natural greenspace. Adjacent to densely populated area. No vehicular access to land. Access onto Silksworth Road would be via a residential area, Clinton Place. The junction of Silksworth Road / Allendale Road has an accident history / visibility issues. Public footpaths located on the site.		Not suitable due to site having no vehicular access. This would be costly to put in place. Previous landfill site, therefore potential contaminations issues. Prominent site- residents using site would have little privacy. Site also being considered as overflow car park for Doxford International Business Park.

Site Ref	Name	Commentary	Potential Mitigation for Proposed TSGTSSGT Allocations Only	Reasoned justification for inclusion / exclusion as allocated site
36	Land east of Silksworth Lane, High Newport	Agricultural land within Settlement Break. Potential amenity issues with existing residential properties. No vehicular access to land. Access onto Silksworth Lane would conflict with safe operation of link road / close proximity of junctions. Accident history on adjacent roundabouts.		Not suitable - part of site is now unavailable as it is developed for extra care scheme (allocated housing site). Remainder of site unsuitable due to having no vehicular access and forms part of a Settlement Break to be protected from development. Very prominent site.
65	Land adjacent to Littlewoods Home shopping group, Commercial Rd, Hendon	Employment land alongside Commercial Road, opposite Raich Carter Centre.		Not suitable as site is to be utilised by employment uses being decanted from Deptford area of Sunderland as a consequence of the building of the Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor. Site also to be used for port related uses. Within Port's middle HSE Blast Zone which would be additional site consideration.
67	Land at North Moor Lane	Site lies to rear of Fire and Police Station. There are existing highways issues relating to North Moor Lane and North Moor Road, associated with queuing vehicles for McDonald's- access should therefore be considered from Primate Road or Perth Court.		Not suitable as part of larger site which forms part of a master plan exercise for residential and commercial development.
68	Ivor Street, Grangetown	Greenspace to the rear of residential properties and beside Southern Radial Route. Poor overall access into site.		Not suitable, the site has poor access and is a very prominent site, and lies in close proximity to existing residential properties.
69	Land to the rear of former Sportsmans Arms P.H, Silksworth	Pasture to the rear of restaurant and adjacent to densely populated area. Prominent location beside Silksworth Road.		Not suitable due to close proximity to existing residential properties. Site forms part of land sale for residential property.
101	Land at Hendon Road East	Grazing pasture on former railway alignment. Adjacent land within corridor is safeguarded for completion of new Port access road. Within employment land setting.	Mitigate against potential impact from new Port access (Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor) to be built on land alongside the site Screening required to site to/from adjacent employment land Site access to be established	Potentially suitable site. It is considered that site constraints can be mitigated for.
111	Land at Sandmere Rd, Leechmere Ind Estate	Narrow area with existing hardstanding on edge of employment site. Close proximity to care home, but very well screened. Access available from existing industrial estate road.	Site access to be established Additional screening required	Potentially suitable site. Subject to further investigations around requirement for employment land and highway safety, but overall it is considered that site constraints can be mitigated for.
112	Land to the rear of allotments at Hollycarrside Road	Very small greenspace site forming edge of Tunstall Hills Local Nature Reserve. A vehicular access would need to be created into the site from adjacent residential area.		Not suitable. Site is very small, and with existing topography provides too little available land for a site without expensive mitigation. Site also lies within the edge of the Tunstall Hills Local Nature Reserve.
Coalfield				
38	Land north of Shiney Row Centre, Shiney Row	Natural greenspace within Settlement Break. Land accessible via emergency vehicle access road adjacent Trinity Park. Public footpaths / multi user route through site.		Not suitable – protected natural greenspace within a Settlement Break, without vehicular access, and remote from primary road network.
41	Land east of Harle Close, Sunnyside	Existing open space in close proximity to existing residential properties to the west. Access to site available from unnamed road off Blind Lane.		Not suitable, due to close proximity to existing Showman's Guild site immediately to the south. Village Green status being explored by local community.
45	Land at Lyons Ave, Easington Lane	Natural greenspace beside residential properties and cricket field. No vehicular access to land- access would be via Lyons Lane.		Site unsuitable- land is earmarked for housing in the longer term. Remote from primary road network.
47	Land north of Moorsley Rd, High Moorsley -Site 1	Prominent site within open countryside. Land accessed via unnamed single lane track off Hazard Lane. Footpaths cross the site but status need to be determined.		Not suitable- site is prominent and remote within open countryside and an area of high landscape value. Site also unsuitable due to planting.
48	Land north of Moorsley Rd, High Moorsley -Site 2	Prominent site within open countryside. Land accessed via unnamed single lane track off Hazard Lane.		Not suitable due to existing grazing agreements. Site is also prominent and remote within open countryside and an area of high landscape value.

Site Ref	Name	Commentary	Potential Mitigation for Proposed TSGTSSGT Allocations Only	Reasoned justification for inclusion / exclusion as allocated site
49	Land South of Valley View, Moorsley Rd, High Moorsley	Prominent site providing woodland plantation. Land accessed off Moorsley Road via track.		Not suitable- site is prominent and remote within open countryside and an area of high landscape value, and also forms a woodland plantation which would be detrimental to area if removed.
50	Site of former Easington Lane Primary School.	Former school area, incorporating hardstanding and school playing fields. Surrounded by residential properties. Access to site via main school entrance on A182 High Street / South Hetton Road. Alternative access via School View in residential area.		Not suitable as it could sterilise wider residential development. Remote from primary road network.
51	Land east of North View,(former Forest Estate) Easington Lane	Former residential area- site may require new access taken from Murton Lane roundabout, which would prove costly.		Not suitable due to impact on regeneration of immediate area and cost of providing additional arm to roundabout. Remote from primary road network.
74	Land north of Collingwood Drive, Shiney Row	Protected greenspace in close proximity to densely populated area. Very narrow access roads leading to site.		Not suitable – site provides protected amenity greenspace, adjoining residential properties. Access to the site is also limited and is via unsuitable, very narrow residential streets. Remote from primary road network.
76	Britannia Terrace Allotments, Fence Houses	Existing allotment site to rear of properties.		Not suitable- site in use as allotments, so currently unsuitable and unavailable.
79	Site of former Fence houses Primary School	Former school site in prominent location in Fence Houses. Now providing informal greenspace- site is earmarked for community uses.		Not suitable- site in prominent central location on main road, currently providing informal greenspace.
93	Land at South Hetton Road, Easington Lane	Open space / highway verge in prominent position facing onto A182.		Not suitable because the shape of site is unable to accommodate many pitches due to being long and narrow. Site also too prominent and would create intrusion into area if fenced off and hardstanding created. Site has the appearance of highway verge.
94	Car Park at Hetton Lyons Ponds	Car park for Stephenson Pond and access into Hetton Lyons Country Park. Use of the site would remove a number of public parking spaces.	Sensitive design to screen site within area of higher landscape value, and to minimise any impact to adjacent Local Wildlife Site Resolve issue regarding loss of car park	Potentially suitable site. Location considered acceptable, however not acceptable to section off part of car park. May be more appropriate to allocate as an informal stopping place without fencing off. Site may be difficult to manage with regards security gate and access. Site lies on edge of Local Wildlife Site and area of higher landscape value, and is remote from primary road network.
95	Land at Forest Estate, Easington Lane	Former allotments (now removed) lying on edge of Forest Estate (also now removed).		Not suitable- site is proposed as a regeneration site in recent bid to the HCA. Site is remote from primary road network.
102	Low Moorsley Road, Low Moorsley	Prominent site within open countryside. Open space located away from residential properties.		Not suitable- would constitute a visible site within area of higher landscape value, if fenced off. Site access for caravans unsuitable.
105	Council Depot, Gravel Walks, Market Place Industrial Estate	Existing Council depot hemmed in by allotments and employment land.	Screening required to site to/from adjacent employment area and from allotments Surface water flooding to address	Potentially suitable site. Depot is currently still in operation, but due for closure within the next 2 years. As such site is considered suitable for Travelling Showpeople.
106	Gilpin House, Blind Land, Houghton-le-Spring	Vacant land and greenspace, in prominent location and overlooked by neighbouring residential properties.		Not suitable for Gypsies and Travellers due to close proximity of Travelling Showpeople site. Site is also very prominent and would be looked over by adjacent residential properties.
107	Land to the north of Pearson's Industrial estate	Amenity greenspace immediately to the north of Travelling Showpeople site on Pearson's Industrial Estate. Flood Zones exist to the north (Hetton Burn). Access to the site could be achieved via Showpeople site.	Hardstanding and screening required to site New access required from Travelling Showpeople site	Potentially suitable site. Unsuitable for Gypsies and Travellers due to close proximity of Travelling Showpeople site. Possible Travelling Showpeople site with access taken from existing showpeople site at Pearson's yard. No current road access to site. Site restricted to north by flood zones, and is remote from primary road network.
113	Land at Lorne St/Elemore Lane	Prominent site at entrance to Elemore Golf Course. Further work will be required as to where a vehicular access point could be taken from.		Not suitable – site is remote and within area of higher landscape value. Remote from primary road network and potential issues with creating a vehicular access point.
114	Land at Gadwall Road, Rainton Bridge Ind Estate	Vacant employment land within a Primary Employment Area.		Not suitable- site forms part of Rainton Bridge Industrial Estate, which is identified as the Coalfield area's only Primary Employment Area, and vacant employment land is to be retained.
115	Land at Mercantile Road, Rainton Bridge Ind Estate	Vacant employment land within a Primary Employment Area.		Not suitable- site forms part of Rainton Bridge Industrial Estate, which is identified as the Coalfield area's only Primary Employment Area, and vacant employment land is to be retained.



Appendix G SA of Draft Policies

Draft Sunderland CSDP Sustainability Appraisal

Appendix G - Sustainability Appraisal of Draft Policies

On behalf of **Sunderland City Council**



Project Ref: 36447/003 | Rev: B | Date: July 2017



Document Control Sheet

Project Name: Sustainability Appraisal of the Sunderland Core Strategy

Project Ref: 36447

Report Title: Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Draft Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan – Appendix F: SA of Draft Policies

Doc Ref: 36447R003AGi2

Date: July 2017

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Duncan Smart	Senior Planner	DS	14.07.2017
	Lauren Park	Senior Planner	LP	
Reviewed by:	Duncan Smart	Senior Planner	DS	18.07.2017
	Cicely Postan	Principal Planner	CP	
Approved by:	John Baker	Partner	JB	20.07.2017
	Nick Skelton	Equity Director	NS	
For and on behalf of Peter Brett Associates LLP				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
B	26.07.2017	Final Report including amendments to respond to client comments	LP / DS	DS	NS

This report has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP ('PBA') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which PBA was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). PBA accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

Contents

- 1 Introduction 1**
 - 1.1 SA of Draft Policies Overview 1
 - 1.2 Key/Assessment Symbols 1
 - 1.3 Structure of this Appendix 2
- 2 SA of Draft Sunderland CSDP Policies 3**
 - 2.1 SA of Sustainable Development Policies 3
 - 2.2 SA of Spatial Strategy Policies 10
 - 2.3 SA of Strategic Site Allocation Policies 17
 - 2.4 SA of Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure Policies 18
 - 2.5 SA of Housing Policies 25
 - 2.6 SA of Economic Growth Policies 38
 - 2.7 SA of Retail and Town Centre Policies 44
 - 2.8 SA of Design and Historic Environment Policies 50
 - 2.9 SA of Natural Environment Policies 57
 - 2.10 SA of Amenity Policies 70
 - 2.11 SA of Climate Change and Water Policies 76
 - 2.12 SA of Connecting the City Policies 89
 - 2.13 SA of Minerals and Waste Policies 98
 - 2.14 SA of Implementation and Enforcement Policies 109

Tables

- Table 1.1 SA Scoring System 1
- Table 2.1 List of Sustainable Development Policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 3
- Table 2.2 Appraisal of Draft Sustainable Development Policies 3
- Table 2.3 List of Spatial Strategy Policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 10
- Table 2.4 Appraisal of Draft Spatial Strategies Policies 10
- Table 2.5 List of Health & Wellbeing Policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 18
- Table 2.6 Appraisal of Draft Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure Policies 18
- Table 2.7 List of Housing Policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 25
- Table 2.8 Appraisal of Draft Housing Policies 26
- Table 2.9 List of Economic Growth policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 38
- Table 2.10 Appraisal of Draft Economic Prosperity Policies 38
- Table 2.11 List of Retail and Town Centre policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 44
- Table 2.12 Appraisal of Draft Retail and Town Centre Policies 44
- Table 2.13 List of Design and Historic Environment policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 50
- Table 2.14 Appraisal of Draft Design and Historic Environment Policies 50
- Table 2.15 List of Natural Environment policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 57
- Table 2.16 Appraisal of Draft Natural Environment Policies 58
- Table 2.17 List of Amenity policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 70
- Table 2.18 Appraisal of Draft Amenity Policies 71
- Table 2.19 List of Carbon Management policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 76
- Table 2.20 Appraisal of Draft Climate Change and Water Policies 77
- Table 2.21 List of Connecting the City policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 89
- Table 2.22 Appraisal of Draft Connecting the City Policies 90
- Table 2.23 List of Minerals and Waste policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 98
- Table 2.24 Appraisal of Draft Minerals and Waste Policies 99
- Table 2.25 List of Implementation and Enforcement policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives 109
- Table 2.26 Appraisal of Draft Implementation and Enforcement Policies 109

1 Introduction

1.1 SA of Draft Policies Overview

1.1.1 This appendix provides a detailed appraisal of predicted effects from the draft policies contained within the Draft Sunderland Core Strategy & Development Plan ('the Draft Sunderland CSDP'). This assessment is consistent with the Sustainability Appraisal Framework and methodology defined within the Sunderland Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (2016), as amended to take account of SA Scoping consultation responses.

1.1.2 In accordance with core Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) requirements, this assessment focuses on identifying significant environmental effects and relevant mitigation measures to address any identified Major Negative (i.e. significant adverse) effects.

1.1.3 The following timeframes are used in this assessment:

- Short term – Effects occurring over a discrete time period either within or less than the duration of the Core Strategy plan period, including construction effects;
- Medium term – Effects occurring over the duration of the Sunderland CSDP plan period; and,
- Long Term – Effects occurring for a period longer than the duration of the Core Strategy plan period, including permanent operational effects.

1.1.4 Notwithstanding the use of these timeframes in accordance with the SEA Regulations, the default position in this appraisal is that all policies would have effects over the Medium and Long Term as they would affect development management decisions within the Sunderland CSDP plan period and therefore also have longer, possibly permanent, effects. Where predicted effects would only have short term effects, e.g. during construction activities within the plan period, this is noted within the relevant policy assessment matrix.

1.2 Key/Assessment Symbols

1.2.1 The symbology and scoring system shown in Table 1.1 is used throughout this SA.

Table 1.1 SA Scoring System

Score	Description	Symbol
Significant Positive Effect	The proposed option/policy contributes significantly to the achievement of the objective.	++
Minor Positive Effect	The proposed option/policy contributes to the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	+
Neutral	The proposed option/policy does not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.	0
Minor Negative Effect	The proposed option/policy detracts from the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	-
Significant Negative Effect	The proposed option/policy detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective.	--
No Relationship	There is no clear relationship between the proposed option/policy and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.	~

Score	Description	Symbol
Uncertain	The proposed option/policy has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an appraisal to be made.	?

1.3 Structure of this Appendix

1.3.1 Section 2 of this appendix provides detailed appraisals of predicted effects from all draft policies and reasonable alternatives. The appraisal has been undertaken by policy grouping, corresponding with each chapter of policies contained within the Draft Sunderland CSDP, with the exception of policies within the Sunderland’s Environment and Economic Prosperity chapters which have been divided into the following groupings to allow different sustainability issues arising from these policies to be assessed in a manageable way:

- Design & Historic Environment;
- Natural Environment;
- Amenity;
- Employment & Business; and,
- Retail & Town Centres.

2 SA of Draft Sunderland CSDP Policies

2.1 SA of Sustainable Development Policies

2.1.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.1. The appraisal is provided in Table 2.2.

Sustainable Development Policies Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.1 List of Sustainable Development Policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Reasonable Alternatives
SS1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	To ensure the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
SS2: Principles of Sustainable Development	To ensure the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives

Sustainable Development Policies SA Matrix

Table 2.2 Appraisal of Draft Sustainable Development Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Theme		Commentary
	S1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development	S2: Principles of Sustainable Development	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy S1 commits the Council to working to identify solutions to ensure that development improves environmental, social and economic conditions. The policy also includes safeguards against granting planning permission where policies are not up to date or relevant, where the NPPF indicates that development should be restricted or where predicted adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh benefits. These provisions would directly safeguard biodiversity, geodiversity and sensitive ecological receptors from unacceptable impacts, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy S2 requires development proposals to mitigate climate change and flood risks and to address identified impacts on the natural environment. This would directly safeguard biodiversity and sensitive ecological receptors from flooding and environmental degradation, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is assumed that the requirement in Policy S1 to identify solutions which ensure that development proposals improve environmental, social and economic conditions would include appropriate measures to safeguard and enhance biodiversity in accordance with relevant environment policies and legislation. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Theme		Commentary
	S1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development	S2: Principles of Sustainable Development	
2. Housing:	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 establishes that a positive and timeous approach will be taken to approve development proposals wherever possible and to ensure development improves environmental, social and economic conditions. This is likely to allow residential development proposals to be built to meet housing needs. Therefore, whilst the policy would not directly contribute to housing delivery it would indirectly support new development proposals. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is predicted. Policy S2 includes criteria to safeguard amenity and optimise the use of land, which would ensure that development proposals increase the housing supply in appropriate areas and do not undermine the attractiveness of existing residential neighbourhoods. Owing to the indirect and weak relationship between this policy and SA objective only a Minor Positive effect is predicted. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that to accord with Policy S1, residential development proposals would satisfy energy efficiency and design requirements set out in other policies and legislation. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
3. Economy and Employment	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 establishes that a positive and pro-active approach will be taken to approve development proposals wherever possible, whilst working to identify solutions which enable development proposals to improve environmental, social and economic conditions. This is likely to encourage and allow employment generating and infrastructure development proposals to be built without unnecessary delay, thereby directly contributing to economic growth and resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy S2 requires development proposals to mitigate climate change, safeguard amenity and include provision of appropriate infrastructure. This would support the transition to a low carbon economy, protect existing business uses and provide new infrastructure to meet identified needs, resulting economic growth and thus a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
4. Learning and Skills	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Theme		Commentary
	S1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development	S2: Principles of Sustainable Development	
5. Sustainable Communities	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 commits the Council to working to identify solutions to ensure that development improves environmental, social and economic conditions. This would indirectly support social inclusion, accessibility to key services and the provision of new community facilities, resulting in Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy S2 requires development proposals to include appropriate infrastructure provision, including to increase accessibility. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
6. Health and Wellbeing	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 commits the Council to working to identify solutions to ensure that development improves environmental, social and economic conditions. This would indirectly support social inclusion, ensure accessibility to services including healthcare facilities and open space, encourage healthy lifestyles and help to meet the needs of an ageing population. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. Policy S2 requires development proposals to include appropriate infrastructure provision, including to increase accessibility and to encourage active travel, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
7. Transport and Communication	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 commits the Council to working to identify solutions to ensure that development improves environmental, social and economic conditions. This would indirectly safeguard existing transport infrastructure and support the provision of new infrastructure to increase the accessibility of key destinations and encourage sustainable and active travel modes. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. Policy S2 requires development proposals to be accessible, to make best use of existing infrastructure and to include provision for additional infrastructure where required, all in order to encourage sustainable and active travel. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Theme		Commentary
	S1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development	S2: Principles of Sustainable Development	
8. Land Use and Soils	~	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between Policy S1 and this SA objective. Policy S2 requires development proposals to optimise the use of land and to address predicted impacts on the natural environment. In line with this SA objective the policy would help to make efficient use of land and, in the case of development proposals on contaminated land would require remediation to take place. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the requirement in Policy S1 to identify solutions which ensure that development proposals improve environmental, social and economic conditions would require the remediation of contaminated land in accordance with relevant environment policies and legislation. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
9. Water	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 commits the Council to working to identify solutions to ensure that development improves environmental, social and economic conditions. This would indirectly protect water resources including the ecological status of the water environment, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy S2 requires development proposals to address predicted impacts on the natural environment. This would protect and enhance water resources, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the requirement in Policy S1 to identify solutions which ensure that development proposals improve environmental, social and economic conditions would include appropriate measures to protect and enhance water resources in accordance with relevant environment policies and legislation. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 commits the Council to working to identify solutions to ensure that development improves environmental, social and economic conditions. The policy also includes safeguards against granting planning permissions where predicted adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh benefits. As such the policy indirectly promotes a pro-active approach to flood risk management, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy S2 requires development proposals to minimise and mitigate climate change and flood risks. This pro-active approach to flood risk management would have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the requirement in Policy S1 to identify solutions which ensure that development proposals improve environmental, social and economic conditions would include appropriate measures to address flood risks in accordance with relevant environment policies and legislation. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Theme		Commentary
	S1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development	S2: Principles of Sustainable Development	
11. Air	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 commits the Council to working to identify solutions to ensure that development improves environmental, social and economic conditions. The policy also includes safeguards against granting planning permissions where predicted adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh benefits. This ensures that air quality impacts, and associated health and environmental effects, will be appropriately treated as material considerations. As a result, the policy is predicted to have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy S2 requires development proposals to address predicted impacts on the natural environment. This would protect and enhance air quality, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the requirement in Policy S1 to identify solutions which ensure that development proposals improve environmental, social and economic conditions would include appropriate measures to safeguard and enhance air quality in accordance with relevant environment policies and legislation. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
12. Climate Change	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 implements the presumption in favour of sustainable development from the NPPF (2012) and states that the Council will work to identify solutions which enable development proposals to improve environmental, social and economic conditions. This would indirectly support climate change mitigation and adaptation through influencing the design and location of development proposals, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy S2 requires all development proposals to contribute to climate change mitigation, incorporate the principles of low carbon development and minimise climate change and flood risks. This would directly implement climate change mitigation and adaptation efforts, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement for development proposals to “<i>aim to achieve higher levels of sustainable construction through incorporating the principles low carbon development</i>” is currently ambiguous and should be clarified in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the requirement in Policy S1 to identify solutions which ensure that development proposals improve environmental, social and economic conditions would include appropriate climate change mitigation and adaptation measures in accordance with relevant environment policies and legislation. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is uncertainty regarding what the requirement for development proposals to “<i>aim to achieve higher levels of sustainable construction through incorporating the principles low carbon development</i>” means in practice.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Theme		Commentary
	S1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development	S2: Principles of Sustainable Development	
13. Waste and Natural Resources	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 states that the Council will work to identify solutions which enable development proposals to improve environmental, social and economic conditions. This would indirectly help to promote the sustainable use of resources, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy S2 requires development proposals to address predicted impacts on the natural environment. This would indirectly help to minimise natural resource use, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the requirement in Policy S1 to identify solutions which ensure that development proposals improve environmental, social and economic conditions would include appropriate measures to minimise natural resource usage and waste as well as to use sustainable materials in accordance with relevant environment policies and legislation. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
14. Cultural Heritage	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 commits the Council to working proactively with the applicant to ensure that development improves environmental, social and economic conditions. This would indirectly support the historical environment and accessibility to key services including CLR venues, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy S2 requires development proposals to be acceptable in terms of their impact on local amenity, which would indirectly protect and enhance heritage assets and therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the requirement in Policy S1 to identify solutions which ensure that development proposals improve environmental, social and economic conditions would include appropriate measures to preserve, protect and enhance cultural heritage assets in accordance with relevant historic environment policies and legislation. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
15. Landscape and Townscape	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy S1 commits the Council to working to identify solutions to ensure that development improves environmental, social and economic conditions. This would indirectly protect and enhance landscape and townscape character, as well as encouraging high quality design, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy S2 requires development proposals to address predicted impacts on the built and natural environment and to safeguard amenity. This would encourage high quality design, protect and enhance landscape and townscape character and safeguard the Green Belt, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the requirement in Policy S1 to identify solutions which ensure that development proposals improve environmental, social and economic conditions would include giving appropriate protection to landscape character and important visual receptors, as well as robustly ensuring high quality design in development proposals, all in accordance with relevant design and environmental policies. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Theme		Commentary
	S1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development	S2: Principles of Sustainable Development	
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Taken together these two policies ensure that the implementation of the Core Strategy contributes to sustainable development, in line with the requirements of the NPPF (2012). These overarching policies would interact with detailed policy requirements contained within subject specific policies, which together could help to implement sustainable development. ▪ Owing to the focus of policy S2 on environmental sustainability issues, subject to the resolution of uncertainties noted below this policy could strengthen the implementation of all other policies related to environmental and amenity protection, resulting in Major Positive cumulative effects on SA objectives 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To address the uncertainties outlined below it is recommended that policies S1 and S2 should be expanded to clarify their relationship with other subject specific policies and how they will be applied by Sunderland City Council to ensure that all development proposals contribute to sustainable development in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is assumed that the requirement in Policy S1 to identify solutions which ensure that development proposals improve environmental, social and economic conditions would include appropriate measures to address a range of sustainability issues, as detailed in the above SA, in accordance with other relevant policies and legislation. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is uncertainty regarding how policies S1 and S2 would be used to ensure the sustainability of development proposals where the proposal either accords with or is contrary to other subject specific policies. This means there is uncertainty regarding the ability of these policies, acting in combination with each other and with other relevant policies, to ensure that all development proposals contribute to sustainable development. 		

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.1.2 No reasonable alternatives have been identified in relation to the assessed policies.

2.2 SA of Spatial Strategy Policies

2.2.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.3. The appraisal is provided in Table 2.4.

Spatial Strategy Polices Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.3 List of Spatial Strategy Policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
SS3: Spatial Delivery for Growth	To support economic growth and meet the city's objectively assessed development needs in accordance with the NPPF.	<p>The Council is unable to identify sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites within its SHLAA to meet the city's objectively assessed housing needs in full. Housing release sites have therefore been identified to provide sufficient land supply to enable the Council to meet its objectively assessed needs.</p> <p>A reasonable alternative which was considered but then discounted would have been to not meet the Council's objectively assessed housing needs in full and continue to protect the existing Green Belt.</p> <p>This approach was not considered to be desirable as it would lead to a shortage of housing supply within the area during the plan period. In addition, all neighbouring authorities have/or will need to amend their own Green Belt boundaries through their own respective plan's to meet their own development needs. It was therefore not considered reasonable to ask these authorities to further develop in their own Green Belt to accommodate Sunderland's needs. Not meeting the city's housing needs is also likely to result in a continuation of net outward migration and population decline, which are trends which the Council wishes to address.</p>
SS4: Urban Core Policy	To support the vitality and viability of the urban core in accordance with the NPPF and to assist the delivery of key Council regeneration priorities.	No reasonable alternatives. Promotes the city centre as the most appropriate location for major retail, office and leisure schemes. The policy also provides support for key regeneration sites within the urban core.

Spatial Strategy SA Matrix

Table 2.4 Appraisal of Draft Spatial Strategies Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Spatial Strategy		Commentary
	SS3 Spatial Delivery for Growth	SS4 Urban Core Policy	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	0	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 directs development proposals to sustainable locations, defined within supporting text to policy SS3 as XX. This would indirectly help to protect biodiversity and geodiversity, including by safeguarding sensitive habitats from inappropriate development. However, the policy also allows the release of Green Belt land to meet housing needs, which could result in adverse impacts on habitats and species. On balance, and taking account of the weak relationship between the policy and this SA objective, a Neutral effect is predicted. There is no clear relationship between Policy SS4 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure that the release of Green Belt land under this policy does not undermine this SA objective or conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations, the policy should be amended to insert the word "<i>inappropriate</i>" before "<i>development</i>" within criteria 4 and to include a cross-reference to assessment criteria within Policy E11 – Green Belt. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that, in directing development proposals to sustainable locations, the application of policy SS3 would have due regard to biodiversity and geodiversity interests. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Spatial Strategy		Commentary
	SS3 Spatial Delivery for Growth	SS4 Urban Core Policy	
2. Housing	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 sets out a strategy for meeting identified housing needs and accommodating predicted population growth by directing new housing development to particular locations, including through residential land use allocations and allowing Green Belt release. By pro-actively helping to meet housing needs the policy would have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy SS4 promotes diverse and high quality residential development in Sunderland City Centre as a means of land use diversification and economic regeneration. This would increase housing provision and improve the quality and choice of housing in a highly accessible location, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
3. Economy and Employment	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 sets out a pro-active strategy for meeting identified employment needs by directing employment and business development to locations capable of accommodating these needs including the city centre, Key Employment Areas and the International Advanced Manufacturing Park. By providing employment land in appropriate locations, the policy would support economic growth, inward investment, new business creation and new employment opportunities, as well as protecting existing businesses. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. Policy SS4 policy provides direct support for economic development, increased office provision and the concentration of retail uses within in Sunderland City Centre. The policy also seeks to enhance the City Centre's vitality and identifies economic regeneration proposals for five Areas of Change . As such the policy directly supports existing businesses, inward investment, regeneration and the creation of new employment opportunities, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
4. Learning and Skills	~	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS4 provides support for the development of higher and further education facilities in Sunderland City Centre, which would improve access to learning facilities in a highly accessible location. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. There is no clear relationship between Policy SS3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Spatial Strategy		Commentary
	SS3 Spatial Delivery for Growth	SS4 Urban Core Policy	
5. Sustainable Communities	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 directs development proposals to sustainable locations, including directing housing and employment development to areas with good accessibility. Policy SS4 directs a range of high footfall generating land uses including employment, leisure and retail developments to Sunderland City Centre, which is highly accessible using existing transport infrastructure and public transport networks. The concentration of key land uses within sustainable and accessible locations including Sunderland City Centre would improve access to community facilities and essential services, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that in directing development proposals to particular locations, the application of policies SS3 and SS4 will have due regard to the location and capacity of existing community facilities and essential services, such that these would be accessible to and able to accommodate new developments. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
6. Health and Wellbeing	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies SS3 and SS4 directs development proposals to sustainable and accessible locations (specifically Sunderland City Centre in relation to policy SS4). This would indirectly improve access to healthcare facilities and greenspaces for residents, whilst indirectly also protecting existing greenspaces and community facilities from development pressures. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that in directing development proposals to particular locations, the application of policies SS3 and SS4 will have due regard to the location and capacity of existing healthcare facilities and open spaces, such that health facilities would be accessible to and able to accommodate new developments. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
7. Transport and Communication	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 directs housing and employment development proposed to particular areas identified in the Draft Sunderland CSDP's Spatial Strategy for Growth, whilst policy SS4 seeks to concentrate high footfall generating main town centre uses in Sunderland City Centre. Policy SS4 also provides support for public realm and connectivity improvements within Sunderland City Centre. Both policies would therefore concentrate development in areas with good accessibility and existing public transport infrastructure, which would improve access to employment opportunities, facilities and services. Policy SS3 allows for Green Belt release to meet housing needs without reference to accessibility or transport impacts, which could adversely impact on the functioning of transport infrastructure, increase car dependency and prevent sustainable modal shifts. This policy is therefore predicted to result in an overall Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. A Major Positive effect is predicted from policy SS4 owing to its focus on concentrating development in the highly accessible Sunderland City Centre. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, ensure the release of Green Belt land under this policy does not undermine this SA objective, conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations or adversely affect the functioning of existing transport infrastructure, the policy should be amended to insert the word "inappropriate" before "development" within criteria 4 and to include a cross-reference to assessment criteria within Policy E11 – Green Belt. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that in directing development proposals to particular locations, the application of policies SS3 and SS4 will have due regard to the capacity and functioning of the existing transport network, such that new development in the specified locations would be able to be accommodated without generating adverse transport impacts. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Spatial Strategy		Commentary
	SS3 Spatial Delivery for Growth	SS4 Urban Core Policy	
8. Land Use and Soils	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 identifies the Vaux site as a location for office led mixed use regeneration, which would include the remediation of contaminated land, and supports economic regeneration within Key Employment Areas, thereby supporting the efficient use of land within Sunderland's existing employment land supply. However, the policy allows for Green Belt release to meet housing needs without consideration of available brownfield sites or potential impacts on agricultural land. On balance, policy SS3 is therefore predicted to result in a Minor Positive impact on this SA objective. Policy SS4 seeks to concentrate higher density main town centre uses within Sunderland City Centre and supports the regeneration of brownfield land at Stadium Village. The policy therefore directly supports the efficient use of land including brownfield land redevelopment, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP ensure the release of Green Belt land under this policy does not undermine this SA objective or conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations, the policy should be amended to insert the word "inappropriate" before "development" within criteria 4 and to include a cross-reference to assessment criteria within Policy E11 – Green Belt. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that in directing development proposals to particular locations, the application of policies SS3 and SS4 will prioritise the redevelopment of brownfield land and seek to minimise the development of greenfield sites. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
9. Water	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 directs development to sustainable locations, which whilst not explicitly defined within the policy could indirectly protect water resources and ensure that water infrastructure can accommodate development proposals. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. There is no clear relationship between Policy SS4 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that, in directing development proposals to particular locations, the application of policies SS3 and SS4 would have due regard to the capacity of water and sewerage networks and to the protection and enhancement of water resources. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Spatial Strategy		Commentary
	SS3 Spatial Delivery for Growth	SS4 Urban Core Policy	
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 directs development proposals to sustainable locations, which whilst not explicitly defined within the policy could direct development away from known flood risk areas. This would indirectly help to minimise flood risks, although the policy does not directly include reference to flood risk management. On balance, a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is predicted. There is no clear relationship between policy SS4 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure that this policy directly contributes to this SA objective, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy should be expanded to take account of flood risk management and to direct inappropriate development, as defined within the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance, away from known flood risk areas. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that, in directing development proposals to particular locations, the identification of these locations and the application of policies SS3 and SS4 would have due regard to flood risk management. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
11. Air	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 directs housing and employment development proposed to particular areas identified in the Draft Sunderland CSDP's Spatial Strategy for Growth, whilst policy SS4 seeks to concentrate high footfall generating main town centre uses in Sunderland City Centre. Both policies would concentrate development in urban areas with good accessibility and existing public transport infrastructure, which could indirectly safeguard or improve air quality through reducing the need for car travel. However, some locations promoted for development in policies SS3 and SS4 may suffer from poor air quality related to existing developments and/or traffic congestion, especially within Sunderland City Centre, and neither policy includes any criteria to assess potential air quality impacts from developing in such locations. On balance both policies are therefore predicted to have only Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure that policies SS3 and SS4 do not inadvertently concentrate development in areas with known poor air quality and thereby exacerbate air pollution, the policy should be amended to include a cross-reference to relevant assessment criteria within Policies HWS1 - Health and Wellbeing and E17 – Quality of Life and Amenity In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that, in directing development proposals to particular locations, the application of policies SS3 and SS4 would have due regard to the protection and enhancement of air quality. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is uncertainty regarding existing air quality in areas which this policy directs development to.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Spatial Strategy		Commentary
	SS3 Spatial Delivery for Growth	SS4 Urban Core Policy	
12. Climate Change	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 directs housing and employment development proposed to particular areas identified in the Draft Sunderland CSDP's Spatial Strategy for Growth, whilst policy SS4 seeks to concentrate high footfall generating main town centre uses in Sunderland City Centre. Both policies would therefore concentrate development in urban areas with good accessibility and existing public transport infrastructure. This would minimise energy use in the transport sector and indirectly support the uptake of sustainable and active travel modes. However, policy SS3 allows for Green Belt release to meet housing needs without reference to accessibility or transport impacts, which could increase car dependency and prevent sustainable modal shifts. On balance, Policy SS3 is therefore predicted to result in a Minor Positive impact on this SA objective, whereas a Major Positive effect is predicted from Policy SS4. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, ensure the release of Green Belt land under this policy does not undermine this SA objective or conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations, the policy should be amended to insert the word "inappropriate" before "development" within criteria 4 and to include cross-references to assessment criteria within Policies E11 – Green Belt and CC1 – Sustainable Travel. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that, in directing development proposals to sustainable locations, the application of policy S3 would have due regard to climate change mitigation and adaptation implications from development proposals. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
13. Waste and Natural Resources	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between Policies SS3 or SS4 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
14. Cultural Heritage	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 supports development to meet identified employment needs, including for creative enterprises, and seeks to direct development to locations with good accessibility to facilities, including CLR venues. Policy SS3 also directs development to sustainable locations, which could indirectly help to protect heritage, cultural and archaeological assets from unacceptable adverse impacts. Owing to the indirect and weak relationship between Policy S3 and this SA objective, only a Minor Positive effect on the SA objective is predicted. Policy SS4 states that SCC will protect and enhance the City Centre's heritage assets. The policy also provides support for new leisure and cultural facilities in the City Centre and supports the development of a cultural hub in Minster Quarter. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is predicted owing to the direct focus of Policy SS4 on cultural heritage protection and cultural development. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that, in directing development proposals to particular locations, the application of policy SS3 would have due regard to the preservation, protection and enhancement of the historic environment. Relevant assessment criteria are already contained within policy SS4. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Spatial Strategy		Commentary
	SS3 Spatial Delivery for Growth	SS4 Urban Core Policy	
15. Landscape and Townscape	0	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 directs development to sustainable locations, which whilst not explicitly defined could indirectly help to protect landscape and townscape character. However, the policy also allows the release of Green Belt land to meet housing needs, which could result in adverse landscape impacts and could affect the functioning and integrity of the Green Belt. On balance, taking account of the weak relationship between the policy and this SA objective, a Neutral effect is predicted. Policy SS4 requires development proposals in Sunderland City Centre to be of a high standard of design that integrates well with the existing urban fabric. The policy also provides support for improvements to the pedestrian environment and public realm. As such the policy would directly contribute to the enhancement of the City Centre's townscape and visual amenity, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure the release of Green Belt land under this policy does not undermine this SA objective or conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations, the policy should be amended to insert the word "<i>inappropriate</i>" before "<i>development</i>" within criteria 4 and to include cross-references to assessment criteria within Policies E11 – Green Belt, E14 – Landscape Character and E15 – Creating and Protecting Views. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that, in directing development proposals to particular locations, the application of policies SS3 and SS4 would have due regard to the protection of landscape and townscape character. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
Likely Cumulative Effects			<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy SS3 interacts with all proposed strategic site allocations and all policies relating to the distribution of development, as it directs development proposals to sustainable locations (undefined) and identifies areas where growth should be focused. Similarly, Policy SS4 interacts with policies relating to the distribution of development as it directs a range of uses to Sunderland City Centre. In combination with each other and with subject specific policies regarding accessibility, infrastructure provision and environmental or amenity protection, Policies SS3 and SS4 would therefore result in Major Positive cumulative effects on SA objectives 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure consistency between policy SS3 and subject specific policies, as well as to ensure that this policy does not undermine SA objectives, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy should be expanded to define "<i>sustainable locations</i>" with reference to sustainability and environmental issues. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure the release of Green Belt land under Policy SS3 does not undermine multiple SA objectives or conflict with the policy requirement to direct development to sustainable locations, the policy should be amended to insert the word "<i>inappropriate</i>" before "<i>development</i>" within criteria 4. For the same reason policy SS3 should also be amended to include appropriate cross-references to assessment criteria within relevant subject specific policies including Policy E11 – Green Belt, E14 – Landscape Character, E15 – Creating and Protecting Views, CC1 – Sustainable Travel, HWS1 - Health and Wellbeing and E17 – Quality of Life and Amenity. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that, in directing development proposals to sustainable locations, the application of policy SS3 would have some level of regard to the full range of sustainability issues detailed within this SA. However, the term "<i>sustainable locations</i>" should be clarified to ensure the effectiveness of this policy. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As policy SS3 does not define "<i>sustainable locations</i>" for development, there is uncertainty regarding whether a range of environmental issues would be considered in assessing development proposals against this policy.

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.2.2 The reasonable alternatives considered in relation to the spatial strategy draft policies (i.e. in respect of policy SS3) are predicted to result in the following effects:

- An alternative strategy which sought to protect the existing Green Belt would not be able to meet OAN for housing and provide the same level of support for economic growth as draft policy SS3. The failure to meet identified needs would result in Major Negative (significant adverse) effects on multiple SA objectives related to socio-economic issues, including SA objectives 2 and 3, whilst the protection afforded to the Green Belt would result in a Major Positive effect on SA Objectives 8 and 15.

2.3 SA of Strategic Site Allocation Policies

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
SA1: Former Vaux Site Strategic Allocation	To ensure the delivery of economic growth in accordance with the NPPF. The policy supports the delivery of a key regeneration project for the Council as set out within the Council's Economic Masterplan and the Economic Leadership Board's 3,6,9 Vision.	No reasonable alternatives. The policy provides the policy framework to deliver the Council's long term aspiration to create a new office led regeneration development on the former Vaux site. The allocation is a continuation of the support already given by Policy SA55A.2 of the existing adopted development plan for central Sunderland (UDP Alteration No.2 – adopted September 2007) and would be consistent with the Council's Economic Masterplan and the Economic Leadership Board's 3,6,9 Vision. The site has planning permission and is under construction.
SA2: South Sunderland Growth Area	To assist the Council in meeting its objectively assessed housing needs in full, in accordance with the NPPF.	A separate Sustainability Appraisal has been prepared for the SSGA, to support the SSGA SPD. Please refer to that SA.
SA3: Housing Release Sites	To assist the Council in meeting its objectively assessed housing needs in full, in accordance with the NPPF. Full details of the assessment undertaken to identify the most appropriate Housing Release Sites is set out within the supporting evidence base to the plan.	The Council is unable to identify sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites within its SHLAA to meet the city's objectively assessed housing needs in full. Housing release sites have therefore been identified to provide sufficient land supply to enable the Council to meet its objectively assessed needs. A reasonable alternative which was considered but then discounted would have been to not meet the Council's objectively assessed housing needs in full and continue to protect the existing Green Belt. This approach was not considered to be desirable as it would lead to a shortage of housing supply within the area during the plan period. In addition, all neighbouring authorities have/or will need to amend their own Green Belt boundaries through their own respective plan's to meet their own development needs. It was therefore not considered reasonable to ask these authorities to further develop in their own Green Belt to accommodate Sunderland's needs. Not meeting the city's housing needs is also likely to result in a continuation of net outward migration and population decline, which are trends which the Council wishes to address. An assessment of all of the sites which were considered as reasonable alternatives is included within the SA.
SA4: Safeguarding Areas	To safeguard future development land between the urban area Green Belt to meet longer term development needs, in accordance with the NPPF.	The NPPF requires that where defining Green Belt boundaries, where necessary, the Council should identify areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. A reasonable alternative was considered under which the Council, would not identify any safeguarded land, however due to limited land supply within the urban area and the need to revise Green Belt boundaries as part of this plan, it was considered prudent to identify a future area for growth at this stage and remove this from the Green Belt boundary now, to reduce the likelihood of needing to undertake another Green Belt Review as part of the next plan.

2.3.1 Policies SA1 – SA4 identify a number of proposed strategic site allocations. Policies SA1 and SA2 propose to allocate the consented development of the Vaux Site and the proposed South Sunderland Growth Area (SSGA), both of which have been scoped out of this SA report for the reasons detailed within Section 4.5 of the Draft Sunderland CSDP SA Report – Main Report. Policy SA3 proposes to allocate a number of Green Belt Housing Release Sites, all of which together with reasonable alternatives have been subject to a SA as reported in Appendix F and therefore do not require further consideration within this Appendix. Policy SA4 proposes to safeguard land (for potential Green Belt release in future plan periods) but it does not set out any substantive policy criteria that would be likely to have an effect on the SA objectives. No new or different environmental or sustainability effects are therefore predicted in relation to policies SA1 – SA4 that are not otherwise considered within the sites based SA presented in Appendix F. Of note, the proposed International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP) is not specifically proposed for allocation within the Draft CSDP, although its delivery is referenced within Policy SS3 – Spatial Delivery for Growth, as it is being taken forward through a specific Area Action Plan (AAP). Once adopted, this AAP will form part of the statutory Development Plan for the SCC area alongside the Sunderland CSDP and other relevant documents. A separate SA has been carried out in relation to the emerging IAMP AAP, hence the IAMP site is not specifically appraised within this appendix.

2.4 SA of Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure Policies

2.4.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.5. The assessment is provided in Table 2.6.

Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure Policies Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.5 List of Health & Wellbeing Policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
HWS1: Health and Wellbeing	To ensure that the plan helps to deliver healthy communities in accordance with the NPPF.	No reasonable alternatives
HWS2: Protection and Delivery of Community, Sport, Social and Cultural Facilities	To protect community, sport, social and cultural facilities to meet local needs in accordance with the NPPF.	No reasonable alternatives
HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism	To support leisure and cultural development within the city, in accordance with the NPPF.	No reasonable alternatives

SA Matrix

Table 2.6 Appraisal of Draft Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure Policies

SA Objective	Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure			Commentary
	HWS1: Health and Wellbeing	HWS2: Protection and delivery of community, sport, social and cultural facilities	Policy HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	+	+	≈	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies HWS1 and HWS2 sets out criteria to protect and improve environmental quality amenity and open space. This would indirectly conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, resulting in Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between Policy HSW3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
2. Housing	++	~	≈	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy HWS1 sets out criteria to improve the quality of Sunderland’s housing stock, which would have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective through improving housing quality. ▪ There is no clear relationship the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure			Commentary
	HWS1: Health and Wellbeing	HWS2: Protection and delivery of community, sport, social and cultural facilities	Policy HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism	
3. Economy and Employment	++	~	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy HWS1 sets out criteria to support the vitality, accessibility and attractiveness of Neighbourhood centres. This would support existing businesses and encourage economic growth and new employment opportunities within Neighbourhood centres, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy HSW3 provides support for culture, leisure and tourism development proposals and well as other development proposals which support Sunderland's 2021 City of Culture bid. The policy also directs such proposals to the hierarchy of identified centres and directs leisure development proposals away from employment land. The policy would therefore directly contribute to this SA objective by providing local employment, enabling the growth of certain economic sectors (e.g. arts, leisure & culture), supporting the vitality of Sunderland City Centre and other centres, and safeguarding the employment land supply for class B and light industrial uses. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. There is no clear relationship between HWS2 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
4. Learning and Skills	+	+	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies HWS1 and HWS2 set out criteria to protect existing community, social and health facilities from adverse development impacts, to prevent the loss of existing facilities and to support the provision of new facilities in accessible locations. This would indirectly support the provision of learning facilities and have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy HSW3 provides support for culture, leisure and tourism development proposals and directs these to the highly accessible hierarchy of identified centres. This would directly contribute to this SA objective through enhancing lifelong learning and cultural education opportunities and facilities, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
5. Sustainable Communities	++	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies HWS1 and HWS2 set out criteria to protect existing community, social and health facilities from adverse development impacts, to prevent the loss of existing facilities and to support the provision of new facilities in accessible locations. Through protecting and increasing access to community facilities and services these policies would have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy HSW3 provides support for culture, leisure and tourism development proposals and well as other development proposals which support Sunderland's 2021 City of Culture bid. The policy also directs such proposals to the hierarchy of identified centres. Concentrating such uses in accessible locations would improve access to both cultural, leisure and tourism facilities and associated employment opportunities, including by non-car based travel, and would also support social inclusion. This policy would therefore have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure			Commentary
	HWS1: Health and Wellbeing	HWS2: Protection and delivery of community, sport, social and cultural facilities	Policy HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism	
6. Health and Wellbeing	+	++	0/?	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy HWS1 set out criteria to protect existing health facilities from adverse development impacts, to prevent the loss of existing facilities and to support the provision of new facilities in accessible locations. Policy HWS1 also sets out measures to encourage healthy lifestyles including restricting new unhealthy eating outlets, promoting access to greenspace and working with the NHS to reduce health inequalities. Policy HWS1 requires proposals for 100+ residential units to be supported by a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) to explain how health considerations have informed the design of development proposals. This would indirectly support the creation of healthy environments, although an HIA would not itself ensure the creation of healthy environments. Overall this results in only a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy HWS2 sets out criteria to protect existing facilities and support the development of new facilities, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy HSW3 provides support for culture, leisure and tourism development proposals and directs these to the hierarchy of identified centres identified in policies EP8 and EP9. Providing leisure facilities in accessible locations could have positive or adverse health impacts depending on whether this encourages physical activities, improved wellbeing and mental health and/or unhealthy activities including alcohol consumption. Owing to this uncertainty this policy is predicted to have a Neutral effect on this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP maximise the contribution of policy HWS1 to this SA objective it is recommended that further information requirements for HIA should be specified and the policy should not support development proposals where an HIA indicates that they would result in adverse health effects. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP allow Policy HSW3 to contribute positively to this SA objective it is recommended that in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, the policy should be expanded to specifically encourage leisure development proposals which contribute to healthy lifestyles, including facilities to undertake physical activities. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the requirement within policy HWS1 to provide a HIA would allow health impacts to be material considerations in the determination of relevant planning applications, although the policy could be amended to confirm this. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is uncertainty regarding the role of HIA's (policy HWS1) in the determination of planning applications, beyond merely providing information to decision makers. There is uncertainty regarding the support provided for new leisure and tourism developments in Policy HSW3 would encourage healthy and/or unhealthy activities.
7. Transport and Communication	+	~	++	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy HWS1 sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals are accessible, promote active travel modes and improve the quality of open space provision. This would reduce car dependency, improve the quality of the environment for non-car users and promote sustainable modal shifts., Policy HWS1 also sets out criteria to support the vitality and accessibility of Neighbourhood centres. This would support public transport provision and help to address traffic congestion. There is a weak relationship between this policy and SA objective. Overall a Minor Positive effect is predicted. Policy HSW3 directs proposed cultural, leisure and tourism development to the highly accessible city and town centres identified in policies EP8 and EP9. This would link new high footfall development with sustainable transport provision and therefore support sustainable modal shifts, resulting in a direct major positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between HWS2 and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure			Commentary
	HWS1: Health and Wellbeing	HWS2: Protection and delivery of community, sport, social and cultural facilities	Policy HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism	
8. Land Use and Soils	~	~	±	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy HSW3 provides support for culture, leisure and tourism development proposals and directs these to the hierarchy of identified centres identified in policies EP8 and EP9. This would optimise the use of available land and indirectly support the redevelopment of brownfield land within the identified centres. The policies would therefore have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
9. Water	+	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy HWS1 requires development proposals not to have an adverse impact on the environment or residential amenity, including through water pollution. This would directly protect water resources, Policy HWS1 sets out criteria to protect environmental quality and amenity, which would indirectly support water resources and overall therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that in directing new culture, leisure and tourism developments to the hierarchy of identified centres identified in policies EP8 and EP9, Policy HSW3 has taken account of any known flood risks in these general areas. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required.

SA Objective	Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure			Commentary
	HWS1: Health and Wellbeing	HWS2: Protection and delivery of community, sport, social and cultural facilities	Policy HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism	
11. Air	++	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy HWS1 sets out criteria to protect environmental quality and amenity, including requiring development proposals not to have adverse air pollution impacts. This would protect and enhance air quality, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
12. Climate Change	+	~	±	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies HWS1 sets out criteria to protect environmental quality and amenity, which would indirectly enhance resilience, support climate change adaptation and therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy HWS3 directs proposed cultural, leisure and tourism development to the highly accessible city and town centres identified in policies EEP8 and EP9. This could reduce car dependency, encourage sustainable modal shifts and thus contribute to climate change mitigation. However, the positive relationship between these policies and this SA objective is weak owing to a lack of coverage of wider climate change issues. There is no clear relationship between HWS2 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
13. Waste and Natural Resources	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Health, Wellbeing and Social Infrastructure			Commentary
	HWS1: Health and Wellbeing	HWS2: Protection and delivery of community, sport, social and cultural facilities	Policy HWS3: Culture, Leisure and Tourism	
14. Cultural Heritage	+	~	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy HWS1 sets out criteria to protect environmental quality and amenity whilst policy DM1 requires development proposals not to have adverse impacts through air, noise or water pollution. This would indirectly conserve heritage assets and their environmental setting, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy HSW3 provides support for culture, leisure and tourism development proposals and well as other development proposals which support Sunderland's 2021 City of Culture bid. The policy also directs such proposals to the hierarchy of identified centres. This would allow CLR venues to be developed in highly accessible locations, resulting in improved opportunities to access to cultural activities. The policy would therefore have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between Policy HWS2 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
15. Landscape and Townscape	+	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy HWS1 sets out criteria to protect environmental quality and amenity, as well as to support the local distinctiveness of Neighbourhood Centres. It also requires development proposals to improve the quality of open space provision, which would indirectly contribute to local distinctiveness and landscape/townscape character. Overall this would indirectly conserve and enhance landscape and townscape character, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between HWS2 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies HSW1 and HSW2 set out the Council's approach to improving health and well-being, which seeks to both reduce negative environmental and amenity impacts and to increase positive health and wellbeing outcomes through providing community facilities, improving greenspace provision (access and quality) and supporting sustainable modal shifts and active travel. Policies HSW1 and HSW2 reinforce each other and would interact with relevant environmental quality, greenspace and amenity protection policies, as well as policies SS1 and SS2 in relation to implementing sustainable development. These policies would therefore have Minor Positive cumulative effects on SA objectives 1, 6 and 11. By meeting cultural, leisure and tourism development needs in appropriate and accessible locations and by directing high footfall development proposals to the identified hierarchy of centres, this policy would help to implement sustainable development, provide facilities to meet population needs and support the vitality and vibrancy of the identified centres. This would result in Minor Positive cumulative effects in combination with policies SS1, SS2, SS3 and SS4 on SA objectives 3 and 5. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy HWS1 should be expanded to clarify the role of HIA's in the determination of relevant planning applications, to ensure that health impacts are appropriately treated as material considerations in combination with other relevant policies in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. 			

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.4.2 No reasonable alternatives have been identified in relation to the assessed policies.

2.5 SA of Housing Policies

2.5.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.7. The assessment is provided in Table 2.8.

Policy Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.7 List of Housing Policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Comply with the requirements of the NPPF and meet the housing needs and aspirations of the city's existing and proposed residents	No reasonable alternative
H2: Housing Delivery	Comply with the requirements of the NPPF	Reasonable alternative in relation to the level and phasing of housing targets, however this could put at risk shortfalls in the housing supply and potentially unsustainable sites being put forward for development.
HS3: Housing Mix	Comply with the requirements of the NPPF and to stem out migration of population to other areas due to lack of housing choice.	No reasonable alternative
H4: Affordable Housing	Comply with NPPF	Reasonable alternative could see the percentage requirement increased or decreased. However, SCC's Whole Plan Viability Assessment indicates that the selected percentage level is the maximum achievable whilst ensuring sites remain viable. Any reduction in the percentage level would not meet identified affordable housing needs.
H5: Student Accommodation	Contribute to regenerating the city centre. Offering students a choice in quality of accommodation, whilst ensuring it is located in the most sustainable location.	Reasonable alternative could be to not place locational requirements on new student accommodation. However, this may result in developments occurring outside of the city centre, which may be unsustainable and as such not contributing to the creation of a vibrant university city centre and its regeneration.
H6: Travelling Showpeople, Gypsies and Travellers	Complies with NPPF and NPPG - Planning Policy for traveller sites	No reasonable alternatives to actual policy, however alternative site locations have been considered through the SA report.
H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Complies with NPPF, in terms of reusing existing resources	No reasonable alternative
H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Ensure HMO properties are not detrimental to the character and function of an area, its local amenity or neighbouring properties.	No reasonable alternatives
H9: Backland and Tandem Development	Protect the local distinctiveness and character of an area.	No reasonable alternatives
H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Comply with the requirements of the NPPF and meet the housing needs and aspirations of the city's existing and proposed residents	No reasonable alternative

SA Matrix

Table 2.8 Appraisal of Draft Housing Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	~	-/?	~	=	=	=	=	=	++	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None of these policies address site specific or detailed ecological matters, resulting in a lack of direct effects on this SA objective. Policy H9 sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals safeguard residential amenity and protect environmental quality. This would indirectly protect and enhance local ecological connectivity, habitats and species, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 could result in residential development to meet or exceed housing needs which adversely affects biodiversity interests. However, any residential development proposals would also need to accord with other policies which do set out criteria to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity interests. The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 is therefore expected to only have a limited adverse effect on biodiversity and geodiversity interests, resulting in a Minor Negative effect on this SA objective Policy H1 provides support for objectives and policy tests stated in other housing policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure that residential development proposals do not result in adverse biodiversity impacts, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP policy H2 should be expanded to define the term "appropriate sites" and include appropriate acceptability criteria, including in relation to the protection of biodiversity and geodiversity interests. In doing so the revised policy should clarify that residential development proposals should accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP. . <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that environmental protection policies would safeguard biodiversity interests from adverse impacts resulting from housing delivery. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Policy H2 the term "appropriate" is not objectively defined. This creates uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to determine whether development proposals accord with this policy.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
2. Housing	++/?	++/?	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the assessed policies would individually and cumulatively result in the provision of suitable housing of all types to meet identified needs, in particular by ensuring delivery of affordable housing and an appropriate range and mix of housing, including the provision of specialist housing to meet identified needs. These policies would therefore have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address, uncertainties (see below), Policy H2 should explain the Council's housing land strategy and set out mechanism to ensure that a five year land supply is maintained at all times In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP.. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is uncertainty within Policies H1 and H2 regarding what the spatial strategy and site allocations to meet the specified housing supply targets are, as well as what mechanisms will be used to ensure the maintenance of a five year land supply at all times.
3. Economy and Employment	~	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the provision of a range of housing to meet identified needs through Policies H2 – H9 would help support economic growth by providing local accommodation for workers. Sustained levels of increased housebuilding, alongside housing renewal and replacement programmes, would also directly increase construction related economic activity and employment in line with this SA objective. All of these policies would therefore have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy H1 provides support for objectives and policy tests stated in other housing policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
4. Learning and Skills	~	~	~	≈	±	±	≈	≈	≈	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy H5 sets out criteria relating to the need for and quality of new student accommodation proposals. This would support the provision of high quality student accommodation to meet identified needs and therefore indirectly contribute to the development of higher education institutions. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. Policy H6 ensures sufficient provision of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites, which would indirectly support children to attend local educational facilities. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
5. Sustainable Communities	~	~	~	±	++	++	≈	≈	≈	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy H4 specifies an affordable housing requirement for residential development proposals (15%) and sets out related delivery mechanisms. The policy requires affordable housing to be provided on-site to help achieve mixed and balanced communities. The creation of multi-tenure developments would help to promote social cohesion, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective/ Policies H5 and H6 direct proposals for specialist housing to areas with high accessibility and suitable infrastructure provision including Sunderland City Centre. These policies would improve access to local services, facilities and amenities, promote social inclusion and ensure appropriate infrastructure provision for existing and new residents. These policies would therefore have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy H1 provides support for objectives and policy tests stated in other housing policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
6. Health and Wellbeing	~	~	++	=	++	++	±	=	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies H5 and H6 direct proposals for specialist housing to areas with high accessibility and suitable infrastructure provision. This would improve access to open space and amenities including healthcare and leisure facilities, as well as encouraging active travel. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. ▪ Policy H7 provides support for proposals to improve, renew and replace the existing housing stock, which would improve health outcomes for existing residents and have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy H3 provides support for proposals to make housing accessible and adaptable for wheelchair users directly supporting those with disabilities. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. ▪ Policy H1 provides support for objectives and policy tests stated in other housing policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effects on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
7. Transport and Communication	~	~	++	=	++	++	=	=	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy H3 requires development proposals to achieve an appropriate density for their location, taking into account the character of the area and the sustainable use of land. This would support higher density residential development in areas of high accessibility and adequate infrastructure to accommodate population growth, including in Sunderland City Centre. This would reduce travel needs and improve the accessibility of key services and facilities to residents, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policies H5 and H6 direct proposals for specialist housing, to areas with high accessibility and suitable infrastructure provision. This would reduce travel needs and improve the accessibility of key services and facilities to residents, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy H1 provides support for objectives and policy tests stated in other housing policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
8. Land Use and Soils		-/?	+							<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy H3 requires development proposals to achieve an appropriate density for their location, taking into account the character of the area and the sustainable use of land. This would optimise the use of land and have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy H2 sets out phased minimum housing supply targets, states that these are minimum targets and further housing delivery will be supported on “appropriate” sites. However, the term “appropriate” is not objectively defined with reference to any acceptability criteria. This creates a tension between this policy and environmental policies, in particular policies E11 and E12. Given that the emerging CSDP’s spatial strategy involves significant Green Belt housing release to achieve stated targets, the support given in policy H2 for housing proposals to meet and exceed these targets without reference to specific acceptability criteria is an important omission. As drafted Policy H2 could be interpreted as providing support for residential development proposals that would may not be supported by other policies, including policies E11 and E12 for sites located within the Green Belt or Settlement Breaks. However, all residential development proposals would also be assessed against other relevant policies and discussions with Council officers have indicated that the reference to “appropriate” sites within Policy H2 refers to the accordance of proposals with other relevant policies. Owing to the identified uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to assess residential development proposals under policy H2, a Minor Negative effect on this SA objective is predicted. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address the predicted Minor Negative effect on this SA objective, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP policy H2 should be expanded to define the term “appropriate sites” and include appropriate acceptability criteria. In doing so the revised policy should clarify that residential development proposals should accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Policy H2 the term “appropriate” is not objectively defined. This creates uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to determine whether development proposals accord with this policy.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
9. Water	~	-/?	~	=	=	±				<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 could result in residential development to meet or exceed housing needs which adversely affects the water environment. However, any residential development proposals would also need to accord with other policies which do set out assessment criteria to protect and enhance the water environment. The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 is therefore expected to only have a limited adverse effect on the water environment, resulting in a Minor Negative effect on this SA objective Policy H6 requires proposals for new GTTS sites to be capable of connection to energy, water and sewage infrastructure. This would ensure that such proposals can be serviced using available water resources and that effluent is adequately treated, thereby protecting the water environment. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address the predicted Minor Negative effect on this SA objective, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP policy H2 should be expanded to define the term "appropriate sites" and include appropriate acceptability criteria. In doing so the revised policy should clarify that residential development proposals should accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Policy H2 the term "appropriate" is not objectively defined. This creates uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to determine whether development proposals accord with this policy.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	~	-/?	~	=	=	=	=	=	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The absence of specific acceptability criteria within policy H2 does not reflect the requirements of the NPPF with respect to flood risk management. However, any residential development proposals would also need to accord with policies CM4 – CM5 which do set out flood risk assessment criteria in line with NPPF requirements. The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 is therefore expected to only have a limited adverse effect in relation to sustainable flood risk management, resulting in a Minor Negative effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure housing delivery minimises flood risks, policy H2 should be expanded define the term “<i>appropriate sites</i>” in relation to sites for housing proposals to both meet or exceed housing supply targets. In doing so the policy should cross-reference the Sequential and Exception Test requirements of policies CM4, CM5 and the NPPF. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that in directing housing to accessible locations including Sunderland City Centre, policies H5 and H6 have considered known flood risks in these general areas. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Policy H2 the term “<i>appropriate</i>” is not objectively defined. This creates uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to determine whether development proposals accord with this policy.
11. Air	~	~	~	=	=	=	=	=	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
12. Climate Change	~	~	+	=	±	±	=	=	=	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies H5 and H6 direct proposals for specialist housing to areas with high accessibility and suitable infrastructure provision, including Sunderland City Centre. In addition, □ Policy H3 requires development proposals to achieve an appropriate density for their location, taking into account the character of the area and the sustainable use of land. In line with this SA objective these policies would indirectly ensure access to public transport for new residents, supporting sustainable modal shifts leading to carbon emissions reduction. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. ▪ Policy H1 provides support for objectives and policy tests stated in other housing policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effects on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
13. Waste and Natural Resources	~	~	~	=	=	=	=	±	=	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy H8 requires proposals for HMOs to include adequate provision refuse and recycling arrangements. This would help to increase the uptake of recycling amongst transient demographic groups, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
14. Cultural Heritage	~	-?	+	=	=	=	=	=	±	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 could result in residential development to meet or exceed housing needs which adversely affects the historic environment. However, any residential development proposals would also need to accord with other policies which do set out assessment criteria to preserve, conserve, protect and enhance the historic environment. The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 is therefore expected to only have a limited adverse effect on the historic environment, resulting in a Minor Negative effect on this SA objective. Policy H3 requires residential development proposals to take account of their site context, whilst policy H9 requires development proposals to contribute to local distinctiveness and protect environmental quality and amenity. This would help to protect and enhance the historic environment, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy H1 provides support for objectives and policy tests stated in other housing policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure that residential development proposals do not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on the historic environment, policy H2 should be expanded to define the term "appropriate sites" and include appropriate acceptability criteria. In doing so the revised policy should clarify that residential development proposals should accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Policy H2 the term "appropriate" is not objectively defined. This creates uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to determine whether development proposals accord with this policy.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
15. Landscape and Townscape	~	-/?	++	=	=	=	=	=	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 could result in residential development to meet or exceed housing needs which adversely affects landscape and/or townscape character. However, any residential development proposals would also need to accord with other policies which do set out assessment criteria to protect and enhance landscapes and visual amenity. The absence of specific acceptability criteria within Policy H2 is therefore expected to only have a limited adverse effect on landscape and townscape interests, resulting in a Minor Negative effect on this SA objective Policy H3 requires residential development proposals to take account of their site context, whilst policy H9 requires development proposals to contribute to local distinctiveness and protect environmental quality and amenity. This would promote high quality design, contribute to local distinctiveness and protect and enhance landscape/townscape character, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy H1 provides support for objectives and policy tests stated in other housing policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure that residential development proposals do not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on landscapes and townscapes, policy H2 should be expanded to define the term “appropriate sites” and include appropriate acceptability criteria. In doing so the revised policy should set out acceptability criteria, including with reference to the protection of landscape character, local distinctiveness and visual amenity, and should also clarify that residential development proposals should accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Policy H2 the term “appropriate” is not objectively defined. This creates uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to determine whether development proposals accord with this policy.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Homes									Commentary
	Policy H1: Sustainable Neighbourhoods	Policy H2: Housing Delivery	Policy H3: Housing Mix	Policy H4: Affordable Housing	Policy H5: Student Accommodation	Policy H6: Travelling showpeople, gypsies and travellers	Policy H7: Residential Conversions and Change of Use	Policy H8: Housing in Multiple Occupation	Policy H9: Backland and Tandem Development	
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acting together and in combination with policy S1, all of the Housing policies would have a Major Positive synergistic effect on SA objectives 2 and 3 as they would support the provision of well-designed housing in appropriate and accessible locations to meet identified housing (and thus labour supply) needs. Delivering sufficient housing to meet identified needs would necessitate development on greenfield sites including the release of land from the Green Belt. The policies clearly address housing needs; in particular, policy H2 sets out phased minimum housing supply targets, states that these are minimum targets and further housing delivery will be supported on “appropriate” sites. However, the term “appropriate” is not objectively defined with reference to any acceptability criteria. As such there is a tension between these housing delivery policies and environmental policies, in particular policies E11 and E12. Given that the emerging CSDP’s spatial strategy involves significant Green Belt housing release to achieve the targets specified in policy H2, the support given for housing proposals to meet and exceed these targets without reference to specific acceptability criteria is an important omission. As drafted the housing delivery policies could, if read in isolation, be interpreted as providing support for residential development proposals that would not be supported by other policies, including policies E11 and E12 for sites located within the Green Belt or Settlement Breaks. However, all residential development proposals would also be assessed against other relevant policies and discussions with Council officers have indicated that the reference to “appropriate” sites within Policy H2 refers to the accordance of proposals with other relevant policies. Owing to the identified uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to assess residential development proposals under policy H2, in the absence of any mitigation there is the potential for Minor Adverse cumulative effects to occur on SA objectives 1, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15. To address the predicted Major Adverse cumulative effects, in the next iteration of the emerging CSDP policy H2 should be amended to objectively define the term “appropriate” in relation to housing proposals to exceed specific targets. To further enhance the effectiveness of these policies, where relevant they should be expanded to include acceptability criteria for all residential development proposals, including those intended to meet the specified housing targets. These policies would interact with employment land related policies in relation to the spatial match between allocated residential and employment locations. The spatial distribution of new housing and employment development would affect the accessibility of employment opportunities, the available labour market and the attractiveness and sustainability of new housing. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to ensure that residential development proposals do not result in adverse impacts on receptors covered by SA objectives 1, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP policy H2 should be expanded define the term “appropriate sites” in relation to sites for housing proposals to both meet or exceed housing supply targets. In doing so the policy should set out acceptability criteria, including with reference to the protection of specific receptors and the need for development proposals to accord with all other relevant policies within the Sunderland CSDP. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within Policy H2 the term “appropriate” is not objectively defined. This creates uncertainty regarding the acceptability criteria used to determine whether development proposals accord with this policy, particularly where a development proposal does not accord with other policies. This should be clarified in the next iteration of the emerging CSD None identified. 									

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.5.2 The reasonable alternatives considered in relation to the sustainable development draft policies are predicted to result in the following effects:

- Reasonable alternatives under Policy H2 in relation to the level and phasing of housing targets could either reduce or increase pressure and policy support for housing delivery. A reduction or delayed phasing of the housing supply target to below OAN would result in Policy H2 having an adverse effect on SA objective 2. This could be significant in SEA terms depending on the risk of a housing supply shortfall below OAN occurring. Conversely, an increase or accelerated phasing of the housing supply target would increase development pressure and could result in potentially unsuitable sites being put forward for development. This could have a Negative effect on SA objectives 1, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15, which could be significant in SEA terms depending on the extent to which unsustainable sites are proposed for development.
- Reasonable alternatives under Policy H4 could either increase or decrease the affordable housing percentage requirement. However, the selected percentage in the policy has been set at the maximum achievable level based on viability as set out in SCC’s Whole Plan Viability Assessment. To increase the percentage above this level would most likely make proposed housing unviable and to decrease it would not meet identified affordable housing needs. In both circumstances housing provision would be suboptimal and policy H4 may not be able to meet identified housing needs, resulting in a Negative effect on SA objective 2. This could be significant depending on the extent to which the affordable housing percentage requirement selected prevents identified affordable housing needs from being met and/or restricts the supply of new build private housing, also to meet identified needs.
- A reasonable alternative under Policy H5 could be to not place locational requirements on new student accommodation. Support for new student developments without any locational steer could result in student accommodation developments being located in less accessible and/or inappropriate locations. This would result in Negative effects on SA objectives 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14 and 15, which could be significant in SEA terms depending on the types of locations where development may be proposed.

2.6 SA of Economic Growth Policies

2.6.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.9. The assessment is provided in Table 2.10.

Policy Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.9 List of Economic Growth policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
EP1: Economic Growth	To support economic growth in accordance with the NPPF.	No reasonable alternatives
EP2: Primary Employment Areas	To support economic growth in accordance with the NPPF. Primary Employment Areas and reasonable alternatives have been assessed as part of this SA.	No reasonable alternatives
EP3: Key Employment Areas	To support economic growth in accordance with the NPPF. Key Employment Areas and reasonable alternatives have been assessed as part of this SA.	No reasonable alternatives
EP4: Other Employment Sites	To support economic growth in accordance with the NPPF.	No reasonable alternatives
EP5: New Employment Areas	To support economic growth in accordance with the NPPF.	No reasonable alternatives
EP6: Offices	To support economic growth in accordance with the NPPF.	No reasonable alternatives
EP7: Trade Counters	To support economic growth and protect the vitality and viability of centres in accordance with the NPPF.	No reasonable alternatives

SA Matrix

Table 2.10 Appraisal of Draft Economic Prosperity Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Economic Prosperity							Commentary
	Policy EP1: Economic Growth	Policy EP2: Primary Employment Areas	Policy EP3: Key Employment Areas	Policy EP4: Other employment sites	Policy EP5: New employment areas	Policy EP6: Offices	Policy EP7: Trade Counters	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Policies EP2 and EP3 allocate Primary and Key Employment Areas (PEA and KEA) respectively. Potential effects from proposed strategic site allocations are considered separately in Appendix F. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ For this purpose of this policy assessment it is assumed that, in allocating PEA and KEA, policies EP2 and EP3 have taken account of relevant biodiversity and natural heritage considerations. Refer to Appendix F for an assessment of proposed strategic site allocations. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Economic Prosperity							Commentary
	Policy EP1: Economic Growth	Policy EP2: Primary Employment Areas	Policy EP3: Key Employment Areas	Policy EP4: Other employment sites	Policy EP5: New employment areas	Policy EP6: Offices	Policy EP7: Trade Counters	
2. Housing	-	-	-	-	-	-	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These policies restrict non-employment uses in designated employment areas, which whilst safeguarding economic uses could limit the provision of new housing close to employment opportunities and restrict the creation of mixed use neighbourhoods. A Minor Negative effect from all policies except Policy E7 (which is not of relevance) on this SA objective is therefore predicted. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the housing delivery policies will support the delivery of sufficient homes in appropriate locations to accommodate the labour supply working within the Sunderland City Council area over the plan period of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
3. Economy and Employment	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These policies provide support for new employment uses and identify designated locations where specific employment uses should be directed to, whilst seeking to prevent the loss of employment space within designated areas. Policies EP2, EP3 and EP7 set out criteria to ensure that new employment/commercial developments are compatible with surrounding uses/business operations and the character and employment function of designated employment areas. These policies therefore all directly support economic activities and the delivery of new employment opportunities, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
4. Learning and Skills	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By providing new employment and business opportunities in appropriate locations these policies could indirectly support the creation of apprenticeships and training opportunities. The policies are therefore considered to have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Economic Prosperity							Commentary
	Policy EP1: Economic Growth	Policy EP2: Primary Employment Areas	Policy EP3: Key Employment Areas	Policy EP4: Other employment sites	Policy EP5: New employment areas	Policy EP6: Offices	Policy EP7: Trade Counters	
5. Sustainable Communities	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
6. Health and Wellbeing	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
7. Transport and Communication	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These policies seek to concentrate new employment, office and light industrial uses within specified highly accessible locations. This would help to manage transport impacts from new development, support sustainable modal shifts and increase the efficiency of freight transport, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Economic Prosperity							Commentary
	Policy EP1: Economic Growth	Policy EP2: Primary Employment Areas	Policy EP3: Key Employment Areas	Policy EP4: Other employment sites	Policy EP5: New employment areas	Policy EP6: Offices	Policy EP7: Trade Counters	
8. Land Use and Soils	~	~	~	+?	+?	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP4 and EP5 allow employment development/use change proposals outwith PEAs and KEAs where they would provide significant regeneration benefits and are acceptable, including in terms of access and amenity impacts. Whilst there are tensions between the two policies, overall this would help to create mixed use and liveable neighbourhoods with accessible economic activities and employment opportunities, as well as optimising the use of land and supporting socio-economic renewal. Minor Positive effects on this SA objective are therefore predicted. ▪ Policy EP6 restricts office floorspace development proposals outwith specified locations, unless they are ancillary to the principal use, or it can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that it is necessary for the development to be located there for operational reasons. This both directs office developments to the most appropriate locations and provides sufficient flexibility to respond to identified needs, which would help to ensure the efficient use of available land. As such a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is predicted. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to improve clarity and policy effectiveness it is recommended that in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policies EP4 and EP5 should be combined into a single policy. A rationalised policy should provide support for new employment uses or extensions outwith PEA and KEA where a) the proposal would contribute to significant regeneration or where a need for the development at the proposed location can be demonstrated and b) no unacceptable adverse impacts would occur, including on access and amenity. ▪ The term "<i>acceptable development</i>" in Policy EP4 should be defined. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is assumed that the term "<i>acceptable development</i>" in Policy EP4 means development without unacceptable adverse impacts, however this should be clarified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is uncertainty regarding the definition of "<i>acceptable development</i>" in Policy EP4. There is further uncertainty regarding the interaction between policies EP4 and EP5, as these set out different policy tests to assess new employment proposals located outwith PEA and KEA.
9. Water	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP2 and EP3 allocate Primary and Key Employment Areas (PEA and KEA) respectively. Potential effects from proposed strategic site allocations are considered separately in Appendix F. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For this purpose of this policy assessment it is assumed that, in allocating PEA and KEA, policies EP2 and EP3 have taken account of impacts on water resources. Refer to Appendix F for an assessment of proposed strategic site allocations. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Economic Prosperity							Commentary
	Policy EP1: Economic Growth	Policy EP2: Primary Employment Areas	Policy EP3: Key Employment Areas	Policy EP4: Other employment sites	Policy EP5: New employment areas	Policy EP6: Offices	Policy EP7: Trade Counters	
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies EP2 and EP3 allocate Primary and Key Employment Areas (PEA and KEA) respectively. Potential effects from proposed strategic site allocations are considered separately in Appendix F. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For this purpose of this policy assessment it is assumed that, in allocating PEA and KEA, policies EP2 and EP3 have taken account of flood risk considerations. Refer to Appendix F for an assessment of proposed strategic site allocations. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.
11. Air	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These policies do not directly contribute to this SA objective. However, the policies seek to concentrate new employment, office and light industrial uses within highly accessible designated areas, which could indirectly safeguard air quality by maximising public transport commuting rather than increased car travel. As such Minor Positive effects on this SA objective are predicted. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
12. Climate Change	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These policies seek to concentrate new employment, office and light industrial uses within highly accessible designated areas, which would support sustainable modal shifts and contribute to climate change mitigation. Minor Positive effects on this SA objective are therefore predicted. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
13. Waste and Natural Resources	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Economic Prosperity							Commentary
	Policy EP1: Economic Growth	Policy EP2: Primary Employment Areas	Policy EP3: Key Employment Areas	Policy EP4: Other employment sites	Policy EP5: New employment areas	Policy EP6: Offices	Policy EP7: Trade Counters	
14. Cultural Heritage	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP2 and EP3 allocate Primary and Key Employment Areas (PEA and KEA) respectively. Potential effects from proposed strategic site allocations are considered separately in Appendix F. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For this purpose of this policy assessment it is assumed that, in allocating PEA and KEA, policies EP2 and EP3 have taken account of relevant cultural heritage considerations. Refer to Appendix F for an assessment of proposed strategic site allocations. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None.
15. Landscape and Townscape	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP2 and EP3 allocate Primary and Key Employment Areas (PEA and KEA) respectively. Potential effects from proposed strategic site allocations are considered separately in Appendix F. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For this purpose of this policy assessment it is assumed that, in allocating PEA and KEA, policies EP2 and EP3 have taken account of relevant landscape considerations. Refer to Appendix F for an assessment of proposed strategic site allocations. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None.
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ These policies all safeguard existing and support new employment, office and businesses/light industrial developments in appropriate locations; therefore each of these policies interacts positively with and reinforces the other assessed policies. The policies seek to meet identified employment needs and to stimulate economic growth in appropriate locations, which would directly contribute to the implementation of sustainable development and the Core Strategy's spatial strategy. As such these policies would have Major Positive cumulative effects in combination with each other and with policies S1, S2, SS3 and SS4 on SA objective 3. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. 							

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.6.2 No reasonable alternatives have been identified in relation to the assessed policies.

2.7 SA of Retail and Town Centre Policies

2.7.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.11. The appraisal is provided in Table 2.12.

Policy Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.11 List of Retail and Town Centre policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
EP8: Designated Centres	To protect the vitality and viability of centres in accordance with the NPPF.	No reasonable alternatives
EP9: Retail Hierarchy	To establish a retail hierarchy in accordance with the NPPF.	No reasonable alternatives
EP10: Retail Impact Assessments	To establish local thresholds for Retail Impact Assessments in accordance with the NPPF	To rely on the default NPPF threshold. This was not considered to be appropriate however due to the sensitivity of some of the city's centres to significant adverse impacts from out-of-centre development, as set out within the Strategic Retail Needs Assessment
EP11: Primary and Secondary Frontages	To identify primary and secondary frontages and make clear what uses would be appropriate within these in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
EP12: Hot Food Takeaways	To protect the vitality and viability of centres in accordance with the NPPF	There is increasing concern over the number and concentration of hot food takeaways within the city's centres. Not including a policy on this was considered, but due to concerns over the impact that such uses are already having on the vitality and viability of centres, this was not considered to be appropriate.

SA Matrix

Table 2.12 Appraisal of Draft Retail and Town Centre Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Retail and Town Centre					Commentary
	Policy EP8: Designated Centres	Policy EP9: Retail Hierarchy	Policy EP10: Retail Impact Assessments	Policy EP11: Primary and Secondary Frontages	Policy EP12: Hot Food Takeaways	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	~	~	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Retail and Town Centre					Commentary
	Policy EP8: Designated Centres	Policy EP9: Retail Hierarchy	Policy EP10: Retail Impact Assessments	Policy EP11: Primary and Secondary Frontages	Policy EP12: Hot Food Takeaways	
2. Housing	+	0	~	0	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies EP8 and EP9 restrict non-main town centre uses from the hierarchy of identified centres, which whilst safeguarding retail and other economic uses could limit the provision of new housing in highly accessible locations. However, Policy EP8 indicates that high density residential development adjacent to higher order centres will be supported, whilst Policy EP9 focuses on directing main town centre uses rather than restricting residential development per se. On balance policy EP8 is predicted to have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective through supporting residential development in Sunderland City Centre, whereas policy EP9 is predicted to have a Neutral effect. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the housing delivery policies will support the delivery of sufficient homes in appropriate locations to accommodate the labour supply working within the Sunderland City Council area over the plan period of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
3. Economy and Employment	++	++	++	++	±	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies EP8, EP9 and EP11 direct retail and other main town centre uses to the hierarchy of identified centres, whilst Policy EP10 sets out criteria to ensure that retail developments proposed for edge or out of centre retail development do not adversely affect the vitality of the existing designated centres in the established retail hierarchy. As such the policies directly contribute to this SA objective through safeguarding existing and supporting new economic activities and employment in highly accessible locations, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy EP12 provides support for hot food takeaway development proposals within designated centres subject to specified criteria including where units have been vacant for 24 months and marketed for main town centre uses. This would support the economically productive use of available space in designated centres and contribute to their footfall levels and vitality, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
4. Learning and Skills	+	+	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies EP8 and EP9 supports new community, cultural and social uses within the hierarchy of identified centres. This could allow education facilities to be developed in highly accessible locations, resulting in improved opportunities to access education and learning. These policies would therefore have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Retail and Town Centre					Commentary
	Policy EP8: Designated Centres	Policy EP9: Retail Hierarchy	Policy EP10: Retail Impact Assessments	Policy EP11: Primary and Secondary Frontages	Policy EP12: Hot Food Takeaways	
5. Sustainable Communities	+	+	~	~	±	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP8 and EP9 support new community, cultural and leisure uses within the hierarchy of identified centres. Concentrating such uses in accessible locations would improve access to facilities and essential services, including by non-car based travel, and would also support social inclusion. These policies would therefore have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
6. Health and Wellbeing	+	+	~	~	-	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective, as neither health facilities nor open/greenspace is mentioned in any of the policies. However, where health facilities/services are considered to constitute main town centre uses (in accordance with the NPPF), policies EP8 and EP9 would direct these facilities to accessible locations, which would indirectly improve access to healthcare. These policies are therefore considered to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ Policy EP12 provides support for hot food takeaway development proposals within designated centres subject to specified criteria. Significantly increased provision of hot food takeaways in highly accessible locations could encourage unhealthy eating, resulting in a Minor Negative effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
7. Transport and Communication.	++	++	++	++	±	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP8 – EP11 seek to concentrate retail and other main town centre uses (as per the NPPF) within the highly accessible hierarchy of identified centres, including Sunderland City Centre. This would link new high footfall development with sustainable transport provision and therefore support sustainable modal shifts, resulting in a direct major positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy EP12 provides support for hot food takeaway development proposals within designated centres subject to specified criteria, including requiring proposals not to be detrimental to highway safety. This would support road safety, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Retail and Town Centre					Commentary
	Policy EP8: Designated Centres	Policy EP9: Retail Hierarchy	Policy EP10: Retail Impact Assessments	Policy EP11: Primary and Secondary Frontages	Policy EP12: Hot Food Takeaways	
8. Land Use and Soils	+	+	~	~	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP8 and EP9 direct retail and other main town centre, higher density land uses to the hierarchy of identified centres. This would optimise the use of available land and indirectly support the redevelopment of brownfield land within the identified centres. The policies would therefore have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ Policy EP12 provides support for hot food takeaway development proposals within designated centres subject to specified criteria including where units have been vacant for 24 months and marketed for main town centre uses. This would support the economically productive use of available space in designated centres, which would help to make efficient use of available land. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
9. Water	~	~	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	~	~	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is assumed that in directing new main town centre uses to the hierarchy of identified centres, Policies EP8 and EP9 have taken account of any known flood risks in these general areas. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Retail and Town Centre					Commentary
	Policy EP8: Designated Centres	Policy EP9: Retail Hierarchy	Policy EP10: Retail Impact Assessments	Policy EP11: Primary and Secondary Frontages	Policy EP12: Hot Food Takeaways	
11. Air	+	+	+	+	±	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP8 – EP11 seek to concentrate retail and other main town centre uses within the highly accessible hierarchy of identified centres. This could indirectly safeguard air quality by maximising public transport use and reducing car dependency, resulting in indirect Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ Policy EP12 provides support for hot food takeaway development proposals within designated centres subject to specified criteria including requiring the protection of local amenity. The policy therefore safeguards against odour release from these establishments, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
12. Climate Change	+	+	+	+	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP8 – EP11 seek to concentrate retail and other main town centre uses within the highly accessible hierarchy of identified centres. Locating high footfall developments in accessible locations would reduce car dependency, support sustainable modal shifts and therefore contribute to climate change mitigation. However, except in relation to accessibility and transport these policies would not contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation. The policies would therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between Policy EP12 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
13. Waste and Natural Resources	~	~	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Retail and Town Centre					Commentary
	Policy EP8: Designated Centres	Policy EP9: Retail Hierarchy	Policy EP10: Retail Impact Assessments	Policy EP11: Primary and Secondary Frontages	Policy EP12: Hot Food Takeaways	
14. Cultural Heritage	++	++	~	~	~	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP8 and EP9 supports new community, cultural and social uses within the hierarchy of identified centres. This would allow CLR venues to be developed in highly accessible locations, resulting in improved opportunities to access to cultural activities. These policies would therefore have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required.
15. Landscape and Townscape	++	~	~	~	±	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy EP8 seeks to ensure that centres including Sunderland City Centre have high quality and attractive physical environments, buildings and public realm. This would directly contribute to local distinctiveness, high quality design in the built environment and townscape character, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy EP12 resists proposals for Hot Food Takeaways in the Primary frontages of the city centre unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. This would indirectly contribute to high quality streetscapes in designated centres, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
Likely Cumulative Effects						<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies EP8 – EP11, and to a lesser extent EP12, seek to concentrate retail and other main town centre uses within the highly accessible hierarchy of identified centres and to protect the vitality of such centres. This would contribute to the implementation of sustainable development as set out in policies S1 and S2 and directly help to implement the spatial strategy set out in policies SS3 and SS4. These policies, acting together and in combination with transport, employment and environmental policies, would result in positive cumulative accessibility, employment and climate change mitigation effects. As such these policies would have Major Positive cumulative effects on SA objectives 3, 5, 7, 8 and 12. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required in relation to cumulative effects. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified in relation to cumulative effects. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified in relation to cumulative effects

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.7.2 With the exception of potential non-inclusion of policies E10 and E12, which ultimately was not considered to be appropriate by SCC (thus no reasonable alternatives remain), no other reasonable alternatives were identified.

2.8 SA of Design and Historic Environment Policies

2.8.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.13. The appraisal is provided in Table 2.14.

Policy Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.13 List of Design and Historic Environment policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
E1: Urban Design	To ensure good design in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E2: Public Realm	To ensure good design in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts	To ensure good design and in the interests of amenity and public safety in accordance with the NPPF and The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007	No reasonable alternatives
Policy E4: Historic Environment	To set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment in accordance with the NPPF.	No Reasonable Alternatives
Policy E5: Heritage Assets	To set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment in accordance with the NPPF.	No Reasonable Alternatives

SA Matrix

Table 2.14 Appraisal of Draft Design and Historic Environment Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Design and Historic Environment					Commentary
	Policy E1: Urban Design	Policy E2: Public Realm	Policy E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts	Policy E4: Historic Environment	Policy E5: Heritage Assets	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	++	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 requires development proposals to contribute to improving the local environment, to provide appropriate landscaping and green infrastructure and to safeguard amenity. This would protect existing priority habitats and help to improve and expand the green infrastructure network, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Design and Historic Environment					Commentary
	Policy E1: Urban Design	Policy E2: Public Realm	Policy E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts	Policy E4: Historic Environment	Policy E5: Heritage Assets	
2. Housing	+	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 sets out design principles and assessment criteria for all development proposals to ensure they achieve high design standards. This would help to improve the quality of housing stock, however due to the narrow scope of this policy only a Minor Positive effect is predicted on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
3. Economy and Employment	++	~	~	+	-	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 requires development proposals to maximise opportunities for supporting the functioning and vitality of the local area, including mixed use development where appropriate. This provides support for employment generating uses within town and City centres, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E4 sets out criteria to protect, conserve, manage and enhance the historic environment. supporting proposals which re-use valued heritage assets. This would indirectly support inward investment and new business creation, particularly within heritage and tourism sectors, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E5 Heritage Assets sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals preserve or conserve (as appropriate) and enhance heritage assets, as well as their character and setting. The policy also sets out criteria to preserve, protect and enhance architectural heritage and restrict the demolition of listed buildings. These criteria could restrict proposed employment generating uses (including expansion or change of use of existing buildings), resulting in a Minor Adverse effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
4. Learning and Skills	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. However, Policy E1 would ensure that proposed new education infrastructure achieves high design standards and therefore provides suitable learning environments. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Design and Historic Environment					Commentary
	Policy E1: Urban Design	Policy E2: Public Realm	Policy E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts	Policy E4: Historic Environment	Policy E5: Heritage Assets	
5. Sustainable Communities	++	++	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 sets out design principles and assessment criteria to ensure development proposals achieve high design standards, contribute to improving the local environment, safeguard amenity and contribute to crime prevention. Policy E2 similarly requires existing and proposed public realm to be of the highest standard, as well as to incorporate public art where appropriate. These policies would contribute to this SA objective through ensuring access to high quality places and public spaces for a range of demographic groups, which could promote social cohesion and inclusion, and would also enhance both perceptions of and actual safety and security. A Major Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
6. Health and Wellbeing	++	++	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 requires development proposals to provide appropriate landscaping, public realm and green infrastructure, whilst Policy E2 requires existing and proposed public realm to be of the highest standard, as well as to incorporate public art where appropriate. These policies would enhance open space provision, encourage the creation of walking and cycling routes through developments and result in other environmental improvements with consequential indirect positive health and wellbeing impacts, including through increased active travel and recreational activities. The policies would therefore have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
7. Transport and Communication	+	+	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 sets out design principles and assessment criteria for all development proposals to ensure they achieve high design standards, contribute to improving the local environment, safeguard amenity and contribute to crime prevention. Policy E2 requires existing and proposed public realm to be of the highest standard. Both policies could indirectly reduce car travel for short distance journeys and encourage sustainable and active travel, resulting in Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Design and Historic Environment					Commentary
	Policy E1: Urban Design	Policy E2: Public Realm	Policy E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts	Policy E4: Historic Environment	Policy E5: Heritage Assets	
8. Land Use and Soils	+	~	~	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 sets out design principles and assessment criteria for all development proposals, including to ensure they achieve contribute to improving the local environment and safeguard amenity. The policy also requires development proposals to maximise opportunities for supporting the functioning and vitality of the local area. As such the policy indirectly encourages the redevelopment of brownfield land and the remediation of contaminated environments, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E4 provides support for development proposals which re-use valued heritage assets, whilst policy E5 provides support for proposals which re-use and restore Heritage at Risk properties. These policies would contribute to making efficient use of available land and existing buildings, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
9. Water	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	++	++	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 requires development proposals to incorporate SUDS wherever possible, and to provide appropriate landscaping, public realm and green infrastructure. Policy E2 requires existing and proposed public realm to be of the highest standard and constructed using sustainable and durable materials. These policies would help to provide suitable drainage, protect surface water quality and reduce potential flood risks in the built environment, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA Objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required, <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Design and Historic Environment					Commentary
	Policy E1: Urban Design	Policy E2: Public Realm	Policy E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts	Policy E4: Historic Environment	Policy E5: Heritage Assets	
11. Air	++	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 sets out design principles and assessment criteria for all development proposals, including to ensure they contribute to improving the local environment and safeguard amenity. This would help to maintain and improve local air quality, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
12. Climate Change	+	+	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 sets out design principles and assessment criteria for to ensure development proposals achieve high design standards, contribute to improving the local environment, safeguard amenity and contribute to crime prevention. Policy E2 also requires existing and proposed public realm to be of the highest standard. Both policies could indirectly reduce car travel for short distance journeys and encourage sustainable and active travel, which would help to reduce transport emissions. Owing to the weak relationship between this policy and SA objective only a Minor Positive effect is predicted. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
13. Waste and Natural Resources	~	+	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E2 requires existing and proposed public realm to be constructed using sustainable and durable materials. This would contribute to the sustainable use of natural resources, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Design and Historic Environment					Commentary
	Policy E1: Urban Design	Policy E2: Public Realm	Policy E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts	Policy E4: Historic Environment	Policy E5: Heritage Assets	
14. Cultural Heritage	+	~	~	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 requires development proposals to contribute to placemaking and local distinctiveness. This would help to conserve the character of built heritage assets and conservation areas, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E4 sets out criteria to protect, conserve, manage and enhance the historic environment. This includes requiring development proposals to make a positive contribution to the character of the historic environment, supporting proposals which re-use valued heritage assets (also supported by Policy E5) and affirming the status of Conservation Area Character Appraisals and Management Strategies as material planning considerations. Policy E5 Heritage Assets sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals preserve or conserve (as appropriate) and enhance heritage assets, as well as their character and setting. The policy also sets out criteria to preserve, protect and enhance architectural heritage and local distinctiveness, including through restricting the demolition of listed buildings. The policy also provides support for proposals which re-use and restore Heritage at Risk properties. Through preserving, protecting, conserving enhancing and encouraging re-use of heritage assets, policies E4 and E5 would both have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policy E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
15. Landscape and Townscape	++	++	++	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E1 requires development proposals to create visually attractive environments and to contribute to placemaking and local distinctiveness, which would have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E2 requires existing and proposed public realm to be of the highest standard and to incorporate public art where appropriate. This would enhance local distinctiveness and visual amenity, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E3 sets out criteria to ensure that relevant development proposals contribute positively to the visual appearance of the streetscape. This would ensure that development proposals protect and enhance townscape character, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policies E4 and E5 sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals preserve or conserve (as appropriate), protect and enhance historic assets and their setting. This would indirectly help to promote local distinctness in the built environment and protect townscape character, resulting in Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Design and Historic Environment					Commentary
	Policy E1: Urban Design	Policy E2: Public Realm	Policy E3: Advertisements/Shop Fronts	Policy E4: Historic Environment	Policy E5: Heritage Assets	
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through requiring development proposals to achieve high design and placemaking standards and by protecting heritage assets (including their setting), these policies would cumulatively act to ensure that development proposals are appropriately sited, designed and integrated with their surroundings. Whilst each policy addresses specific issues and/or potential development impacts, acting together these policies would have Major Positive cumulative effects on the quality of the built environment and the creation of sustainable, attractive places. In doing so the policies would help to implement sustainable development and would therefore have Major Positive cumulative effects in combination with policies S1 and S2 on SA objectives 5, 8, 9, 14 and 15. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 					

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.8.2 No reasonable alternatives have been identified in relation to the assessed policies.

2.9 SA of Natural Environment Policies

2.9.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.15. The appraisal is provided in Table 2.16.

Policy Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.15 List of Natural Environment policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
E6: Green Infrastructure	To ensure the planning and delivery of green infrastructure in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	To deliver net gains in biodiversity and the protection of habitats in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E8: Woodlands/ Hedgerows and Trees	To protect habitats in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E9: Greenspace	To ensure the delivery of greenspaces in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E10: Burial Space	To ensure that the city provides an appropriate and adequate supply of burial spaces within the plan period, including meeting the needs of various ethnic and religious groups within the city	No reasonable alternatives
E11: Green Belt	To ensure the protection of Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E12: Settlement Breaks	Existing policy in the UDP, policy seeks to update the Settlement Breaks and to retain those remaining	No reasonable alternative – failure to protect settlement breaks in the city would have a major adverse (significant) effect to the city's green infrastructure
E13: Development in the Open Countryside	To ensure appropriate development in the open countryside, in line with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E14: Landscape Character	To ensure the protection and enhancement of landscape character in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Existing policy in the UDP to be retained, and to ensure that policy supports good design as well as the protection and enhancement of landscape character in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E16: Agricultural land	To ensure the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives

SA Matrix

Table 2.16 Appraisal of Draft Natural Environment Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	++	++	++	++	~	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E6 sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals maintain, protect and enhance the integrity and connectivity of the Green Infrastructure Network. As such the policy would protect and enhance habitats and ecological connectivity, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E7 commits the Council to protecting, conserving and enhancing designated sites (ecological and geological). The policy sets out criteria which require development proposals to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on receptors including designated sites (from international to local level), as well as to provide net gains in biodiversity. Where a development proposal is likely to adversely affect biodiversity or geodiversity interests, the policy requires appropriate mitigation or compensatory measures to be secured. This policy would directly protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity interests, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E8 requires development proposals to retain and conserve “significant” trees and woodland, whilst the policy also protects “important” Hedgerows. The policy also requires development proposals involving felling or the loss of hedgerows to be supported by a justification and to provide mitigation and compensatory planting, with priority to be given to using native species. This would directly protect existing habitats and maintain ecological connectivity and green infrastructure, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E9 sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals protect, conserve and enhance the quality, value, function and accessibility of greenspace across the City Council’s area. This includes criteria to restrict the loss of existing greenspace and ensure that residential development proposals include sufficient amenity greenspace, which would enhance access to nature and therefore have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policies E11, E12, E14 and E15 set out criteria to ensure that development proposals respect, protect and enhance landscape character. This would indirectly provide a degree of protection for existing habitats, whilst measures to enhance landscape character could also improve ecological connectivity. These policies are therefore predicted to have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy E16 sets out criteria to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land from development, including requiring a sequential test to be undertaken. This would indirectly provide a degree of protection for existing rural habitats, field based species and soil ecosystems, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E13 provides support for appropriate development proposals in the countryside subject to satisfying multiple criteria, including that proposals must not result in a scale of activity that has a detrimental impact on the surrounding area. This would indirectly protect biodiversity interests and habitats in close proximity to development proposals, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between Policy E10 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP provide appropriate protection for designated sites, in accordance with legislative requirements and the NPF it is recommended that Policy E7 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity should be expanded to include criteria to assess the acceptability of adverse impacts on protection species. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is uncertainty regarding the level of protection afforded to protected (as opposed to “priority”) species by Policy E6, as the draft policy does not include specific criteria to assess impacts on these receptors.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
2. Housing	~	~	~	~	~	-	-	+	~	~	-	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E11 and E12 set out criteria to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. These policies also require development proposals not to conflict with the identified purposes of the Green Belt and Settlement Breaks and to support their functioning. In addition, Policy E17 sets out criteria to safeguard the best and most versatile agricultural land from development. Given that these policies act to restrict potential development on sites which may otherwise be effective and suitable for housing, they are considered to have Minor Adverse effects on this SA objective through limiting the short-term delivery of new housing outwith the existing urban area. Policy E13 identifies and provides support for appropriate development in the countryside. This includes suitable extensions/alterations to buildings and new dwellings associated with forestry, agriculture or horticultural activities. As such the policy indirectly contributes to rural housing provision to support existing land uses and prevent depopulation, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
3. Economy and Employment	+	+	+	+	~	-	-	++	+	+	+	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 13 identifies and provides support for appropriate development in the countryside. The policy seeks to sustain existing businesses, grow the rural economy, and support rural economic diversification, which would have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E11 and E12 set out criteria to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. These policies also require development proposals not to conflict with the identified purposes of and to support the functioning of the Green Belt and Settlement Breaks, which include being to support urban regeneration and prevent coalescence. Given that these policies act to restrict potential development on sites which may otherwise be effective and suitable for employment use, they are considered to have Minor Adverse effects on this SA objective through limiting the short-term delivery of employment land. However, this is offset by the Major Positive effect of Policy E13, which provides support for employment development proposals that are deemed to be appropriate for their rural location, including within the Green Belt and Settlement Breaks. There is no clear relationship between Policy E10 and this SA objective. All the other assessed policies make an indirect contribution to this objective by seeking to protect and enhance the environmental quality of the area, which will be important in retaining and attracting investment resulting in economic growth and new business creation. The policies would therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
4. Learning and Skills	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
5. Sustainable Communities	++	~	~	++	~	~	~	++	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E6 commits the Council to maintaining and improving the Green Infrastructure Network by enhancing, creating and managing multifunctional greenspace that are well connected to each other and the wider countryside. This policy includes requirements for development proposals to include provide walking and cycling routes through corridors and provide greenspace. Policy E9 also sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals protect, conserve and enhance the quality, value, function and accessibility of greenspace across the City Council's area. Policies E6 and E9 would therefore improve access to high quality greenspace and community facilities for new and existing residents. This includes greenspace provision within new developments, which could increase social inclusion and cohesion. These policies are therefore predicted to have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy E13 provides support for development proposals in the Green Belt which provide opportunities outdoor sport and recreation. This would improve access to leisure activities and promote social inclusion, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
6. Health and Wellbeing	+	+	+	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E9 sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals protect, conserve and enhance the quality, value, function and accessibility of greenspace across the City Council's area. The policy also commits the Council to ensuring all residents can access a range of indoor and outdoor sport and leisure venues. This would enhance open space and leisure facilities provision, which would encourage and facilitate increased physical recreational activities with associated positive health outcomes. The policy is therefore predicted to have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies E13 and E10 and this SA objective. All of the other assessed policies make an indirect contribution to this SA objective by seeking to protect and enhance the environmental quality of the area, which would contribute to positive physical and mental health outcomes. The policies would therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
7. Transport and Communication	++	~	~	+	++	+	+	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E6 commits the Council to maintaining and improving the Green Infrastructure Network by enhancing, creating and managing multifunctional greenspace that are well connected to each other and the wider countryside. The policy includes requirements for development proposals to provide walking and cycling routes through corridors. This would directly support the uptake of sustainable and active travel modes, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E9 sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals protect and enhance the accessibility of greenspaces. The policy also commits the Council to ensuring all residents can access a range of indoor and outdoor sport and leisure venues and requires housing development proposals to include sufficient greenspace provision. As such the policy would improve access to key amenities and indirectly reduce the need to travel, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E10 requires proposals for new burial spaces to be located in close proximity to relevant communities, which would reduce travel needs and have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policies E11 and E12 set out criteria to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. These policies also require development proposals not to conflict with the identified purposes of and to support the functioning of the Green Belt and Settlement Breaks, which include being to support urban regeneration and prevent coalescence. This would help to concentrate development within existing built up areas, which would indirectly reduce travel needs and therefore have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
8. Land Use and Soils	+	++	+	+	+	++	++	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies E11 and E12 set out criteria to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. These policies also require development proposals not to conflict with the identified purposes of and to support the functioning of the Green Belt and Settlement Breaks, one of which is to support urban regeneration. These policies therefore prioritise brownfield redevelopment over development on greenfield sites, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy E16 sets out criteria to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land from development, including requiring a sequential test to be undertaken. This would indirectly prioritise brownfield redevelopment over development on greenfield sites, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy E7 sets out criteria which require development proposals to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on receptors including designated sites (from international to local level), as well as to provide net gains in biodiversity. This would directly help to conserve soils and protect soil ecology, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ All of the other assessed policies make an indirect contribution to this SA objective by seeking to protect and enhance environmental quality, which could support contaminated land remediation, promote brownfield land redevelopment and optimise the use of available land. As such these policies would have Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
9. Water	++/?	++	+	+	+	-	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E6 commits the Council to maintaining and improving the Green Infrastructure Network by enhancing, creating and managing multifunctional greenspace that are well connected to each other and the wider countryside. This policy includes requirements for development proposals to include climate change mitigation and adaptation measures. New green infrastructure corridors could be located along rivers and other waterbodies as these already form aquatic and riparian ecological corridors. This policy therefore has the potential to deliver improvements to water quality and the ecological status of waterbodies, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E7 commits the Council to protecting, conserving and enhancing designated sites (ecological and geological). The policy sets out criteria which require development proposals to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on receptors including designated sites (from international to local level), as well as to provide net gains in biodiversity. This would protect riparian and aquatic ecology from adverse development impacts and would help to improve water quality (including ecological status), resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between Policies E11 – E16 and this SA objective. Policy 10 – Burial Space requires relevant development proposals to minimise impacts on the water table, which would help to protect ground water quality. Owing to the limited need for new burial space developments across the Council's area this policy would only be applied to a small number of development sites, meaning that it would have only a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective in overall terms. All of the other assessed policies make an indirect contribution to this SA objective by seeking to protect and enhance environmental quality, which would directly or indirectly include the quality of the water environment. These policies would therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the new green infrastructure corridors developed under Policy E6 could, in appropriate circumstances, be located along rivers and waterbodies as these already provide ecological connectivity. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is uncertainty regarding the proposed location of green infrastructure corridors (Policy E6) in relation to the water environment.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	+	~	~	+	+	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E6 commits the Council to maintaining and improving the Green Infrastructure Network by enhancing, creating and managing multifunctional greenspace that are well connected to each other and the wider countryside. The policy includes requirements for development proposals to include climate change mitigation and adaptation measures and greenspace provision, which is also required by Policy E9. Providing that green infrastructure corridors and greenspaces are sited and designed have a multi-functional role including water management, these policies would indirectly reduce potential flood risks through providing space for natural attenuation of water, resulting in Minor Positive effects on this SA Objective. Policy E10 requires relevant development proposals to minimise impacts on the water table and flood risk. Owing to the limited need for new burial space developments across the Council's area this policy would only be applied to a small number of development sites, meaning that it would have only a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective in overall terms. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
11. Air	+	+	+	+	+	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E8 requires development proposals to retain and conserve "significant" trees and woodland, whilst the policy also protects "important" Hedgerows, both to safeguard amenity and landscape setting. As trees and woodlands act as a natural regulator of oxygen content within local atmospheric conditions, the protection given to trees and woodlands by this policy would indirectly help to maintain and enhance local air quality. The policy would therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between Policies E11 – E16 and this SA objective. All of the other assessed policies make an indirect contribution to this SA objective by seeking to protect and enhance environmental quality, which would directly or indirectly include air quality. These policies would therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
12. Climate Change	++	~	+	++	+	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E6 commits the Council to maintaining and improving the Green Infrastructure Network by enhancing, creating and managing multifunctional greenspace that are well connected to each other and the wider countryside. The policy includes requirements for development proposals to include climate change mitigation and adaptation measures, which within the context of the green infrastructure network could include the provision of multi-functional greenspace. Policy E9 also sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals protect, conserve and enhance the quality, value, function and accessibility of greenspace. The provision of green infrastructure and greenspace would help to adapt to climate change including by reducing climate-related flood risks through providing natural attenuation. These policies would therefore have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy E8 requires development proposals to retain and conserve “significant” trees and woodland, whilst the policy also protects “important” Hedgerows. This would indirectly help to protect against flood risks and thus would contribute to climate change adaption. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. Policy E10 requires relevant development proposals to minimise impacts on the water table and flood risk. This would enhance reliance and adaptation capacity within the environment, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
13. Waste and Natural Resources	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
14. Cultural Heritage	+	~	+	+	~	~	~	~	++	++	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E14 sets out criteria to ensure that all development proposals respect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the immediate and wider environment. Policy E15 requires development proposals to take account of views in to, out of and within development areas to preserve or enhance key local views and vistas. These policies would protect and enhance the setting of the historic environment, and the contribution of heritage assets to the surrounding landscape, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies E7 or E10 – E13 and this SA objective. All of the other assessed policies make an indirect contribution to this SA objective by seeking to protect and enhance environmental quality and assets, which would indirectly help to preserve and enhance the historic environment, in particular the setting of heritage assets. These policies would therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
15. Landscape and Townscape.	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	++	++	++	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E14 sets out criteria to ensure that all development proposals respect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the immediate and wider environment. Policy E15 requires development proposals to take account of views in to, out of and within development areas to preserve or enhance key local views and vistas. As such these policies would have Major Positive effects on this SA objective through protecting and enhancing landscape character and key views. Policies E11 – E13 set out criteria to protect the countryside, including the designated Green Belt and Settlement Breaks, from inappropriate development. These policies also require development proposals not to conflict with the identified purposes of the Green Belt and Settlement Breaks, which include being to prevent coalescence, maintain openness and preserve the setting and special character of Springwell Village, and to support the functioning of the Green Belt and Settlement Breaks. As such these policies would directly contribute to the functioning of the Green Belt as well as protecting and enhancing local distinctiveness and wider landscape character, resulting in Major Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between Policy E10 and this SA objective. All of the other assessed policies make an indirect contribution to this SA objective by seeking to protect and enhance environmental quality, which would help to protect landscape character and visual amenity. These policies would therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Natural Environment											Commentary
	Policy E6: Green Infrastructure	Policy E7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy E8: Woodlands/Hedgerows and Trees	Policy E9: Greenspace	Policy E10: Burial Space	Policy E11: Green Belt	Policy E12: Settlement Breaks	Policy E13: Development in the Open Countryside	Policy E14: Landscape Character	Policy E15: Creating and Protecting Views	Policy E16: Agricultural Land	
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies E11 – E13 and E16 direct most development to established urban areas, which would support the overall spatial strategy of the Draft Sunderland CSDP and therefore have Minor Positive cumulative effects in combination with policy SS3 on SA objectives 8 and 15. ▪ All of the assessed policies seek to protect and enhance environmental quality, including through the provision of green infrastructure and by protecting landscape character, biodiversity, geodiversity and the water environment from adverse impacts. Whilst each policy addresses specific issues, acting together the policies would reinforce each other and have Major Positive cumulative effects on the overall quality of built and natural environments. In doing so the policies would help to implement sustainable development; therefore, these policies would have Major Positive cumulative effects in combination with policies S1 and S2 on SA objectives 1, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 15. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. 											

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.9.2 No reasonable alternatives have been identified in relation to the assessed policies.

2.10 SA of Amenity Policies

2.10.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.17. The appraisal is provided in Table 2.18.

Policy Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.17 List of Amenity policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
E17: Quality of Life and Amenity	To ensure that new development does not have adverse environmental impacts on the natural and historic environment and on human health, in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E18: Noise-Sensitive Development	To ensure that noise-sensitive development is not affected by unacceptable levels of noise, in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
E19: Contaminated Land	To ensure that new development proposals address issues of contaminated land, in accordance with the NPPF and with established procedures, such as the Code of Practice for the Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites	No reasonable alternatives
E20: Health and Safety Executive	To ensure that development proposals relating to HSE areas and/or involving hazardous substances are appropriately addressed, in line with Health & Safety Executive advice and controls.	No reasonable alternatives

SA Matrix

Table 2.18 Appraisal of Draft Amenity Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Amenity				Commentary
	Policy E17: Quality of Life and Amenity	Policy E18: Noise Sensitive Development	Policy E19: Contaminated Land	Policy E20: Health and Safety Executive Areas and Hazardous Substances	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	+	+	+	±	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E17 requires all development proposals not to have unacceptable adverse amenity impacts, whilst Policy E20 requires proposals for the introduction, storage or use of hazardous substances not to create unacceptable risks. These criteria would indirectly protect biodiversity interests including priority habitats from adverse development impacts and unacceptable pollution risks, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy E19 requires development proposals on contaminated land not to result in unacceptable risks, including to the environment, and to remediate contamination. This could help to improve the quality of habitats, however depending on the scale of redevelopment proposals it could also facilitate development on currently vacant land in urban areas, which may reduce ecological connectivity and habitat availability. On balance and given this uncertainty the policy is predicted to have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
2. Housing	~	~	~	≈	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
3. Economy and Employment	~	~	~	≈	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Amenity				Commentary
	Policy E17: Quality of Life and Amenity	Policy E18: Noise Sensitive Development	Policy E19: Contaminated Land	Policy E20: Health and Safety Executive Areas and Hazardous Substances	
4. Learning and Skills	~	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
5. Sustainable Communities	~	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
6. Health and Wellbeing	++	++	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies E17 – E20 set out criteria to control development on contaminated land, the storage and management of hazardous substances and to avoid unacceptable adverse amenity impacts, including from statutory nuisances and pollution. This would protect the environment and human health from unacceptable impacts and risks. Owing to the focus on protecting health these policies would have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
7. Transport and Communication	~	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Amenity				Commentary
	Policy E17: Quality of Life and Amenity	Policy E18: Noise Sensitive Development	Policy E19: Contaminated Land	Policy E20: Health and Safety Executive Areas and Hazardous Substances	
8. Land Use and Soils	~	~	0	=	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E19 requires development proposals on contaminated land not to result in unacceptable risks to health or the environment and to address existing contamination such that the site is made suitable for the proposed use. This provides a framework to allow the redevelopment of brownfield land, however the policy does not actually promote such redevelopment. A Neutral effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP allow Policy E19 to contribute to this objective it is recommended that the policy should be expanded to include support for the redevelopment of brownfield and contaminated land, providing that development proposals remediate known contamination and do not result in unacceptable health or environmental risks. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
9. Water.	++	+	+	±	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E17 requires all development proposals not to have unacceptable adverse amenity impacts, including from surface run-off, the migration of contamination and from dust and litter pollution. By managing pollution discharge into the water environment the policy would protect and enhance the ecological status and overall quality of waterbodies, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. The other assessed policies set out criteria to control development on contaminated land and the storage and management of hazardous substances. This would indirectly protect the water environment from unacceptable impacts and risks, resulting in Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	~	~	~	=	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Amenity				Commentary
	Policy E17: Quality of Life and Amenity	Policy E18: Noise Sensitive Development	Policy E19: Contaminated Land	Policy E20: Health and Safety Executive Areas and Hazardous Substances	
11. Air	++	~	~	≈	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E17 requires all development proposals not to have unacceptable adverse amenity impacts, including from dust, odour, emissions and traffic. As such the policy would directly help to maintain and improve air quality and minimise emissions, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst there are no existing AQMA's within the City Council's area, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP Policy E17 could be expanded to set out an approach to monitoring areas with known poor air quality and to taking appropriate mitigation measures, to ensure that no AQMA's require to be declared. This would enhance the contribution of Policy E17 to this SA objective In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
12. Climate Change	+	~	~	≈	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E17 requires all development proposals not to have unacceptable adverse amenity impacts, which would help to maintain the adaptive capacity of the environment and would therefore have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
13. Waste and Natural Resources	~	~	~	≈	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Amenity				Commentary
	Policy E17: Quality of Life and Amenity	Policy E18: Noise Sensitive Development	Policy E19: Contaminated Land	Policy E20: Health and Safety Executive Areas and Hazardous Substances	
14. Cultural Heritage	+	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E17 requires all development proposals not to have unacceptable adverse amenity impacts, which would indirectly help to preserve, protect and enhance the historic environment including designated heritage assets. The policy is therefore predicted to have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
15. Landscape and Townscape	+	~	~	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy E17 requires all development proposals not to have unacceptable adverse amenity impacts, which would indirectly help to protect and enhance the physical environment including landscape character and visual amenity. A Minor Positive effect on this SA objective is therefore predicted. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies E17 – E20 set out criteria to control development on contaminated land, the storage and management of hazardous substances and to avoid unacceptable adverse amenity impacts. The policies would individually and cumulatively protect the environment and human health from unacceptable impacts and risks. As such the policies would contribute to sustainable development and would have Major Positive cumulative effects in combination with each other and with policies S1 and S2 on SA objectives 1, 8, 9, 10 and 11. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst there are no existing AQMA's within the City Council's area, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP Policy E17 could be expanded to set out an approach to monitoring areas with known poor air quality and to taking appropriate mitigation measures, to ensure that no AQMA's require to be declared. This would enhance the contribution of Policy E17 to this SA objective In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. 				

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.10.2 No reasonable alternatives have been identified in relation to the assessed policies.

2.11 SA of Climate Change and Water Policies

2.11.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.19. The assessment is provided in Table 2.20.

Policy Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.19 List of Carbon Management policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
CM1: Climate Change and Water	To ensure that development minimises the impact of climate change in accordance with the NPPF and UK Climate Change Programme	No reasonable alternatives
CM2: Decentralised, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy	To comply with NPPF and NPPW and the Renewable energy Directive (2009)	No reasonable alternative. Low carbon energy options will come forward and the plan needs to ensure it has a policy basis from which to make decisions.
CM3: Energy from Waste	Required to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and NPPW and the Waste Needs Assessment	No reasonable alternatives
CM4: Flood risk and Water Management	To ensure that development adopts sustainable principles to flood risk and water management in accordance with the NPPF, Environment Agency and City Council as Lead Local Flood Authority	No reasonable alternatives
CM5: Surface Water Management	To ensure that development adopts sustainable principles to surface water management in accordance with the NPPF, Environment Agency and City Council as Lead Local Flood Authority	No reasonable alternatives
CM6: Water Quality	To ensure that development adopts sustainable principles to maintaining good water management in accordance with the NPPF, Environment Agency, water and sewerage companies and City Council as Lead Local Flood Authority	No reasonable alternatives
CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	To ensure that development adopts sustainable principles towards the disposal of foul water in accordance with the NPPF, Environment Agency, water and sewerage companies and City Council as Lead Local Flood Authority	No reasonable alternatives
CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	To ensure good design and sustainable construction methods in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives

SA Matrix

Table 2.20 Appraisal of Draft Climate Change and Water Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	~	++	++	++	++	++	±	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM2 provides support for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development proposals subject to compliance with criteria requiring proposals not to result in adverse or unmitigated significance adverse environmental and amenity impacts. Policy CM3 similarly sets out criteria to assess predicted environmental, amenity and technical safeguarding impacts. Despite inconsistencies between policy tests in relation to the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse effects, these policies would protect environmental quality including biodiversity and geodiversity interests. Major Positive effects on this SA objective are therefore predicted. Policies CM4, CM5 and CM6 require development proposals to control surface water runoff and not to have a detrimental impact on water quality (surface or groundwater). This would directly protect the flow regime and ecological status of waterbodies thereby protecting and enhancing aquatic and riparian habitats. Major Positive effects on this SA objective are therefore predicted. Policy CM7 sets out foul drainage criteria for development proposals which would protect against the release of untreated sewage. This would indirectly protect the <u>ecological status of waterbodies</u>, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy CM8 states that development proposals should incorporate measures which enhance the biodiversity value of development, such as green roofs. This would enhance the natural environment and create new habitats, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or unmitigated significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is inconsistency between policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 in terms of whether adverse environmental and amenity impacts must be avoided from development proposals, or only unmitigated significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. Policy CM4 does not provide sufficient assessment criteria to consider impacts on environmental and amenity receptors from proposed new or extensions/ improvements to existing waste water, sludge or sewage treatment works.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
2. Housing	~	~	=	=	=	=	=	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies CM2 – CM8 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
3. Economy and Employment.	+	+	±	=	=	≈	≈	≈	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies. However, bringing together and re-iterating all climate change related policy objectives within a single policy would strengthen the attention given to climate change mitigation and the development of the low carbon economy in the determination of planning applications, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy CM2 provides support for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development proposals subject to compliance with criteria requiring proposals not to result in adverse or unmitigated significance adverse environmental and amenity impacts. Policy CM3 similarly sets out criteria to assess predicted environmental, amenity and technical safeguarding impacts. Policies CM2 and CM3 therefore provide a framework to enable the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy generation facilities, which would support the development of the low carbon economy. However, as drafted the policies suffer from inconsistencies between policy tests in relation to the avoidance of adverse or unmitigated significant adverse effects. In addition, policy CM3 – Renewable Energy identifies the need for assess energy development proposals in the Green Belt against national policy, but it is not clear whether this relates to national energy and/or Green Belt protection policies. These policy tests could preclude the development of renewable and low carbon energy generation facilities. On balance only Minor Positive effects are predicted on this SA objective. Policies CM4 and CM5 both require development proposals to satisfy the Sequential and, where relevant, Exception tests detailed in the NPPF. Depending on the local interpretation of development categories (e.g. essential infrastructure, re-use of existing buildings, etc.) this could restrict employment generating development in flood risk areas. The Sequential and Exception tests are however controlled through the NPPF rather than this policy, so on balance only a Minor Negative effect on this SA objective is predicted. There is no clear relationship between policies CM6 – CM8 and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address identified inconsistencies, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or unmitigated significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure these policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst providing an appropriately supportive policy framework for the development of the low carbon economy in pursuit of this SA objective, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is inconsistency between policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 in terms of whether adverse environmental and amenity impacts must be avoided from development proposals, or only unmitigated significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
4. Learning and Skills	~	~	=	=	=	=	=	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between any of the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified/. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
5. Sustainable Communities	~	~	=	=	=	=	=	=	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between any of the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified/. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
6. Health and Wellbeing	~	+	±	±	±	±	±	±	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM2 provides support for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development proposals subject to compliance with criteria requiring proposals not to result in adverse or unmitigated significance adverse environmental and amenity impacts. Policy CM3 similarly sets out criteria to assess predicted environmental, amenity and technical safeguarding impacts. Despite inconsistencies between policy tests in relation to the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse effects, these policies would protect amenity, which would indirectly protect the health of populations. Minor Positive effects on this SA objective are therefore predicted. Policies CM4, CM5 and CM6 require development proposals not to have a detrimental impact on water quality (surface or groundwater). This would protect drinking water quality (including water extracted from Private Water Supplies for potable use), which could prevent ill health. Minor Positive effects on this SA objective are therefore predicted. Policy CM7 sets out foul drainage criteria for development proposals which would protect against the release of untreated sewage. This would indirectly protect public health, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policy CM8 and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is inconsistency between policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 in terms of whether adverse environmental and amenity impacts must be avoided from development proposals, or only unmitigated significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
7. Transport and Communication	-	+	±	=	=	=	=	=	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM2 provides support for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development proposals subject to compliance with criteria requiring proposals not to result in adverse or unmitigated significance adverse environmental and amenity impacts. Policy CM3 similarly sets out criteria to assess predicted environmental, amenity and technical safeguarding impacts. Despite inconsistencies between policy tests in relation to the avoidance of adverse or unmitigated significant adverse effects, these policies would protect public amenity, including indirectly in relation to the use of transport infrastructure. Minor Positive effects on this SA objective are therefore predicted. Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies CM4 – CM8 and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is inconsistency between policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 in terms of whether adverse environmental and amenity impacts must be avoided from development proposals, or only unmitigated significant adverse impacts.
8. Land Use and Soils	-	-	=	±	±	±	±	=	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies CM4, CM5 and CM6 require development proposals not to have a detrimental impact on water quality, including groundwater. This would soil quality and safeguard against land contamination from groundwater pollution, resulting in Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy CM7 sets out foul drainage criteria for development proposals which would protect against the release of untreated sewage. This would indirectly protect public health, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies CM2, CM3 and CM8 and this SA objective. Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is inconsistency between policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 in terms of whether adverse environmental and amenity impacts must be avoided from development proposals, or only unmitigated significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
9. Water	~	++	++	++	++	++	±	++	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM2 provides support for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development proposals subject to compliance with criteria requiring proposals not to result in adverse or unmitigated significance adverse environmental and amenity impacts. Policy CM3 similarly sets out criteria to assess predicted environmental, amenity and technical safeguarding impacts. Despite inconsistencies between policy tests in relation to the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse effects these policies would protect water resources and water quality, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. <u>Policy CM4 sets out criteria to ensure that development proposals reduce flood risk, promote water efficiency measures and protect and enhance water quality. Similar and in some cases overlapping assessment criteria are set out in Policy CM5 and CM8. Policy CM6 - Water Quality also requires all development proposals to control the quality of surface water runoff and not to have a detrimental impact on water quality. These policies would therefore protect and enhance waterbodies and water quality and would increase water efficiency in new development, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective.</u> Policy CM7 sets out foul drainage criteria for development proposals which would protect against the release of untreated sewage. This would indirectly protect and enhance the quality of the water environment, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF. To address identified uncertainties within policy CM4, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy should be amended to clarify required surface run-off reductions and set out criteria to assess impacts on environmental and amenity receptors from proposed new or extensions/ improvements to existing waste water, sludge or sewage treatment works. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is inconsistency between policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 in terms of whether adverse environmental and amenity impacts must be avoided from development proposals, or only unmitigated significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. Policy CM4 does not provide sufficient assessment criteria to consider impacts on environmental and amenity receptors from proposed new or extensions/ improvements to existing waste water, sludge or sewage treatment works. There is also uncertainty regarding whether Policy CM4 requires proposals to demonstrate surface run-off rate reduction, and if so what this should be reduced from and to, rather than only deploying SUDS where viable.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	~	++	++	++	++	++	±	=	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM2 provides support for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development proposals subject to compliance with criteria including requiring proposals not to result in unmitigated significance adverse flood risk impacts. Policy CM3 similarly sets out criteria to assess predicted environmental and amenity impacts. Both policies would therefore help to minimise flood risks from new development, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policies CM4, CM5 and CM8 set out criteria to ensure that development proposals reduce flood risk, minimise vulnerability to flooding and incorporate SUDS wherever viable. The policies therefore provide a pro-active approach to flood risk management, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy CM6 also requires all development proposals to control the quality of surface water runoff and not to have a detrimental impact on water quality. These policies would therefore protect and enhance waterbodies and water quality and would increase water efficiency in new development, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy CM7 sets out foul drainage criteria for development proposals which would protect against the release of untreated sewage. This would help to minimise risks of flash flooding from the sewer network, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies CM6 – CM7 and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF. To address identified uncertainties within policy CM4, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy should be amended to clarify required surface run-off reductions. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is inconsistency between policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 in terms of whether adverse environmental and amenity impacts must be avoided from development proposals, or only unmitigated significant adverse impacts. There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. There is uncertainty regarding whether Policy CM4 requires proposals to demonstrate surface run-off rate reduction, and if so what this should be reduced from and to, rather than only deploying SUDS where viable.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
11. Air	~	++	++	=	=	=	=	=	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM2 provides support for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development proposals subject to compliance with criteria requiring proposals not to result in adverse or unmitigated significance adverse environmental and amenity impacts. Policy CM3 similarly sets out criteria to assess predicted environmental, amenity and technical safeguarding impacts. Despite inconsistencies between policy tests in relation to the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse effects these policies would protect air quality, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies CM4 – CM8 and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is inconsistency between policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 in terms of whether adverse environmental and amenity impacts must be avoided from development proposals, or only unmitigated significant adverse impacts.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
12. Climate Change	+	+	±	±	±	=	=	±	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Policy CM2 provides support for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development proposals subject to compliance with criteria requiring proposals not to result in adverse or unmitigated significance adverse environmental and amenity impacts. Policy CM3 similarly sets out criteria to assess predicted environmental, amenity and technical safeguarding impacts. ■ Policies CM2 and CM3 therefore provide a framework to enable the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy generation facilities, which would help to decarbonise the energy sector and mitigate climate change. However, as drafted the policies suffer from inconsistencies between policy tests in relation to the avoidance of adverse or unmitigated significant adverse effects. These policy tests could preclude the development of renewable and low carbon energy generation facilities. On balance only Minor Positive effects are predicted on this SA objective. ■ Policies CM4, CM5 and CM8 set out criteria to ensure that development proposals reduce flood risks and flooding vulnerabilities, which would support adaption to climate change. Minor Positive effects on this SA objective are therefore predicted. ■ Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies. However, bringing together and re-iterating all climate change related policy objectives within a single policy would strengthen the attention given to climate change mitigation and adaption in the determination of planning applications, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ■ There is no clear relationship between policies CM6 – CM7 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ To address identified inconsistencies, in the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP the policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or unmitigated significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure these policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst providing an appropriately supportive policy framework for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development in pursuit of this SA objective, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. ■ There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies. In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, consideration should therefore be given to rationalising policies CM4 – CM6 into a single policy with clear assessment criteria that are themselves consistent with the NPPF. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ There is inconsistency between policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 in terms of whether adverse environmental and amenity impacts must be avoided from development proposals, or only unmitigated significant adverse impacts. ■ There is considerable overlap and inconsistency in policy tests between policies CM4 – CM6, which impedes the effectiveness of these policies.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
13. Waste and Natural Resources	~	~	=	=	=	=	=	++	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between Policies CM2 – CM7 and this SA objective. Policy CM8 - Sustainable Design and Construction states that development proposals should waste arising and increase recycling. The policy also requires development proposals to be supported by a Sustainability Statement to demonstrate the sustainability of the proposal, including with reference to proposed construction materials. Policy CM8 therefore promotes sustainable resource usage and the minimisation of waste in new developments, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
14. Cultural Heritage	~	++	++	=	=	=	=	=	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM2 provides support for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development proposals subject to compliance with criteria requiring proposals not to result in adverse or unmitigated significance adverse environmental and amenity impacts. Policy CM3 similarly sets out criteria to assess predicted environmental, amenity and technical safeguarding impacts. Despite inconsistencies between policy tests in relation to the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse effects these policies would protect heritage assets and the setting of the historic environment, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. <u>There is no clear relationship between policies CM4 – CM8 and this SA objective.</u> <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Climate Change and Water								Commentary
	Policy CM1: Climate Change and Water	Policy CM2: Decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy	Policy CM3: Energy from Waste	Policy CM4: Flood risk and Water management	Policy CM5: Surface Water Management	Policy CM6: Water Quality	Policy CM7: Disposal of Foul Water	Policy CM8: Sustainable Design and Construction	
15. Landscape and Townscape	~	++	++	=	=	=	=	=	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CM2 provides support for decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development proposals subject to compliance with criteria requiring proposals not to result in adverse or unmitigated significance adverse environmental and amenity impacts. Policy CM3 similarly sets out criteria to assess predicted environmental, amenity and technical safeguarding impacts. Despite inconsistencies between policy tests in relation to the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse effects these policies would protect landscape character and visual amenity, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy CM1 simply provides support for objectives stated in other policies, meaning that the policy would itself have no additional effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies CM4 – CM8 and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, policy tests within policies CM2 and CM3 regarding the avoidance of adverse or significant adverse impacts should be harmonised. To ensure the policies adequately protect environmental and amenity interests, in particular landscape character and visual amenity, whilst not unnecessarily restricting decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy development, consideration should be given to amending the policy tests to instead require the avoidance of unacceptable significant adverse impacts. Without this modification, wind energy development proposals may not be capable of according with Policy CM2 as some adverse landscape impacts could be expected from most proposals.
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By re-iterating all climate change related policy objectives within a single policy, Policy CM1 in combination with all other carbon management policies would strengthen the attention given to climate change mitigation/adaption and the development of the low carbon economy in the determination of relevant planning applications. This would result in a Minor Positive cumulative effect on SA objectives 3 and 12 (Climate Change). <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. 								

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.11.2 No reasonable alternatives have been identified in relation to the assessed policies.

2.12 SA of Connecting the City Policies

2.12.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.21. The appraisal is provided in Table 2.22.

Policy Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.21 List of Connecting the City policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
CC1: Sustainable Travel	To ensure the delivery of sustainable travel in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives- the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, in accordance with the NPPF
CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network	To ensure the delivery of transport infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement	To ensure improved accessibility and movement in the City Centre- promoting sustainable travel in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
CC4: Port of Sunderland	To support Port growth and future development in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
CC5: Local Road Network	To ensure that new development affecting the local road network adheres to NPPF, national design policy and Local Highway Authority standards	No reasonable alternatives
CC6: New Development and Transport	To ensure that new development supports sustainable access principles, in line with the NPPF, national design policy and Local Highway Authority standards	No reasonable alternatives
CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications	To ensure the delivery of digital communication and telecommunications infrastructure is in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives

SA Matrix

Table 2.22 Appraisal of Draft Connecting the City Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Connecting the City							Commentary
	Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel	Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network	Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement	Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland	Policy CC5: Local Road Network	Policy CC6: New Development and Transport	Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	~	-	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CC2 – Connectivity identifies 4 highway schemes and 7 main transport routes to reduce congestion, as well as the safeguarding of 2 railway/metro alignments, which will be supported. Owing to the absence of criteria within this policy according with other policies or assessing environmental impacts, this could indirectly result in adverse impacts on biodiversity interests including habitats and ecological connectivity. However, specific impacts would depend upon the siting and design characteristics of each project. Due to this uncertainty and the need for each project to obtain planning permission in its own right, this policy is itself only considered to have a Minor Negative impact on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP address the identified deficiency regarding consideration of environmental impacts associated with the transport infrastructure projects supported by policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network, it is recommended that this policy should be expanded to reference the need for these projects to accord with other relevant planning policies and to demonstrate that they would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
2. Housing	+	+	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CC1 sets out the Council's commitment to improve connectivity from homes to employment, designated centres and other key trip generators which would indirectly provide more sustainable homes and stop out-migration, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network sets out criteria and Council commitments to improve accessibility and connectivity, including in relation to key housing sites. This would indirectly support the provision of significant quantities of new housing to meet identified needs, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Connecting the City							Commentary
	Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel	Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network	Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement	Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland	Policy CC5: Local Road Network	Policy CC6: New Development and Transport	Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications	
3. Economy and Employment		+						<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between policy CC7 and policy CC6 New Development and Transport and this SA objective. All of the other assessed policies contribute to this SA objective as they require development proposals to safeguard and enhance the functioning, capacity and connectivity of the transport network. The Draft Core Strategy supporting text identifies “the need to improve local transport infrastructure in order to secure local economic growth and access to work and the labour market” as a significant issue to be addressed by then plan and its policies. Policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network sets out criteria and Council commitments to improve accessibility and connectivity, including to key employment sites and city/town/neighbourhood centres, as well as through supporting new strategic infrastructure projects, in order to secure economic growth. Policy CC3 City Centre Accessibility and Movement commits the Council to improving access in the city centre which would directly enable growth of existing businesses. Policy CC4 Port of Sunderland commits the Council to the reinvigoration of this area providing a flexible environment for rapidly changing markets. This would directly support economic growth and inward investment. Policy CC5 – Local Road Network set out criteria to protect the function of Strategic Routes on the Local Road Network, namely to facilitate safe and efficient movement of traffic. This policy would directly enable economic growth through improving the reliance of local businesses, supporting new businesses and employment opportunities, and stimulating regeneration in specific areas. As such these policies would have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
4. Learning and Skills		+						<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These policies would not directly contribute to this SA objective. However, Policy CC2 Connectivity and Transport Network would indirectly contribute through directing new educational facilities, as it directs and seeks to intensify development in accessible built-up areas whilst also committing to transport network improvements. This would be likely to ensure good physical access to education and learning opportunities, which is an essential prerequisite for the local population to develop new skills and knowledge. This policy is therefore considered to have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Connecting the City							Commentary
	Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel	Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network	Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement	Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland	Policy CC5: Local Road Network	Policy CC6: New Development and Transport	Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications	
5. Sustainable Communities	++		++		++		~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CC1 – Sustainable Travel sets out Council commitments to improve sustainable accessibility and connectivity. Policy CC2 Connectivity and Transport Network sets out criteria to improve connectivity and support new strategic infrastructure projects. Policy CC3 City Centre Accessibility and Movement supports accessibility within the city centre which would result in better walking/cycling and bus routes so that all people are better able to access community facilities. Policy CC5 Local Road Network set out criteria to protect the function of the local road network, namely to facilitate safe and efficient movement of traffic. These policies would therefore directly contribute to this SA through enhancing access, in particular using public transport, to services, facilities and amenities, and through providing adequate transport infrastructure, as well as indirectly supporting improvements to the environment around transport infrastructure. These policies would have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy CC6 New Development and Transport expects all new development to incorporate safe and convenient access as well as a number of other measures which would indirectly support access to community facilities and essential services. This would have Minor positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policy CC4 Port of Sunderland and CC7 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
6. Health and Wellbeing		++	++		+		~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CC1 Sustainable Travel commits the Council to mitigate against health impacts of traffic and promote a cleaner and more inclusive centre and neighbourhoods. Policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network commits the Council to working to create a strategic network of active travel routes, Policy CC3 City Centre Accessibility and Movement commits the Council to increasing priority for pedestrians and cyclists. Taking account of proposed behaviours change measures this would directly increase active travel including cycling, resulting in improved physical health through exercise and Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy CC6 New Development and Transport requires development proposals to include cycle parking and to ensure accessibility by a range of travel modes including walking and cycling. As such the policy would support active travel which would indirectly support positive physical health outcomes. As such the policy would have a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Connecting the City							Commentary
	Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel	Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network	Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement	Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland	Policy CC5: Local Road Network	Policy CC6: New Development and Transport	Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications	
7. Transport and Communication			++	++	++	++	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These policies directly contribute to this SA objective as they set out criteria to ensure development proposals improve accessibility, connectivity, road safety and transport network efficiency, as well as supporting sustainable and active modal shifts, strategic transport projects and appropriately located digital communications infrastructure. The policies would therefore enhance the functioning of transport and communications networks, which would improve safety, accessibility, transport infrastructure provision and sustainable modal shifts. As such these policies would have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
8. Land Use and Soils	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
9. Water	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Connecting the City							Commentary
	Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel	Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network	Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement	Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland	Policy CC5: Local Road Network	Policy CC6: New Development and Transport	Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications	
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	~	-	~	~	~	~	~	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. However, policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network identifies 4 specific new highway schemes and 7 strategic road improvements, as well as two extensions to the metro/rail network, which will all be supported, without reference to any environmental acceptability criteria including potential flood risks or surface water drainage requirements for road infrastructure. Given that transport infrastructure may be classified as essential infrastructure within the NPPF the policy could therefore allow transport infrastructure to be developed within/pass through flood risk areas, rather than potentially less sensitive areas, which could exacerbate flooding impacts or increase flood risk elsewhere. Depending on the locational characteristics of the transport projects supported, which are currently uncertain this policy could therefore result in Minor Adverse effects on this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP address the identified deficiency regarding consideration of environmental and potential flood risk impacts associated with the transport infrastructure projects supported by policy CC2 – Connectivity it is recommended that this policy should be expanded to reference the need for these projects to accord with other relevant planning policies and to demonstrate that they would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
11. Air							~	<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CC1 – Sustainable Travel sets out criteria and Council commitments to manage congestion and health and environmental impacts through traffic management measures. Policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network also sets out criteria and Council commitments to promote sustainable and active travel and work to create a strategic network of active travel routes. and Policy CC6 – New Development and Transport also includes criteria to ensure that development proposals include adequate and suitable cycle access. These policies would ensure that development does not exacerbate existing air quality problems, either through avoiding locating development in areas of poor air quality or deploying appropriate mitigation measures, and would help to reduce car dependency and encourage sustainable modal shifts, which could reduce traffic congestion and overall levels within busy urban areas, resulting in long term air quality improvements. As such these policies would have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. Policy CC5 – Local Road Network sets out criteria to protect the efficiency and safety of Strategic Routes on the Local Road Network. By avoiding additional congestion this policy would indirectly help to maintain local air quality, resulting in Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Connecting the City							Commentary
	Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel	Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network	Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement	Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland	Policy CC5: Local Road Network	Policy CC6: New Development and Transport	Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications	
11. Climate Change								<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CC1 – Sustainable Travel sets out criteria and Council commitments to promote sustainable and active travel, direct development to accessible urban locations and work to create a strategic network of active travel routes.. Policy CC6 – New Development and Transport includes criteria to ensure that development proposals include adequate and suitable pedestrian and cycle access as well as electrical vehicle and charging infrastructure. These policies would indirectly contribute to this SA objective through reducing car dependency, provide facilities for electric cars and encouraging sustainable modal shifts, which would help to decarbonise the transport sector and contribute to climate change mitigation. These policies are therefore predicted to have Major Positive effects on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
12. Waste and Natural Resources								<p>Assessment of Predicted Effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p>Mitigation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Connecting the City							Commentary
	Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel	Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network	Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement	Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland	Policy CC5: Local Road Network	Policy CC6: New Development and Transport	Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications	
13. Cultural Heritage		-					++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effect</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network identifies 4 new highway schemes and 7 strategic road improvements, as well as two extensions to the metro/rail network, which will be supported. Owing to the absence of criteria within this policy according with other policies or assessing environmental impacts, this could indirectly result in adverse impacts on archaeology and the setting of cultural heritage receptors. However, specific impacts would depend upon the siting and design characteristics of each project. Due to this uncertainty and the need for each project to obtain planning permission in its own right, this policy is itself only considered to have a Minor Adverse impact on this SA objective. Policy CC7 sets out criteria to ensure that telecommunication development proposals are appropriately sited and designed, including a requirement to ensure that the special character and appearance of all heritage assets is preserved or enhanced. This would directly protect and enhance the historic environment, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP address the identified deficiency regarding consideration of environmental impacts associated with the transport infrastructure projects supported by Policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network, it is recommended that this policy should be expanded to reference the need for these projects to accord with other relevant planning policies and to demonstrate they would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts (including on cultural heritage receptors). <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Connecting the City							Commentary
	Policy CC1: Sustainable Travel	Policy CC2: Connectivity and Transport Network	Policy CC3: City Centre Accessibility and Movement	Policy CC4: Port of Sunderland	Policy CC5: Local Road Network	Policy CC6: New Development and Transport	Policy CC7: Digital Infrastructure and Telecommunications	
14. Landscape and Townscape	~	~	+	~	~	~	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network identifies 4 specific new highways schemes and 7 strategic road improvements, as well as two extensions to the metro/rail network, which will be supported, without reference to the consideration of potential environmental or amenity impacts, including potential landscape impacts. This could indirectly result in adverse landscape impacts, although specific impacts would depend upon the siting and design characteristics of each project. Due to this uncertainty and the need for each project to obtain planning permission in its own right, on balance this policy is predicted to have a Neutral overall effect on this SA objective. Policy CC3 – City Centre Accessibility and Movement commits the Council to contributing to improving the public realm and street scene. This would protect visual amenity and local distinctiveness, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy CC7 sets out criteria to ensure that telecommunication development proposals are appropriately sited and designed, including a requirement to avoid adverse impacts on the external appearance of buildings/spaces where the proposals are sited. This would protect visual amenity and local distinctiveness, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP address the identified deficiency regarding consideration of environmental impacts associated with the transport infrastructure projects supported by Policy CC2 – Connectivity and Transport Network, it is recommended that this policy should be expanded to reference the need for these projects to accord with other relevant planning policies and to demonstrate they would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts (including landscape impacts, erosion of Settlement Breaks or harm to the functioning or integrity of the Green Belt). <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy CC1 – Sustainable Travel directs development to accessible locations and sets out criteria to improve accessibility to key housing and employment sites and City/town/neighbourhood centres. Policy CC5 set out criteria to protect the efficiency and safety of the strategic and local road network. Policies CC3 and CC6 would help to meet identified connectivity needs, concentrate and unlock new development in accessible locations, encourage sustainable modal shifts and increase access to key facilities and employment opportunities. As such these policies would have Major Positive cumulative effects in combination with the housing, economic prosperity, retail & town centre on SA objectives 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11 and 12. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. 							

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.12.2 No reasonable alternatives have been identified in relation to the assessed policies.

2.13 SA of Minerals and Waste Policies

2.13.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.23. The appraisal is provided in Table 2.24.

Policy Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.23 List of Minerals and Waste policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
WM1: Waste Management	Required to comply with the EU Waste Framework Directive, The Waste Regulations 2011, NPPF and NPPW	No reasonable alternatives
WM2: Waste Facilities	Required to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and NPPW and the Waste Needs Assessment	No reasonable alternatives
WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Required to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and NPPW and the Waste Needs Assessment	No reasonable alternatives
WM4: Open waste Facilities	Required to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and NPPW and the Waste Needs Assessment amenity	No reasonable alternatives
WM5: Mineral Extraction	To comply with the requirements of the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
WM6: : Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Minerals and Waste Infrastructure	To comply with the requirements of the NPPF , BGS Guide to Mineral Safeguarding and The Minerals Safeguarding Topic Paper	No reasonable alternatives
WM7: Opencast Coal	Required to comply with the EU Waste Framework Directive, The Waste Regulations 2011, NPPF and NPPW	No reasonable alternatives
WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Required to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and NPPW and the Waste Needs Assessment	No reasonable alternatives
WM9: Cumulative Impact	Required to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and NPPW and the Waste Needs Assessment	No reasonable alternatives
WM10: Restoration and Aftercare	Required to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and NPPW and the Waste Needs Assessment amenity	No reasonable alternatives

SA Matrix

Table 2.24 Appraisal of Draft Minerals and Waste Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Minerals and Waste										Commentary
	Policy WM1: Waste Management	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact	Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	++	~	~	++	~	~	~	~	++	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies WM1 and WM2 set out criteria to assess development proposals for new waste management facilities, including to ensure that proposals would not have residual unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impacts, including on wildlife. Policies WM5 - Mineral Extraction and WM7 – Open Cast Coal similarly require mineral extraction and mining development proposals to protect and enhance the natural environment. As such these policies would protect biodiversity interests including priority habitats and species, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM9 – Cumulative Impact requires minerals extraction and waste management development proposals not to have cumulative significant adverse impacts on the environmental or local amenity. This would protect biodiversity interests from cumulative significant adverse effects, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM10 - Restoration and Aftercare requires minerals extraction and temporary waste management development proposals to demonstrate a high standard of proposed site restoration and aftercare such that the intended end land use, which should be identified in the planning application, can be achieved in a timely manner. This would indirectly safeguard future biodiversity protection and potential enhancement after minerals extraction/waste management activities cease, including in relation to soil ecology, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required in relation to this specific SA objective, however general mitigation measures are set out elsewhere in this policy assessment. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
2. Housing	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The policies would help to safeguard residential amenity and ensure sufficient availability of locally sourced construction materials, including for use in housebuilding. However, owing to the weak and very indirect relationship these policies are predicted to have an Uncertain but potentially positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Minerals and Waste										Commentary
	Policy WM1: Waste Management	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact	Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare	
3. Economy and Employment	?	?	?	?	~	~	?	~	?	?	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between Policies WM5, WM6, WM8 and this SA objective. All of the other assessed policies would help to safeguard amenity, which could support inward investment and economic growth. However, owing to the weak and very indirect relationship these policies are predicted to have an Uncertain but potentially positive effect on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required in relation to this specific SA objective, however general mitigation measures are set out elsewhere in this policy assessment. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
4. Learning and Skills	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between these policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
5. Sustainable Communities	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	~	+	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy WM6 identifies areas which are safeguarded for minerals extraction and sets out criteria to assess conflicting or incompatible development proposals. These criteria require such development proposals to demonstrate that MSA would not be sterilised or that material considerations indicating the need for the development proposal should override the presumption in favour of safeguarding the MSA. This could indirectly restrict the provision of new community facilities within MSA, although other material considerations may be able to justify the proposals on community benefit grounds. As such the policy is predicted to have an Uncertain effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between Policy WM8 - Land Instability and Minerals Legacy and this SA objective. All of the other policies set out criteria to ensure that development proposals would not have significant adverse impacts on the environment or amenity. This would help to protect the quality of life of residents and employees, resulting in indirect Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required in relation to this specific SA objective, however general mitigation measures with indirect positive effects on this SA objective are set out elsewhere in this policy assessment. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Minerals and Waste										Commentary
	Policy WM1: Waste Management	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact	Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare	
6. Health and Wellbeing	0	~	~	0	~	0	0	~	0	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies WM1 - Waste Management, WM2 - Waste Facilities and WM4 - Open Waste Management Sites set out criteria to assess development proposals for new waste management facilities, including to ensure that proposals would not have residual unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impacts. Policies WM5 - Mineral Extraction and WM7 – Open Cast Coal similarly require mineral extraction and mining development proposals to protect and enhance the environment and local amenity, whilst Policy WM9 – Cumulative Impact also requires minerals extraction and waste management development proposals not to have cumulative significant adverse impacts on the environmental or local amenity. As such these policies would protect physical health through avoiding significant adverse amenity and air quality impacts, although the policies would not actually contribute to improving health outcomes or addressing health inequalities. These policies are therefore predicted to have a Neutral effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required in relation to this specific SA objective, however general mitigation measures are set out elsewhere in this policy assessment. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
7. Transport and Communication	~	+	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy WM2 – Waste Facilities requires consideration to be given to “harmful materials entering the public highway” from proposed waste management development proposals, with mitigation measures deployed as necessary. This would indirectly help to ensure the safety, efficiency and amenity of the road network, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Minerals and Waste										Commentary
	Policy WM1: Waste Management	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact	Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare	
8. Land Use and Soils	+	+	~	+	~	++	~	++	~	++	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies WM1 - Waste Management, WM2 - Waste Facilities and WM4 Open Waste Management Sites direct development proposals to suitable locations where amenity impacts and land use conflicts can be minimised. Policy WM1 – Waste Management also encourages development proposals to consider opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises and co-location of developments that can use each other's waste materials. These policies would help to avoid land use conflicts, make efficient use of land and could indirectly promote the redevelopment of brownfield land, resulting in Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM8 - Land Instability and Minerals Legacy requires development proposals to consider hazards arising from past coal mining, in particular land instability and mine gas, and to undertake investigations and mitigation as necessary. This would directly contribute to contaminated land remediation, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM6 identifies areas which are safeguarded for minerals extraction and sets out criteria to assess conflicting or incompatible development proposals. By avoiding the sterilisation of mineral resources this policy would directly support the efficient use of land and therefore have a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM10 - Restoration and Aftercare requires minerals extraction and temporary waste management development proposals to demonstrate a high standard of proposed site restoration and aftercare such that the intended end land use, which should be identified in the planning application, can be achieved in a timely manner. This would directly support the efficient use of land and future brownfield land redevelopment, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required in relation to this specific SA objective, however general mitigation measures are set out elsewhere in this policy assessment. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Minerals and Waste										Commentary
	Policy WM1: Waste Management	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact	Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare	
9. Water	++	++	~	++	++	~	++	~	++	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies WM1 - Waste Management, WM2 - Waste Facilities and WM4 Open Waste Management Sites set out criteria to assess development proposals for new waste management facilities, including to ensure that proposals would not have residual unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impacts, including on water quality. Policies WM5 - Mineral Extraction and WM7 – Open Cast Coal similarly require mineral extraction and mining development proposals to protect and enhance the natural environment. As such these policies would protect the water environment from significant adverse impacts, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM9 – Cumulative Impact requires minerals extraction and waste management development proposals not to have cumulative significant adverse impacts on the environmental or local amenity. This would protect the water environment from cumulative significant adverse effects, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM10 - Restoration and Aftercare requires minerals extraction and temporary waste management development proposals to demonstrate a high standard of proposed site restoration and aftercare such that the intended end land use, which should be identified in the planning application, can be achieved in a timely manner. This would indirectly safeguard and could enhance the water environment after mineral extraction/waste management operations cease, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required in relation to this specific SA objective, however general mitigation measures are set out elsewhere in this policy assessment. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective		Draft Policies: Minerals and Waste									Commentary	
		Policy WM1: Waste Management	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact		Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare
10.	Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	++	++	~	++	++	~	++	~	++	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies WM1 - Waste Management, WM2 - Waste Facilities and WM4 Open Waste Management Sites set out criteria to assess development proposals for new waste management facilities, including to ensure that proposals would not have residual unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impacts, including on flood risk. Policies WM5 - Mineral Extraction and WM7 – Open Cast Coal similarly require mineral extraction and mining development proposals to protect and enhance the natural environment. As such these policies would help to minimise the risk of flooding, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM9 – Cumulative Impact requires minerals extraction and waste management development proposals not to have cumulative significant adverse impacts on the environmental or local amenity. This would help to minimise the risk of flooding, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM10 - Restoration and Aftercare requires minerals extraction and temporary waste management development proposals to demonstrate a high standard of proposed site restoration and aftercare such that the intended end land use, which should be identified in the planning application, can be achieved in a timely manner. This would indirectly help to address potential flood risks after mineral extraction/waste management operations cease, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required in relation to this specific SA objective, however general mitigation measures are set out elsewhere in this policy assessment. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
11.	Air	++	++	~	++	++	~	++	~	++	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies WM1 - Waste Management, WM2- Waste Facilities and WM4 Open Waste Facilities set out criteria to assess development proposals for new waste management facilities, including to ensure that proposals would not have residual unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impacts, including odour and air quality impacts. Policies WM5 - Mineral Extraction and WM7 – Open Cast Coal similarly require mineral extraction and mining development proposals to protect and enhance the natural environment and local amenity. As such these policies would help to maintain air quality and avoid significant adverse odour impacts, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM9 – Cumulative Impact requires minerals extraction and waste management development proposals not to have cumulative significant adverse impacts on the environmental or local amenity. This would help to maintain air quality, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required in relation to this specific SA objective, however general mitigation measures are set out elsewhere in this policy assessment. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Minerals and Waste										Commentary
	Policy WM1: Waste Management	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact	Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare	
12. Climate Change	+	+	~	+	~	~	+	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies WM1 - Waste Management, WM2 - Waste Facilities and Open Waste Management Sites promote the most sustainable form of waste processing possible (in accordance with the waste hierarchy) and direct proposals to suitable locations. Policy WM1 – Waste Management also encourages relevant development proposals to consider opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises and co-location of developments that can use each other’s waste materials. These policies would reduce the need to transport waste, thereby reducing transport emissions, whilst also promoting sustainable alternatives to landfilling which would reduce methane gas release. Owing to the indirect relationship between these policies and this SA objective only Minor Positive effects are predicted. ▪ Policy WM7 – Open Cast Coal sets out a presumption against new open cast mines and requires any such development proposals to be environmentally acceptable and to generate community benefits which outweigh likely adverse impacts. This would restrict the expansion of coal mining within the Council area, which would have an indirect positive effect on climate change mitigation through limiting the local availability of fossil fuel resources for combustion. This could indirectly support shifts to cleaner fuels, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is assumed that any coal extracted from existing or new open cast mines would be used in combustion processes to generate energy, thereby releasing greenhouse gas emissions (whether locally or elsewhere). <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Minerals and Waste										Commentary
	Policy WM1: Waste Management	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact	Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare	
13. Waste and Natural Resources	++	~	++	~	+	+	~	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy WM1 - Waste Management requires all waste management development proposals to satisfy a sequential test to demonstrate compliance with the waste hierarchy. This would help to maximise resource (including energy) recovery from waste materials. In addition, the Council commits to facilitating the development of recycling of facilities across the city. The focus of this policy on implementing the waste hierarchy would result in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy WM3 – Safeguarding Waste Facilities identified sites for future waste management developments to be safeguarded in order to meet waste management needs, unless the site is demonstrated to no longer be needed for such purpose. This would help to maintain sufficient waste management processing capacity within the Council's area to treat waste arisings in an appropriate way (as outlined in Policy WM1 – Waste Management), resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. Policy WM5 - Mineral extraction requires minerals development proposals to demonstrate the need for extraction whilst Policy WM6 – Minerals Safeguarding Areas identifies areas which are safeguarded for minerals extraction and sets out criteria to assess conflicting or incompatible development proposals. These policies would ensure the continuing availability of locally sourced construction materials although they would not reduce demand for such materials, resulting in Minor Positive effects on this SA objective. As drafted there is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to minimise duplication between policies it is recommended that policy WM1 – Waste Management should be recast to focus on strategic criteria, including setting out a clear waste hierarchy, identifying waste management capacity requirements, establishing the need for development and directing waste management proposals to preferred locations. Policy WM2 – Waste Facilities should be dedicated to assessing all waste management development proposals against design, environmental and amenity criteria. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Minerals and Waste										Commentary
	Policy WM1: Waste Management	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact	Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare	
14. Cultural Heritage	++	++	~	++	++	~	++	~	++	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies WM1 - Waste Management, WM2 - Waste Facilities and WM4 Open Waste Management Sites set out criteria to assess development proposals for new waste management facilities, including to ensure that proposals would not have residual unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impacts, including on heritage assets. Policies WM5 - Mineral Extraction and WM7 – Open Cast Coal similarly require mineral extraction and mining development proposals to protect and enhance the historical environment. As such these policies would protect the heritage interests from significant adverse impacts, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM9 – Cumulative Impact requires minerals extraction and waste management development proposals not to have cumulative significant adverse impacts on the environmental or local amenity. This would protect the historical environment from cumulative significant adverse effects, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM10 - Restoration and Aftercare requires minerals extraction and temporary waste management development proposals to demonstrate a high standard of proposed site restoration and aftercare such that the intended end land use, which should be identified in the planning application, can be achieved in a timely manner. This would indirectly safeguard and could enhance the historical environment after mineral extraction/waste management operations cease, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None required in relation to this specific SA objective, however general mitigation measures are set out elsewhere in this policy assessment. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Minerals and Waste										Commentary
	Policy WM1: Waste Management	Policy WM2: Waste Facilities	Policy WM3: Safeguarding Waste Facilities	Policy WM4: Open Waste Facilities	Policy WM5: Mineral Extraction	Policy WM6: Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Waste Infrastructure	Policy WM7: Opencast Coal	Policy WM8: Land Instability and Minerals Legacy	Policy WM9: Cumulative Impact	Policy WM10: Restoration and Aftercare	
15. Landscape and Townscape	++	++	~	++	++	~	++	~	++	+	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies WM1 - Waste Management, WM2 - Waste Facilities and WM4 Open Waste Management Sites set out criteria to assess development proposals for new waste management facilities, including to ensure that proposals would not have residual unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impacts, including on landscapes. Policies WM5 - Mineral Extraction and WM7 – Open Cast Coal similarly require mineral extraction and mining development proposals to protect and enhance environmental interests including landscapes. As such these policies would help to protect landscape character, resulting in Major Positive effects on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM9 – Cumulative Impact requires minerals extraction and waste management development proposals not to have cumulative significant adverse impacts on the environmental or local amenity. This would help to protect landscape character, resulting in a Major Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ Policy WM10 - Restoration and Aftercare requires minerals extraction and temporary waste management development proposals to demonstrate a high standard of proposed site restoration and aftercare such that the intended end land use, which should be identified in the planning application, can be achieved in a timely manner. This would indirectly help to protect and potentially enhance local distinctiveness and landscape character after mineral extraction/waste management operations cease, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. ▪ There is no clear relationship between the other assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is not clear why the scope of Policy WM9 – Cumulative Impact is limited to only minerals and waste developments, especially as the draft Core Strategy does not contain similar policies to assess cumulative impacts from any other development types. The policy also fails to consider the acceptability of impacts as it only refers to impact significance, which could unreasonable restrict development given that a minerals or waste development of any significant scale may have a limited number of significant adverse impacts, including significant adverse local landscape character or visual impacts, resulting in significant cumulative adverse impacts by default if several development proposals are located within the same study area. The policy wording is also ambiguous regarding whether residual significance or merely significance in the absence of potential mitigation is to be assessed. These issues should be resolved in the next iteration of the emerging CSDP by rewording the policy to require the avoidance of unacceptable residual significant cumulative impacts. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified.
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ These policies set out criteria to ensure sufficient availability/capacity of mineral resources and waste management processing facilities to meet identified needs, whilst minimising land use conflicts and avoiding significant adverse environmental or amenity impacts. As such the policies would individually and cumulative contribute to sustainable development and would therefore have Major Positive effects in combination with policies S1, S2 and S3 on SA objectives 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 15. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the next iteration of the emerging Sunderland CSDP, to minimise duplication and potential conflicts in the wording of assessment criteria between policies it is recommended that policy WM1 – Waste Management should be recast to focus on strategic criteria, including setting out a clear waste hierarchy, identifying waste management capacity requirements, establishing the need for development and directing waste management proposals to preferred locations. Policy WM2 – Waste Facilities should be dedicated to assessing all waste management development proposals against design, environmental and amenity criteria. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None identified. 										

Appraisal of Reasonable Alternatives

2.13.2 No reasonable alternatives have been identified in relation to the assessed policies.

2.14 SA of Implementation and Enforcement Policies

2.14.1 This subsection provides an appraisal of the draft policies and reasonable alternatives listed in Table 2.25. The appraisal is provided in Table 2.26.

Policy Justification and Consideration of Alternatives/Options

Table 2.25 List of Implementation and Enforcement policies with Justifications and Reasonable Alternatives

Policy Title	Policy Justification	Consideration of Alternatives
ID1: Delivering Infrastructure	To ensure the delivery of sufficient infrastructure to support the plan, in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
ID2: Planning Obligations	To set out a policy framework for planning obligations in accordance with the NPPF	No reasonable alternatives
ID3: Enforcement	To ensure consistency with the Council's Planning Enforcement Charter	A reasonable alternative would be to not include a policy on enforcement, as the charter sets out the Council's procedures for enforcement. However, for clarity on the Council's approach to enforcement it was considered prudent to include a policy within the plan.

SA Matrix

Table 2.26 Appraisal of Draft Implementation and Enforcement Policies

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Implementation and Enforcement			Commentary
	Policy ID1: Delivering Infrastructure	Policy ID2: Planning Obligations	Policy ID3: Enforcement	
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Implementation and Enforcement			Commentary
	Policy ID1: Delivering Infrastructure	Policy ID2: Planning Obligations	Policy ID3: Enforcement	
2. Housing	~	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ID2 – Planning Obligations states that section 106 planning obligations would be used to secure affordable housing in accordance with Policy H4 – Affordable Homes. This would indirectly support the delivery of new affordable housing, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies ID1 and ID3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
3. Economy and Employment	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
4. Learning and Skills	~	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ID2 – Planning Obligations states that section 106 planning obligations would be used to ensure that development proposals provide or fund local improvements to mitigate impacts or meet additional needs arising due to the development, including onsite provision of libraries, schools, cultural and community facilities. This would indirectly support the delivery of new education infrastructure which could enhance learning opportunities, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies ID1 and ID3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Implementation and Enforcement			Commentary
	Policy ID1: Delivering Infrastructure	Policy ID2: Planning Obligations	Policy ID3: Enforcement	
5. Sustainable Communities	~	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ID2 – Planning Obligations states that section 106 planning obligations would be used to ensure that development proposals provide or fund local improvements to mitigate impacts or meet additional needs arising due to the development, including onsite provision of community facilities and local public realm improvements. This would indirectly support the delivery of new community facilities to meet identified needs and promote social interactions within the built environment, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies ID1 and ID3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
6. Health and Wellbeing	~	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ID2 – Planning Obligations states that section 106 planning obligations would be used to ensure that development proposals provide or fund local improvements to mitigate impacts or meet additional needs arising due to the development, including onsite provision of healthcare facilities and emergency services as well as local public realm and open space improvements. This would indirectly improve equitable access to health services, align healthcare services with growth, support people with disabilities, help to meet the needs of an ageing population and increase access to high quality open spaces suitable for physical recreation, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies ID1 and ID3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
7. Transport and Communication	~	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ID2 – Planning Obligations states that section 106 planning obligations would be used to ensure that development proposals provide or fund local improvements to mitigate impacts or meet additional needs arising due to the development, including any required highway works or traffic mitigation measures as well as walking and cycling improvements. This would indirectly help to protect and enhance the safety, efficiency and sustainability of the transport network, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies ID1 and ID3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Implementation and Enforcement			Commentary
	Policy ID1: Delivering Infrastructure	Policy ID2: Planning Obligations	Policy ID3: Enforcement	
8. Land Use and Soils	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
9. Water	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
10. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	~	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ID2 – Planning Obligations states that section 106 planning obligations would be used to ensure that development proposals provide or fund local improvements to mitigate impacts or meet additional needs arising due to the development, including to address potential flood risks. This would indirectly help to minimise flooding and improve flood protection defences, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies ID1 and ID3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
11. Air	~	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ID2 – Planning Obligations states that section 106 planning obligations would be used to ensure that development proposals provide or fund local improvements to mitigate impacts or meet additional needs arising due to the development. This would indirectly help to address local incidences of poor air quality through funding appropriate and necessary mitigation measures, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies ID1 and ID3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Implementation and Enforcement			Commentary
	Policy ID1: Delivering Infrastructure	Policy ID2: Planning Obligations	Policy ID3: Enforcement	
12. Climate Change	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
13. Waste and Natural Resources	~	~	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear relationship between the assessed policies and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
14. Cultural Heritage	~	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ID2 – Planning Obligations states that section 106 planning obligations would be used to ensure that development proposals provide or fund local improvements to mitigate impacts or meet additional needs arising due to the development, including the mitigation of impacts on and/or enhancement of heritage assets. This would indirectly help to preserve, protect and enhance the historic environment, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies ID1 and ID3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.
15. Landscape and Townscape	~	+	~	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ID2 – Planning Obligations states that section 106 planning obligations would be used to ensure that development proposals provide or fund local improvements to mitigate impacts or meet additional needs arising due to the development, including local public realm and streetscape improvements. This would indirectly help to protect and enhance local distinctiveness and townscape character, resulting in a Minor Positive effect on this SA objective. There is no clear relationship between policies ID1 and ID3 and this SA objective. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required. <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified.

SA Objective	Draft Policies: Implementation and Enforcement			Commentary
	Policy ID1: Delivering Infrastructure	Policy ID2: Planning Obligations	Policy ID3: Enforcement	
Likely Cumulative Effects	<p><u>Assessment of Predicted Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These policies set out mechanisms to ensure that development proposals provide adequate infrastructure to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms and are implemented in accordance with valid planning permissions, but they do not set out policy tests. The policies would therefore be limited to playing a supporting role in implementing other subject specific policies in pursuit of sustainable development, but are not predicted to have any individual or cumulative significant effects. <p><u>Mitigation and Enhancement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 			

SA of Reasonable Alternatives

2.14.2 No reasonable alternatives have been identified in relation to the assessed policies.